

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

ORDER NO. R1-2020-0012
NPDES NO. CA0022764
WDID NO. 1B830990SON

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
SANTA ROSA REGIONAL WATER REUSE SYSTEM, LAGUNA TREATMENT PLANT
SONOMA COUNTY

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

Table 1. Permittee Information

Permittee	City of Santa Rosa
Name of Facility	Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System, Laguna Treatment Plant
Facility Address	4300 Llano Road
	Santa Rosa, CA 95407
	Sonoma County
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
Facility Design Flow	21.34 million gallons per day (mgd) (average dry weather design flow)
	64 mgd (peak weekly wet weather design flow)
	47.3 mgd (peak monthly wet weather design flow)

Table 2. Discharge Locations

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
006A (Meadow Lane Pond D)	Disinfected Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 22' 00"	122° 46' 24"	Laguna de Santa Rosa
006B (Meadow Lane Pond D)	Disinfected Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 22' 25"	122° 46' 33"	Laguna de Santa Rosa
012A (Delta Pond)	Disinfected Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 26' 50"	122° 49' 25"	Santa Rosa Creek
012B (Delta Pond)	Disinfected Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 26' 57"	122° 50' 00"	Santa Rosa Creek

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
015	Disinfected Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 22' 17"	122° 46' 31"	Laguna de Santa Rosa

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted on:	August 20, 2020
This Order shall become effective on:	October 1, 2020
This Order shall expire on:	September 31, 2025
The Permittee shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDRs in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, (CCR) and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	October 1, 2024
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region have classified this discharge as follows:	Major

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R1-2013-0001 and Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) No. R1-2013-0001, are rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the California Water Code (Water Code) (commencing with section 13000) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Permittee shall comply with the requirements of this Order. This action in no way prevents the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous permit.

I, Matthias St. John, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region, on **August 20, 2020**.

 Matthias St. John, Executive Officer

20_0012_SantaRosa-LagunaWWTF_NPDES

Contents

I. Facility Information..... 5

II. Findings..... 5

III. Discharge Prohibitions..... 5

IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications..... 7

 A. Effluent Limitations – All Discharge Points..... 7

 B. Land Discharge Specifications and Requirements – Not Applicable 10

 C. Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements – Recycled Water Distribution Points
 001 and 002 10

 D. Other Requirements 11

V. Receiving Water Limitations..... 15

 A. Surface Water Limitations 15

 B. Groundwater Limitations 17

VI. Provisions 18

 A. Standard Provisions..... 18

 B. Monitoring and Reporting Program Requirements 18

 C. Special Provisions..... 19

VII. Compliance Determination..... 29

 A. General 29

 B. Multiple Sample Data 29

 C. Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL) 30

 D. Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL) 30

 E. Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)..... 30

 F. Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation 30

 G. Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation 31

 H. Bacteriological Limitations 31

 I. Acute Toxicity Limitations 32

 J. Chronic Toxicity..... 32

 K. Average Dry Weather Flow..... 32

 L. Peak Weekly Wet Weather Flow 32

 M. Peak Monthly Wet Weather Flow 32

 N. Receiving Water Objectives 32

 O. Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations for Total Phosphorus 33

Tables

Table 1. Permittee Information..... 1
Table 2. Discharge Locations..... 1
Table 3. Administrative Information..... 2
Table 4. Final Technology-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points 001, 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)..... 7
Table 5. WQBELs– Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) 9
Table 6. WQBELs – Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B (Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-012A(2), and EFF-012B) 9
Table 7. Recycling Discharge Specifications – Recycled Water Distribution Points 001 and 002 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)10
Table 8. Schedule for Compliance with UV Disinfection System Operational Requirements and Total Coliform Effluent Limitations29

Attachments

Attachment A – Definitions A-1
Attachment B – Maps B-1
Attachment C-1 – FACILITY Flow Schematic C-1
ATTACHMENT C-2 – RECLAMATION FLOW SCHEMATIC..... C-2
Attachment D – Standard Provisions..... D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet..... F-1
Attachment G – AMEL and MDEL Copper Standards based on CTR Water Quality Criteria for Freshwater..... G-1
Attachment H– Example Copper Impact Ratio (CIR) CalculatorH-1
Attachment I– Water Quality Trading Framework..... I-1
Attachment J- September 1, 2015 Regional Water Board Letter to the City of Santa Rosa regarding groundwater monitoring..... J-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Santa Rosa (Permittee) Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System, Laguna Treatment Plant (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (Regional Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit authorizing the Permittee to discharge into waters of the United States at the discharge locations described in Table 2 subject to the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). This Order also serves as WDRs pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).
- B. Basis and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the Permittee's application, monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F) contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order and is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G, I, and K are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections III.E, III.F, III.L, IV.B-D, V.B, VI.C.1.g, VI.C.2.c, VI.C.2.f, VI.C.2.g, VI.C.5.a, VI.C.5.d, VI.C.5.h, VI.C.6.a, and VI.C.6.b of this Order and sections VII, VIII.C, IX.A, IX.B, and X.E.2 and X.E.3 of the MRP are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board has notified the Permittee and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- E. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** The discharge of any waste not disclosed by the Permittee or not within the reasonable contemplation of the Regional Water Board is prohibited.
- B.** Creation of pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined by section 13050 of the Water Code is prohibited.
- C.** The discharge of sludge or digester supernatant is prohibited, except as authorized under section VI.C.5.c of this Order (Sludge Disposal and Handling Requirements).

- D.** The discharge or recycling use of untreated or partially treated waste (receiving a lower level of treatment than described in section II.A of the Fact Sheet) from anywhere within the collection, treatment, or disposal systems is prohibited, except as provided for in Attachment D, Standard Provisions G (Bypass) and H (Upset).
- E.** Any sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) that results in a discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater to (a) waters of the state or (b) land and creates pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined in Water Code section 13050(m) is prohibited.
- F.** The discharge of waste to land that is not owned by the Permittee, governed by City ordinance, or under agreement to use by the Permittee, or for which the Permittee has explicitly permitted such use, is prohibited, except for use for fire suppression as provided in title 22, sections 60307(a) and 60307(b) of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).
- G.** The discharge of waste at any point not described in Finding II.B of the Fact Sheet or authorized by a permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or another Regional Water Board is prohibited.
- H.** The average dry weather flow of waste through the Facility in excess of 21.34 mgd is prohibited until such time as additional treatment, storage, and/or total water recycling capacity has been added to accommodate a higher average dry weather flow, not to exceed 25.9 mgd. The peak weekly wet weather flow of waste through the Facility shall not exceed 64 mgd and the peak monthly wet weather flow of waste through the Facility shall not exceed 47.3 mgd. Compliance with this prohibition shall be determined as defined in sections VII.K, VII.L, and VI.M of this Order.
- I.** The discharge of waste to the Russian River and its tributaries is prohibited during the period from May 15 through September 30 of each year.
- J.** During the period from October 1 through May 14, discharges of treated wastewater to the unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and Santa Rosa Creek, tributaries to the Russian River, shall not exceed five percent of the flow of the Russian River, as measured at the Hacienda Bridge at United States Geological Survey (USGS) Gauge No. 11467000. For the purposes of this Order, compliance with this discharge prohibition shall be determined as follows:
 - 1.** The discharge of advanced treated wastewater¹ shall be adjusted at least once daily to avoid exceeding, to the extent practicable, five percent of the most recent daily flow measurement of the Russian River at the Hacienda Bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000. Daily flow shall be based on flow meter comparisons reasonably read between the hours of 12:01 am and 12:00 midnight; and,
 - 2.** In no case shall the total volume of advanced treated wastewater discharged in a calendar month exceed five percent of the total volume of the Russian River measured at the Hacienda Bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000 in the same calendar month. At the beginning of the discharge season, the monthly flow volume comparisons shall be based on the date when the discharge commenced to the end of the calendar month. At the end of the

¹ For the purposes of this Order, the terms “advanced treated wastewater or effluent” and “tertiary wastewater, recycled water, or effluent” are held to be equivalent. “Advanced treated wastewater” is from section 4 of the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (Basin Plan) and “disinfected tertiary recycled water” is from section 60301.230 of division 4, chapter 3, section 60301.230 of title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. The level of expected treatment is defined in section IV.A.1.a and IV.C.1.a of this Order.

discharge season, the monthly flow volume comparisons shall be based on the first day of the calendar month to the date when the discharge ceased for the season.

- K. The discharge of any radiological, chemical, or biological warfare agent into waters of the state is prohibited under Water Code section 13375.
- L. The discharge of septage to a location other than an approved septage receiving station, or equivalent location within the Facility, is prohibited.
- M. The discharge of waste from Discharge Points 012A(1) and 012A(2) is prohibited until the Permittee has demonstrated that these discharge points are operationally functional and are being properly operated and maintained in accordance with Special Provision VI.C.4.a.

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – All Discharge Points

1. Final Technology-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points 001, 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

- a. The discharge of treated wastewater to Discharge Points 001, 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015 shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001, as described in the MRP (Attachment E). The advanced treated wastewater shall be adequately oxidized, filtered, and disinfected as defined in title 22, division 4, chapter 3, of the CCR.

Table 4. Final Technology-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points 001, 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly ¹	Average Weekly ¹	Maximum Daily ¹	Instantaneous Minimum ¹	Instantaneous Maximum ¹
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
pH					6.5 ²	8.5 ²

Table Notes:

- 1. See Definitions in Attachment A and Compliance Determination discussion in section VII of this Order.
- 2. For transfers of disinfected tertiary effluent to storage pH shall be within the limits of 6.0 and 9.0. All discharges to surface waters shall be within the limits of 6.5 and 8.5.

- b. **Percent Removal.** The average monthly percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS shall not be less than 85 percent. Percent removal shall be determined from the monthly average value of influent wastewater concentration in comparison to the monthly average value of effluent concentration for the same constituent over the same time period as measured at Monitoring Locations INF-001 and EFF-001, respectively.
- c. **Disinfection.** Disinfected effluent, sampled in each of the disinfection channels, shall not contain bacteria exceeding the following concentrations, as measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001:

- i. Total Coliform Bacteria**
 - (a)** The median concentration of the disinfection channels shall not exceed a Most Probable Number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters (mL) using the daily bacteriological results² of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed³;
 - (b)** The number of coliform bacteria shall not exceed an MPN of 23 per 100 mL in more than one sample in any 30-day period; and
 - (c)** No sample shall exceed an MPN of 240 total coliform bacteria per 100 mL.
- 2. Final Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)- Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 012A(1), 012A(2), 012B, and 015 (Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-001, EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, and EFF-001, respectively)**
 - a.** The discharge of treated wastewater shall maintain compliance with the following final WQBELs at Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 012A(1), 012A(2), 012B, and 015, with compliance measured at Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-001, EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, and EFF-001, respectively, as described in the MRP (Attachment E).
 - i. Total Phosphorus.** There shall be no net loading of total phosphorus to the water bodies of the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed.⁴

Compliance with this effluent limitation shall be determined in accordance with section VII.O of this Order
 - ii. Total Nitrogen.** The average monthly concentration of total nitrogen shall not exceed 10.6 mg/L.
 - iii. Acute Toxicity.** There shall be no acute toxicity in treated wastewater discharged to the Laguna de Santa Rosa or Santa Rosa Creek. The Permittee will be considered in compliance with this limitation when the survival of aquatic organisms in a 96-hour bioassay of undiluted effluent complies with the following:
 - (a)** Minimum for any one bioassay: 70 percent survival; and
 - (b)** Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays: at least 90 percent survival.
 - (c)** Compliance with this effluent limitation shall be determined in accordance with section VII.I of this Order and section V.A of the MRP (Attachment E).
- 3. Final WQBELs - Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)**
 - a.** The discharge of treated wastewater shall maintain compliance with the following WQBELs at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001, as described in the MRP (Attachment E).

² All operating channels shall be sampled. The daily result is the highest result when multiple UV channels are operational.

³ See section VII.H of this Order regarding compliance with bacteriological limitations.

⁴ For purposes of this Order, the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed consists of the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Creek, and Mark West Creek hydrologic subareas (HSUs) as mapped in the Basin Plan.

Table 5. WQBELs– Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly ¹	Average Weekly ¹	Maximum Daily ¹	Instantaneous Minimum ¹	Instantaneous Maximum ¹
pH	Standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	1.1	--	--
Copper Impact Ratio ²	Ratio	1	--	1	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.6	--	--
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	0.28	--	0.56	--	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	0.01	--	0.02	--	--

Table Notes:

- See Definitions in Attachment A and Compliance Determination discussion in section VII of this Order.
- The Copper Impact Ratio (CIR) applies at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 only.** The CIR is calculated as the ratio of the copper concentration in the effluent and the applicable copper standard (AMEL and MDEL). Attachment H is a PDF example of the calculator that will be sent to the Permittee to determine compliance with the AMEL/MDEL CIR. For each of the applicable copper standards, Attachment G includes two tables that provide the variable AMEL and MDEL copper standards used in calculating the CIR. The CIR is the copper effluent limitation and must be reported in the self-monitoring reports in addition to copper concentrations in the effluent and hardness concentration in the receiving water. Monitoring for effluent copper and receiving water hardness must be conducted concurrently in order for the CIR to be calculated properly.

4. Final WQBELs– Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B (Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and 012B)

- The discharge of treated wastewater shall maintain compliance with the following WQBELs at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B, with compliance measured at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B, respectively, as described in the MRP (Attachment E).

Table 6. WQBELs – Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B (Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-012A(2), and EFF-012B)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly ¹	Average Weekly ¹	Maximum Daily ¹	Instantaneous Minimum ¹	Instantaneous Maximum ¹
pH	Standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	1.8	--	3.6	--	--

Table Notes:

- See Definitions in Attachment A and Compliance Determination discussion in section VII of this Order.

5. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

This Order does not establish interim effluent limitations or schedules for compliance with final effluent limitations.

B. Land Discharge Specifications and Requirements – Not Applicable

C. Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements – Recycled Water Distribution Points 001 and 002

1. Water Recycling Specifications

- a. All treated effluent produced at the Facility and delivered to the recycled water system is either from on-site recycled water storage ponds or directly from the Facility, therefore, the Permittee shall maintain compliance with the following water recycling specifications at Recycled Water Distribution Points 001 and 002, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001, as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E). All tertiary recycled water shall be adequately oxidized, filtered, and disinfected as defined in title 22, division 4, chapter 3 of the CCR.

Table 7. Recycling Discharge Specifications – Recycled Water Distribution Points 001 and 002 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Discharge Specifications				
		Average Monthly ¹	Average Weekly ¹	Maximum Daily ¹	Instantaneous Minimum ¹	Instantaneous Maximum ¹
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0

Table Notes:
 1. See Definitions in Attachment A and Compliance Determination discussion in section VII of this Order.

- b. **Disinfection.** Disinfected effluent, sampled in each of the UV disinfection channels, shall not contain total coliform bacteria exceeding the following concentrations, as measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001:
 - i. The median concentration of the disinfection channels shall not exceed a Most Probable Number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters (mL) using the daily bacteriological results⁵ of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed⁶;
 - ii. The number of coliform bacteria shall not exceed an MPN of 23 per 100 mL in more than one sample in any 30-day period; and
 - iii. No sample shall exceed an MPN of 240 total coliform bacteria per 100 mL.

2. Water Recycling Requirements

- a. This Order includes water recycling requirements that apply to the production and storage of recycled water. The Permittee and the City of Rohnert Park have each separately obtained coverage under State Water Board Order No.

⁵ All operating channels shall be sampled. The daily result is the highest result when multiple UV channels are operational.

⁶ See section VII.H of this Order regarding compliance with bacteriological limitations.

WQ 2016-0068-DDW, Water Reclamation Requirements for Recycled Water Use (Recycled Water General Order) to regulate recycled water distribution and use.

- b.** The Permittee shall comply with applicable state and local requirements regarding the production of recycled water, including requirements of Water Code sections 13500-13577 (Water Reclamation) and State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) regulations at title 22, sections 60301 – 60357 of the CCR (Water Recycling Criteria).
 - c.** The Permittee shall implement its DDW-accepted December 2019 title 22 Recycled Water Engineering Report (and any subsequent amendments thereto). The Permittee shall submit revisions and updates to the title 22 Recycled Water Engineering Report to reflect any changes in operations and recycled water management or new use types.
- 3. Water Recycling Capacity.** The Permittee shall maintain, at a minimum, a total water recycling capacity of 4,015 million gallons for Geysers recharge and maintain the capability to irrigate 2,590 million gallons per year at 21.34 mgd average dry weather flow (ADWF). Prior to allowing an increase in the permitted recycled water flows, the Permittee shall submit to the Regional Water Board, an engineering report detailing modifications to the treatment and/or water recycling capacity. The engineering report shall demonstrate the capability of meeting the Facility's capacity requirements of 25.9 mgd ADWF without necessitating an increase in discharge volumes to surface waters above those permitted. The Permittee developed the Incremental Recycled Water Program Master Plan (IRWP Master Plan) (August 2007) as a means of planning for future flows to the Facility. The IRWP Master Plan has been designed to meet the Facility's capacity requirements and flow management with a mixture of conservation and reuse. The design ADWF volume permitted to be recycled may be modified provided the Permittee demonstrates the agreements, modifications, and capacity are adequate to ensure surface water discharge volumes remain unchanged.

D. Other Requirements

1. Filtration Process Requirements

- a. Filtration Rate.** The rate of filtration through the tertiary filters, as measured at Monitoring Location INT-001A, shall not exceed any of the following specifications:

 - i.** 7.5 gallons per minute per square foot (gpm/ft²) of surface area as a 24-hour average; and
 - ii.** 8.0 gpm/ft² of surface area as an instantaneous maximum; or
 - iii.** Other filtration rates authorized in writing by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer and under conditions recommended by DDW.
- b. Turbidity.** Effluent from the tertiary treatment process filters must at all times be filtered such that the combined filter effluent complies with the following tertiary filter turbidity requirements, as measured at Monitoring Location INT-001B, prior to discharge to the disinfection unit:

 - i.** When the tertiary filters are operated at or below a loading rate of 5 gpm/ft², the effluent from the tertiary treatment process filters shall not exceed any of the following specifications:

 - (a)** An average of 2 NTU during any 24-hour period;

Treatment Plant at both maximum and minimum plant flows. At a minimum, the Permittee shall demonstrate a 99.99 percent removal and/or inactivation of MS2 through the UV disinfection system only.

- b.** Provide continuous, reliable monitoring of flow per channel, UV transmittance, UV dose, and UV power at Monitoring Location INT-002, and turbidity at Monitoring Location INT-001B. The Permittee must demonstrate compliance with the UV dose requirement.
- c.** Operate the UV disinfection system to provide a minimum UV dose of 100 millijoules per square centimeter (mJ/cm²) at all times at Monitoring Location INT-002, unless otherwise approved by DDW. This dose shall apply to recycled water for delivery to use sites that require “disinfected tertiary recycled water.” All other use sites and surface water discharges do not require a dose of 100 mJ/cm².
- d.** Ensure that the UV transmittance (at least 254 nanometers) in the wastewater does not fall below 50 percent of maximum at any time, unless otherwise approved by DDW.
- e.** Visually inspect the quartz sleeves and cleaning system components per the manufacturer’s operation manual for physical wear (scoring, solarization, seal leaks, etc.) and check the efficacy of the cleaning system.
- f.** Wipe/clean the quartz sleeves at least once every 12 hours following the manufacturer’s procedures to maintain a fouling factor of 0.95 and to ensure the minimum required UV dose delivery is consistently achieved. Cleaning intervals shall be increased as necessary to ensure compliance with permit requirements such as UV dose and total coliform organism requirements.
- g.** Use equations below to calculate the UV dose, as part of the automatic UV disinfection control system⁷.

$$\text{Dose} = (0.86) * (\text{FF}) * (\text{EOLL}) * 10^{-3.28 - 0.91 * \log \text{Flow} + 2.32 * \log \text{UVT} + 1.34 * \log P}$$

Where:

Dose= Delivered UV dose per bank (mJ/cm²)

FF = 0.95 Fouling Factor based upon a cleaning frequency of once every 12 hours

UVT = % UV transmittance at 254 nm (%)

Flow = Flow rate per lamp [gallons per minute (gpm)/lamp], with gpm/lamp calculated as gpm divided by the number of lamps in one bank

EOLL = End of Lamp Life factor is assumed to be 0.85 at 10,000 hours for the PROLAMP bulbs

P = percent power

- h.** Under normal operational conditions, provide adequate redundancy. If adequate reliability features can be demonstrated and implemented via an approved operations

⁷ A letter dated September 5, 2014, to DDW documented the Permittee’s UV system control equation to deliver a dose of 100 mJ/cm². This equation is shown in a different mathematical format for the purpose of programming but delivers the same results as the equation shown in the August 29, 2012 CDPH acceptance letter.

and maintenance plan, four banks per channel shall only be used when needed, provided the UV dose is 100 mJ/cm² or greater.

- i.** Operate the UV disinfection system in accordance with an approved operations and maintenance plan, which specifies clearly the operational limits and responses required for critical alarms. The Permittee shall maintain a copy of the approved operations plan at the treatment plant and make the plan readily available to operations personnel and regulatory agencies. The Permittee shall post a quick reference plant operations data sheet at the treatment plant. The data sheet shall include the following information:
 - i.** The alarm set points for secondary and tertiary turbidity, high and low flow, UV dose and transmittance, UV lamp operation hours, and power.
 - ii.** The values of secondary and tertiary turbidity, high and low flow, UV dose and transmittance, UV lamp operation hours, and power when flow must be diverted to waste.
 - iii.** The values of high daily and weekly median total coliform when an operational response must be taken.
 - iv.** The required frequency of calibration for all meters measuring turbidity, flow, UV transmittance, and power.
 - v.** The required frequency of mechanical cleaning/wiping and equipment inspection.
 - vi.** The UV lamp age tracking procedures and replacement intervals.
- j.** Replace lamps every 10,000 hours of operation, or sooner, if there are indications that the lamps are failing to provide adequate disinfection. The Permittee shall maintain lamp age and lamp replacement records for a time period consistent with the record retention requirements in the Standard Provisions (Attachment D, Section IV).
- k.** Properly calibrate flow meters and UV transmittance (UVT) monitors to ensure proper disinfection.
- l.** Inspect the UVT meter and check against a reference bench-top unit weekly to document accuracy.
- m.** Recalibrate the on-line UVT analyzer by a procedure recommended by the manufacturer if the on-line analyzer UVT reading (expressed in percent transmittance) varies from the bench-top spectrophotometer UVT reading (expressed in percent transmittance) by 2 percent or more.
- n.** Operate the UV disinfection system with a built-in automatic reliability feature that must be triggered when the system drops below the target UV dose. If the measured UV dose drops below the minimum UV dose, the UV reactor in question must alarm and startup the next available UV lamp bank or reactor. Conditions that should divert flow include inability to meet the UV dose of 100 mJ/cm² at full power and all four banks on.
- o.** At least monthly, inspect flow meters measuring the flow through the UV reactor to determine accuracy by checking the flow reading against other flow determination methods.

- p. Not allow equivalent or substitutions of equipment to occur without an adequate demonstration of equivalent disinfection performance to the satisfaction and approval of DDW.
 - q. When extreme storm flow conditions are anticipated, the Permittee shall operate the UV disinfection system in accordance with a DDW-approved Emergency Operation, Redundancy, and Response Plan.
5. **Storage Ponds.** The Permittee shall construct ponds used for the storage of recycled water in a manner that protects groundwater. Prior to construction or use of any new recycled water storage ponds, or repurposing of existing ponds for recycled water storage, the Permittee shall submit to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer for review and approval, a technical report that includes design proposals and a technical evaluation that demonstrates that the pond design complies with the Water Code. Pond design and operation plans must include features and best management practices (BMPs) to protect groundwater and prevent exceedances of groundwater quality objectives.

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. Receiving water conditions not in conformance with the limitations are not necessarily a violation of this Order. Compliance with receiving water limitations shall be measured at monitoring locations described in the MRP (Attachment E). The Regional Water Board may require an investigation and/or may consider other available information to determine cause and culpability prior to asserting that a violation has occurred.

A. Surface Water Limitations

Discharges from the Facility shall not cause the following in the receiving water:

1. The discharge shall not cause the dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration of the receiving water to be depressed below 9.0 mg/L daily and 11.0 mg/L as a 7-day rolling average.

In those waterbodies for which the aquatic life-based DO requirements are unachievable due to natural conditions⁸, site-specific background DO requirements can be applied⁹ as water quality objectives by calculating the daily minimum DO necessary to maintain 85% DO saturation during the dry season and 90% DO saturation during the wet season under site salinity, site atmospheric pressure, and natural receiving water temperature¹⁰. In no event may controllable factors reduce the daily minimum DO below 6.0 mg/L.

2. The discharge shall not cause the pH of receiving waters to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. Within this range, the discharge shall not cause the pH of the receiving waters to be changed at any time more than 0.5 units from that which occurs naturally.
3. The discharge shall not cause the turbidity of receiving waters to be increased more than 20 percent above naturally occurring background levels.

⁸ Natural conditions are conditions or circumstances affecting the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of water that are not influenced by past or present anthropogenic activities.

⁹ Upon approval from the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

¹⁰ The method(s) used to estimate natural temperatures for a given waterbody or stream length must be approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer and may include, as appropriate, comparison with reference streams, simple calculation, or computer models.

4. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
5. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain floating materials, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
6. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, that cause nuisance, or that adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. The discharge shall not cause coloration of receiving waters that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
8. The discharge shall not cause bottom deposits in receiving waters to the extent that such deposits cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
9. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain concentrations of biostimulatory substances that promote objectionable aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses. Compliance with effluent limitations for total phosphorus and total nitrogen established in sections IV.A.2.a.i and IV.A.2.a.ii (final effluent limitations), and VII.O (Compliance Determination for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations for Total Phosphorus) of this Order will satisfy this requirement.
10. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, plants, animals, or aquatic life. Compliance with this objective will be determined by use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, bioassays of appropriate duration, or other appropriate methods, as specified by the Regional Water Board.
11. The following temperature limitations apply to the discharge to the receiving waters:
 - a. When the receiving water is below 58°F, the discharge shall cause an increase of no more than 4°F in the receiving water, and shall not increase the temperature of the receiving water beyond 59°F. No instantaneous increase in receiving water temperature shall exceed 4°F at any time.
 - b. When the receiving water is between 59°F and 67°F, the discharge shall cause an increase of no more than 1°F in the receiving water. No instantaneous increase in receiving water temperature shall exceed 1°F at any time.
 - c. When the receiving water is above 68°F, the discharge shall not cause an increase in temperature of the receiving water.
 - d. Additionally, the discharge shall not cause the 7-day average of the daily maximum receiving water temperature to exceed 64.4°F.
12. The discharge shall not cause an individual pesticide or combination of pesticides to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. The discharge shall not cause bioaccumulation of pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life.

13. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain concentrations of pesticides in excess of Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) established for these pollutants in title 22, division 4, chapter 15, article 5.5 of the CCR.
14. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials in concentrations that result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, that cause nuisance, or that otherwise affect beneficial uses.
15. The discharge shall not cause a violation of any applicable water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Water Board or the State Water Board, as required by the federal Clean Water Act and regulations adopted thereunder. If more stringent applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, the Regional Water Board will revise and modify this Order in accordance with such more stringent standards.
16. The discharge shall not cause concentrations of chemical constituents to occur in excess of MCLs and secondary MCLs (SMCLs) established for these pollutants in title 22, division 4, chapter 15, article 4, section 64431, article 5.5, section 64444, and article 16, section 64449 of the CCR.
17. The discharge shall not cause receiving waters to contain radionuclides in concentrations which are deleterious to human, plant, animal or aquatic life, nor which result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent which presents a hazard to human, plant, animal or indigenous aquatic life, nor in excess of the MCLs and SMCLs established for these pollutants in title 22, division 4, chapter 15, article 5, sections 64442 and 64443 of the CCR.
18. The bacteria water quality objective for all waters where the salinity is equal to or less than 1 part per thousand (ppt) 95 percent or more of the time during the calendar year is: a six week rolling geometric mean of *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) not to exceed 100 colony forming units (CFU) per 100 milliliter (mL), calculated weekly, and a statistical threshold value (STV) of 320 CFU/100 mL not to be exceeded by more than 10 percent of the samples collected in a calendar month, calculated in a static manner.

B. Groundwater Limitations

1. The collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastewater shall not cause degradation of groundwater quality unless a technical evaluation is performed that demonstrates that any degradation that could reasonably be expected to occur, after implementation of reasonable best management practices (BMPs), will not violate groundwater quality objectives or cause impacts to beneficial uses of groundwater.
2. The collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastewater shall not cause or contribute to levels of chemical constituents in groundwater that exceed the MCL and SMCL provisions established for these pollutants in title 22, division 4, chapter 15, article 4, section 64431, article 5.5, section 64444, and article 16 section 64449 of the CCR.
3. The collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastewater shall not cause or contribute to levels of radionuclides in groundwater in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses, nor in excess of the MCLs and SMCLs established for these pollutants in the CCR, title 22, division 4, chapter 15, article 5, sections 64442 and 64443 of the CCR.

4. The collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastewater shall not cause groundwater to contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
5. The collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastewater shall not cause the median of the most probable number of coliform organisms over any 7-day period to exceed 1.1 MPN/100 mL or 1 colony/100 mL in groundwaters used for domestic or municipal supply (MUN).
6. The collection, treatment, storage and disposal of wastewater shall not cause groundwater to contain toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, or that adversely affects beneficial uses. This limitation applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the synergistic effect of multiple substances.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. **Federal Standard Provisions.** The Permittee shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order.
2. **Regional Water Board Standard Provisions.** The Permittee shall comply with the following Regional Water Board standard provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
 - a. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this Facility, may subject the Permittee to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Permittee to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
 - b. In the event the Permittee does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, final effluent limitation, recycled water specification, other specification, receiving water limitation, or provision of this Order that may result in a significant threat to human health or the environment, such as inundation of treatment infrastructure, breach of pond containment, sanitary sewer overflow, recycled water main break or equivalent release, irrigation runoff, etc., that results in a discharge to a drainage channel or a surface water, the Permittee shall notify Regional Water Board staff within 24 hours of having knowledge of such non-compliance. Spill notification and reporting shall be conducted in accordance with section V.E of Attachment D and section X.E of the MRP (Attachment E).

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program Requirements

The Permittee shall comply with the MRP, included as Attachment E to this Order, and future revisions thereto.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Standard Revisions.** If applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, the Regional Water Board may reopen this Order and make modifications in accordance with such revised standards.
- b. **Reasonable Potential.** This Order may be reopened for modification to include an effluent limitation if monitoring establishes that the discharge causes, or has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to, an excursion above a water quality criterion or objective applicable to the receiving water.
- c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a narrative or numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on that objective.
- d. **303(d)-Listed Pollutants.** If an applicable total maximum daily load (TMDL) (see Fact Sheet, section III.D) program is adopted, this Order may be reopened and effluent limitations for the pollutant(s) that are the subject of the TMDL may be modified or imposed to conform this Order to the TMDL requirements.
- e. **Water Effects Ratios (WERs) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable priority pollutant inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Permittee performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators and submits a report that demonstrates that WER or translator studies were performed in accordance with U.S. EPA or other approved guidance, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable constituents.
- f. **Nutrients.** This Order contains effluent limitations for nitrate, nitrite, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus and effluent monitoring for nutrients (ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, and total phosphorus). If new water quality objectives for nutrients are established, if monitoring data indicate the need for new or revised effluent limitations for any of these parameters, or if new or revised methods for compliance with effluent limitations for any of these parameters are developed, this Order may be reopened and modified to include new or modified effluent limitations or other requirements, as necessary.
- g. **Salt and Nutrient Management Plans (SNMPs).** The State Water Board adopted the Water Quality Control Policy for Recycled Water (Recycled Water Policy) in 2009 and amended it in 2013 and 2018. The Recycled Water Policy recognizes the fact that some groundwater basins in the state contain salts and nutrients that exceed or threaten to exceed water quality objectives in the applicable Basin Plans, and that not all Basin Plans include adequate implementation procedures for achieving or ensuring compliance with the water quality objectives for salt or nutrients. However, in the absence of an approved SNMP, the Regional Water Board may impose specific

requirements to ensure the preservation and maintenance of high-quality groundwater.

- h. Title 22 Engineering Report.** This Order implements title 22 requirements to protect public health. If the Permittee's title 22 engineering report requires modifications to this Order to adequately implement title 22 requirements applicable to the production of recycled water, this Order may be reopened and modified as necessary.
- i. Temperature Study.** This Order may be reopened to modify temperature effluent limitations as appropriate, if the Permittee completes, for approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), a work plan and study to determine site-specific temperature limitations for the receiving waters.
- j. Mixing Zone Study.** This Order may be reopened to modify effluent limitations and receiving water monitoring locations if the Permittee demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer that it has evaluated all reasonable alternatives for compliance with human health-based effluent limitations, and conducts a mixing zone study that provides a basis for determining that permit conditions should be modified.
- k. Pathogens.** This Order includes monitoring requirements for *E. Coli* bacteria in order to develop data needed to assess whether or not the Permittee's discharge is a source of pathogens as defined in the Regional Water Board's Russian River Watershed Pathogen TMDL Action Plan adopted in August 2019 and to determine if the Facility complies with the bacteria water quality objective. This Order may be reopened if monitoring data indicate the need for additional monitoring requirements or water quality-based effluent limitations for bacteria to implement the Russian River Watershed Pathogen TMDL.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. Pathogen Special Study.** The Permittee shall conduct a study to assess the Facility's ability to comply with the bacteria water quality objective in Section V.A.18 of the Order and required actions outlined in Table 4 of the Russian River Watershed Pathogen TMDL Action Plan (Pathogen TMDL, TMDL, or Action Plan) adopted by the Regional Water Board in August 2019. By **August 1, 2021**, the Permittee shall submit, for Regional Water Board Executive Officer approval, a work plan for conducting the study. A final report summarizing the results of the Permittee's ability to comply with the bacteria water quality objective and the Pathogen TMDL, and, if necessary, a plan and schedule for achieving compliance with the Pathogen TMDL shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board in conjunction with the ROWD by **July 31, 2024**. If monitoring demonstrates that the Permittee cannot comply with the bacteria water quality objective and the Pathogen TMDL, the plan of compliance shall identify any other studies necessary to demonstrate compliance with the bacteria water quality objective and the Pathogen TMDL (i.e., study to determine whether the discharge includes pathogens of human origin).
- b. Engineering Evaluation of Recycled Water Storage Ponds and Discharge Outfalls.** The Permittee shall submit for Regional Water Board Executive Officer approval, a work plan and schedule by **February 1, 2021** for conducting an engineering evaluation

of all recycled water storage ponds and discharge outfall infrastructure to assess the condition of each storage pond and discharge outfall and associated infrastructure (e.g., piping, pumps, valves, etc.). Upon completion of the engineering evaluation, a final report shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board in conjunction with the ROWD on **July 31, 2024**. The final report shall describe the condition of each recycled water storage pond, outfall, and associated infrastructure, identify a plan for addressing any deficiencies identified and to ensure proper on-going maintenance, and provide an updated map of discharge outfalls and associated infrastructure.

- c. Local Limits Evaluation.** In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(j)(2)(ii), the Permittee shall provide a written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits under 40 C.F.R. section 403.5(c)(1) once every five years. The written evaluation report shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board by **February 1, 2024**. If the report recommends revisions to the local limits, the Permittee shall include a schedule for updating the local limits in the written local limits evaluation report. Local limits shall be developed in accordance with U.S. EPA's July 2004 *Local Limits Development Guidance* (EPA 833-R-04-002A).
- d. Sewer Use Ordinance Evaluation.** The Permittee shall perform a review of the existing sewer use ordinance to ensure the Permittee has the necessary legal authorities to monitor and enforce source control standards, restrict discharges of toxic materials to the collection system and inspect facilities connected to the system. In conducting the review, the Permittee may consult the January 2007 EPA Model Pretreatment Ordinance (EPA 833-B-06-002). The Permittee shall submit a report documenting the results of the review and recommended revisions to the sewer use ordinance, if applicable, to the Regional Water Board by **February 1, 2024**. If the report recommends revisions to the sewer use ordinance, the Permittee shall include a schedule for updating the sewer use ordinance in the written sewer use ordinance evaluation report.
- e. Disaster Preparedness Assessment Report and Action Plan.** Natural disasters, extreme weather events, sea level rise, and shifting precipitation patterns, some of which are projected to intensify due to climate change, have significant implications for wastewater treatment and operations. Some natural disasters are expected to become more frequent and extreme according to the current science on climate change. In order to ensure that Facility operations are not disrupted, compliance with conditions of this Order are achieved, and receiving waters are not adversely impacted by permitted and unpermitted discharges, the Permittee shall submit a Disaster Preparedness Assessment Report and Action Plan to the Regional Water Board by **August 1, 2023**, for Regional Water Board Executive Officer review and approval.

The Permittee shall: (1) conduct an assessment of the wastewater treatment facility, operations, collection, and discharge systems to determine areas of short- and long-term vulnerabilities related to natural disasters and extreme weather, including sea level rise and other conditions projected by climate change science, if applicable; the assessment shall consider, as applicable, impacts to plant operations due to changing influent and receiving water quality, rising sea level, storm surges, fires, floods, earthquakes, tsunamis, back-to-back severe storms, and other extreme conditions that pose a risk to plant operations and water quality; (2) identify control measures needed to protect, improve, and maintain wastewater infrastructure, waste discharge

compliance, and receiving water quality in the event of a natural disaster or, if applicable, under conditions resulting from climate change; (3) develop a schedule to implement necessary control measures. Control measures shall include, but are not limited to, emergency procedures, contingency plans, alarm/notification systems, training, backup power and equipment, and the need for planned mitigations to ameliorate potential risks associated with extreme weather events and changing conditions resulting from climate change; and (4) implement the necessary control measures per the approved schedule of implementation.

- f. Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program.** The Permittee shall implement the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program developed under Order No. R1-2013-0001 and submitted to the Regional Water Board on September 30, 2014 (initial report) and July 10, 2015 (addendum) and any future changes to the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. Section VI.C.2.g of the Fact Sheet describes the Permittee's approach to implementing the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program and how each activity is addressed in this Order and MRP. The Permittee shall document implementation of the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program annually, as further described in MRP section X.D.2.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

- i.** The Permittee shall, as required by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, develop and conduct a PMP, as further described below, when there is evidence (e.g., sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than those methods required by this Order, presence of whole effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling) that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
- (a)** The concentration of the pollutant is reported as "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the reporting limit (RL);
 - (b)** A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL), using definitions described in Attachment A and reporting protocols described in MRP section X.B.5.
- ii.** The PMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Water Board:
- (a)** An annual review and semi-annual monitoring of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s), which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;
 - (b)** Quarterly monitoring for the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the influent to the wastewater treatment system;
 - (c)** Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;

- (d) Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable priority pollutant(s), consistent with the control strategy; and
- (e) An annual status report that shall be submitted as part of the Annual Facility Report due **March 1st** to the Regional Water Board and shall include:
 - (1) All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
 - (2) A list of potential sources of the reportable pollutant(s);
 - (3) A summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and
 - (4) A description of actions to be taken in the following year.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Proper Operation and Maintenance.** This Order (Attachment D, Standard Provision I.D) requires that the Permittee at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) that are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with this Order. Proper operation and maintenance includes adequate laboratory quality control and appropriate quality assurance procedures.
- b. **Operation and Maintenance Manual.** The Permittee shall maintain an updated Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Manual for the operational components of the Facility. The Permittee shall update the O&M Manual, as necessary, to conform to changes in operation and maintenance of the Facility. The Permittee shall operate and maintain the Facility in accordance with the most recently updated O&M Manual. The O&M Manual shall be readily available to operating personnel onsite and for review by state or federal inspectors. The O&M Manual shall include the following.
 - i. Description of the Facility's organizational structure showing the number of employees, duties and qualifications, and plant attendance schedules (daily, weekends and holidays, part-time, etc.). The description should include documentation that the personnel are knowledgeable and qualified to operate the Facility so as to achieve the required level of treatment at all times.
 - ii. Detailed description of safe and effective operation and maintenance of treatment processes, process control instrumentation and equipment.
 - iii. Description of laboratory and quality assurance procedures.
 - iv. Process and equipment inspection and maintenance schedules.
 - v. Description of safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Permittee will be able to comply with requirements of this Order.
 - vi. Description of preventive (fail-safe) and contingency (response and cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. These plans shall identify the possible sources (such as loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit failure, process equipment failure, tank and piping failure) of accidental discharges, untreated or partially treated waste bypass, and polluted drainage.

- c. **Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Chlorine Usage.** The Permittee shall develop and maintain SOPs for the use of chlorine at the Facility, including, but not limited to, maintenance cleaning of the UV disinfection system and recycled water used for in-plant uses, to demonstrate that procedures are implemented to ensure that chlorine is not discharged to the receiving water. The Permittee shall submit its SOPs to the Regional Water Board by **November 1, 2020**. The Permittee shall update the SOPs as needed and report any changes to the SOPs or changes in chlorine usage in the Annual Report.
- d. **Operating Records.** The Permittee shall maintain operating records at the Facility or at the Permittee's central depository. The records shall include: all analyses specified in the reclamation criteria; any documentation of operational problems, plant and equipment breakdowns, and diversions to emergency storage or disposal; and documentation of all corrective or preventive actions taken.

Process or equipment failures triggering an alarm shall be recorded and maintained as a separate record file. The recorded information shall include the time and cause of failure and corrective action(s) taken.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Wastewater Collection Systems

i. Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems

The Permittee has coverage under, and is separately subject to, the requirements of State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as amended by Order No. WQ 2013-0058-EXEC. As such, the Permittee provides notification and reporting of SSOs in accordance with the requirements of Order Nos. 2006-0003-DWQ and WQ 2013-0058-EXEC and any revisions thereto for operation of its wastewater collection system.

b. Pretreatment of Industrial Waste

- i. The Permittee shall be responsible for the performance of all pretreatment requirements contained in 40 C.F.R. part 403 and shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines, and other remedies by the U.S. EPA or other appropriate parties as provided in the CWA, as amended (33 USC 1351 et seq.). The Permittee shall implement and enforce its approved Facility Pretreatment Program. The Permittee's approved Facility Pretreatment Program is hereby made an enforceable condition of this Order. U.S. EPA may initiate enforcement action against an industrial user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the CWA.
- ii. The Permittee shall enforce the requirements promulgated under Sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d), and 402(d) of the CWA. The Permittee shall cause industrial users subject to Federal Categorical Standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new industrial user, upon commencement of the discharge.
- iii. The Permittee shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 C.F.R. part 403 including, but not limited to:

- (a)** Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(1);
 - (b)** Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 C.F.R. sections 403.5 and 403.6;
 - (c)** Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2); and
 - (d)** Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(3).
- iv.** The Permittee shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 C.F.R. section 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system:
 - (a)** Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
 - (b)** Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
 - (c)** Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation of treatment works;
 - (d)** Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD₅, etc.), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
 - (e)** Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F);
 - (f)** Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass-through;
 - (g)** Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and
 - (h)** Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Permittee, and consisting of waste that can be adequately treated at the Facility.
- v.** The Permittee shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 C.F.R. section 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:
 - (a)** Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or
 - (b)** Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

c. Sludge Disposal and Handling Requirements

- i.** Sludge, as used in this Order, means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screenings generated during preliminary treatment. Biosolids refers to sludge that has been treated, tested, and demonstrated to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agriculture, silviculture, horticulture, and land reclamation activities.
- ii.** All collected sludges and other solid waste removed from liquid wastes shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, and tanks as needed to ensure optimal plant operation and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations.
- iii.** The use and disposal of biosolids shall separately comply with all of the land application and disposal requirements in 40 C.F.R. part 503, which are enforceable by the U.S. EPA, not the Regional Water Board. If during the life of this Order, the state accepts primacy for implementation of 40 C.F.R. part 503, the Regional Water Board may also initiate enforcement where appropriate.
- iv.** Sludge or biosolids that are disposed of in a municipal solid waste landfill or used as daily landfill cover shall meet the applicable requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 258. In the annual self-monitoring report, the Permittee shall report the amount of sludge placed in a landfill and the landfill(s) which received the sludge or biosolids.
- v.** The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to prevent and minimize any sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that may adversely affect human health or the environment.
- vi.** Solids and sludge treatment, storage, and disposal or reuse shall not create a nuisance, such as objectionable odors or flies, and shall not result in groundwater contamination.
- vii.** Solids and sludge treatment and storage sites shall have facilities adequate to divert surface water runoff from adjacent areas, protect the boundaries of the site from erosion, and prevent drainage from the treatment and storage site. Adequate protection is defined as protection from a design storm with a 100-year recurrence interval and 24-hour duration.
- viii.** The discharge of sewage sludge and solids shall not cause waste material to be in a position where it is, or can be, conveyed from the treatment and storage sites and deposited in the waters of the state.

d. Biosolids Management

For any discharge of biosolids from the Facility, the Permittee shall comply with the following requirements:

- i.** For the land application of biosolids as soil amendment within the North Coast region, the Permittee shall obtain or maintain coverage under the State Water Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0012-DWQ General Waste Discharge

Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land or Use as a Soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural, Horticultural, and Land Reclamation Activities, or

- ii. Alternatively, the Permittee may dispose of biosolids at another appropriately permitted facility.
- iii. New sludge treatment and storage facilities must comply with the requirements of the Water Code and title 27 of the CCR for the protection of water quality.

e. Operator Certification

Supervisors and operators of municipal wastewater treatment facilities shall possess a certificate of appropriate grade in accordance with title 23, CCR, section 3680. The State Water Board may accept experience in lieu of qualification training. In lieu of a properly certified wastewater treatment facility operator, the State Water Board may approve use of a water treatment facility operator of appropriate grade certified by DDW where water recycling is involved.

f. Adequate Capacity

If the Facility will reach capacity within 4 years, the Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board. A copy of such notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies, and the press. Factors to be evaluated in assessing reserve capacity shall include, at a minimum, (1) comparison of the wet weather design flow with the highest daily flow, and (2) comparison of the average dry weather design flow with the lowest 30-day flow. The Permittee shall demonstrate that adequate steps are being taken to address the capacity problem. The Permittee shall submit a technical report to the Regional Water Board showing how flow volumes will be prevented from exceeding capacity, or how capacity will be increased, **within 120 days after providing notification to the Regional Water Board**, or within 120 days after receipt of Regional Water Board notification that the Facility will reach capacity within 4 years. The time for filing the required technical report may be extended by the Regional Water Board. An extension of 30 days may be granted by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, and longer extensions may be granted by the Regional Water Board itself. [CCR title 23, section 2232].

g. Septage Handling Requirements

- i. The Permittee shall implement any necessary legal authorities to monitor and enforce septage handling requirements, including restriction of discharges of toxic materials to the collection system and wastewater treatment facility and inspection of facilities connected to the system.
- ii. The Permittee shall maintain a waste hauler manifest that identifies the names of the hauler, the date and time the waste load was transferred, and the volume of the waste.
- iii. The Permittee shall maintain an updated Trucked Waste Management Plan that sets forth policies and procedures to ensure that trucked waste to the Facility is properly managed and controlled.
- iv. The Permittee shall accept septage only at an approved septage receiving station/location.

h. Resource Recovery from Anaerobically Digestible Material

The Permittee receives hauled-in anaerobically digestible material for injection into its anaerobic digesters. The Permittee developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for this activity which were submitted to the Regional Water Board on February 25, 2020. The Permittee shall implement the SOPs to ensure protection of its system. The SOPs shall be updated as necessary and shall address material handling, including unloading, screening, or other processing prior to anaerobic digestion; transportation; spill prevention; and spill response. In addition, the SOPs shall address avoidance of the introduction of materials that could cause interference, pass-through, or upset of the treatment processes; avoidance of prohibited material; vector control; odor control; operation and maintenance; and the disposition of any solid waste segregated from introduction to the digester. The Permittee shall train its staff on the SOPs and shall maintain records for a minimum of five years for each load received, describing the hauler, waste type, and quantity received. In addition, the Permittee shall maintain records for a minimum of five years for the disposition, location, and quantity of cumulative pre-digestion-segregated solid waste hauled off-site.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. Recycled Water Operation and Discharge Management. The Permittee shall operate recycled water storage and discharges in accordance with the most current *City of Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System Discharge Management Plan*, approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. The Recycled Water Operation and Discharge Management Plan defines the Permittee's procedures and protocol to maximize reclamation and minimize discharges to surface waters.

b. Capacity Increase Engineering Report

At such time as the Permittee makes improvements or other changes that increase the treatment and/or total reclamation capacity, the Permittee shall submit to DDW and the Regional Water Board an updated Recycled Water Engineering report, prepared in accordance with title 22, documenting that treatment and/or total water recycling capacity has been added. This report shall document that the Permittee exceeds the water recycling capacity of 4,015 million gallons for Geysers recharge and maintains the capability to irrigate at least 2,590 million gallons per year at 21.34 mgd ADWF. The Regional Water Board Executive Officer will inform the Permittee within 90 days after receipt of the report that the additional capacity is recognized by the Regional Water Board.

c. Storm Water

For the control of storm water discharges from the Facility, the Permittee shall seek separate authorization to discharge under the requirements of the State Water Board's Water Quality Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (or subsequent revisions of the Storm Water General Permit), which is not incorporated by reference in this Order.

7. Compliance Schedules

The Permittee shall comply with the following schedule in order to comply with UV system operational requirements and achieve consistent compliance with Total Coliform effluent limitations. No later than 14 days following each compliance date, the Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board, in writing of its compliance with the compliance requirement.

Table 8. Schedule for Compliance with UV Disinfection System Operational Requirements and Total Coliform Effluent Limitations

Task	Proposed Action	Compliance Date
1	Submit progress reports to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer	March 1, annually
2	Secure project funding (conduct bond sales)	July 2020 – July 31, 2022
3	Select UV disinfection system equipment and design and permit the project	January 2016 – December 31, 2022
4	Advertise for bidding	January 1, 2023
5	Award construction contract	July 1, 2023
6	Construct on-site diversion system and UV disinfection system upgrade project	July 2023- December 31, 2024
7	Commission UV disinfection system	December 1, 2024
8	Conduct UV testing and DDW evaluation	July 1, 2025
9	Achieve full compliance with UV system operational requirements and effluent limitations	September 30, 2025

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

Compliance with the effluent limitations contained in section IV of this Order will be determined as specified below.

A. General

Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants, when effluent limitations have been established, shall be determined using sample reporting protocols defined in the MRP and Attachment A of this Order. For purposes of reporting and administrative enforcement by the Regional and State Water Boards, the Permittee shall be deemed out of compliance with effluent limitations if the concentration of a pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reported minimum level (ML).

B. Multiple Sample Data

When determining compliance with an AMEL for priority pollutants, and more than one sample result is available, the Permittee shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains

one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the Permittee shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure.

1. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
2. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two middle values unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ and a value of zero shall be used for the ND or DNQ value in the median calculation for compliance purposes only. Using a value of zero for DNQ or ND samples does not apply when performing reasonable potential or antidegradation analyses.

C. Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

If the average (or when applicable, the median determined by subsection B, above, for multiple sample data) of daily discharges over a calendar month exceeds the AMEL for a given parameter, this will represent a single violation, though the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for each day of that month for that parameter (e.g., resulting in 31 days of non-compliance in a 31-day month). If only a single sample is taken during the calendar month and the analytical result for that sample exceeds the AMEL, the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for that calendar month. The Permittee will only be considered out of compliance for days when the discharge occurs. If there are ND or DNQ results for a specific constituent in a calendar month, the Permittee shall calculate the median of all sample results within that month for compliance determination with the AMEL as described in section VII.B, above.

D. Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

If the average (or when applicable, the median determined by subsection B, above, for multiple sample data) of daily discharges over a calendar week exceeds the AWEL for a given parameter, this will represent a single violation, though the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for each day of that week for that parameter, resulting in 7 days of non-compliance. If only a single sample is taken during the calendar week and the analytical result for that sample exceeds the AWEL, the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for that calendar week. The Permittee will only be considered out of compliance for days when the discharge occurs. If there are ND or DNQ results for a specific constituent in a calendar week, the Permittee shall calculate the median of all sample results within that week for compliance determination with the AWEL as described in section VII.B, above.

E. Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

If a daily discharge (or when applicable, the median determined by subsection B, above, for multiple sample data of a daily discharge) exceeds the MDEL for a given parameter, the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for that parameter for that 1 day only within the reporting period.

F. Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

If the analytical result of a single grab sample is lower than the instantaneous minimum effluent limitation for a parameter, the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for that parameter for that single sample. Non-compliance for each sample will be considered separately (e.g., the

results of two grab samples taken within a calendar day that both are lower than the instantaneous minimum effluent limitation would result in two instances of non-compliance with the instantaneous minimum effluent limitation).

If the Permittee monitors pH continuously, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 401.17, the Permittee shall be in compliance with the pH limitation specified herein provided that both of the following conditions are satisfied: (1) the total sum of time during which the pH values are outside the required range of pH values shall not exceed 7 hours and 26 minutes in any calendar month; and (2) no individual excursion from the range of pH values shall exceed 60 minutes.

G. Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

If the analytical result of a single grab sample is higher than the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for a parameter, the Permittee will be considered out of compliance for that parameter for that single sample. Non-compliance for each sample will be considered separately (e.g., the results of two grab samples taken within a calendar day that both exceed the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation would result in two instances of non-compliance with the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation).

If the Permittee monitors pH continuously, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 401.17, the Permittee shall be in compliance with the pH limitation specified herein provided that both of the following conditions are satisfied: (1) the total sum of time during which the pH values are outside the required range of pH values shall not exceed 7 hours and 26 minutes in any calendar month; and (2) no individual excursion from the range of pH values shall exceed 60 minutes.

H. Bacteriological Limitations

- 1. Median (Total Coliform).** The median is the central tendency concentration of the pollutant. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the ND concentrations lowest, followed by quantified values. The median value is determined based on the number of data points in the set. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, the median is the average of the two middle values, unless one or both points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two middle data points. DNQ is lower than a detected value, and ND is lower than DNQ.

Compliance with the 7-day median will be determined as a rolling median during periods when sampling occurs more frequently than weekly. During periods when sampling is weekly, this requirement shall apply to each weekly sample. Compliance with total coliform limitations will be based on the maximum value of all operational channels operating each day of sampling. For ND results, the MDL shall be used to calculate the 7-day rolling median.

- 2. Six-week Rolling Geometric Mean (*E. coli* bacteria).** The rolling geometric mean shall be calculated using at least 5 sample results over a 6-week period from a site using the following formula:
$$GM = \sqrt[n]{(x_1)(x_2)(x_3)\dots(x_n)}$$
, where x is the sample value and n is the number of samples taken.¹¹

¹¹ A minimum of three samples over a six-week period is necessary to calculate the geometric mean. When less than three samples are taken in a six-week period, compliance with the *E. coli* receiving water objective shall be determined using the Statistical Threshold Value (STV). If the Permittee samples less than three times during a six-week period, compliance shall be assessed by comparing the single sample results to the STV.

3. **Statistical Threshold Value (*E. coli* bacteria).** (1) The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking any ND concentrations lowest, followed by quantified values. (2) The number of sample results should then be multiplied by 90 percent then rounded up to the nearest whole number. (3) Count the values in the data set starting from lowest to highest until the number indicated in step (2) is reached. (4) To be compliant with the statistical threshold value in Receiving Water Limitation V.A.18, all sample results less than the point described in step 3 must be less than 100 MPN/100 mL.

I. Acute Toxicity Limitations

Compliance with the three-sample median acute toxicity effluent limitation shall be determined when there is a discharge, by calculating the median percent survival of the three most recent consecutive samples meeting all test acceptability criteria collected from Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-012A(2), and EFF-012B.

Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE provisions shall constitute compliance with the acute toxicity requirements, as specified in the MRP (Attachment E, sections V.A and V.C).

J. Chronic Toxicity

Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE provisions shall constitute compliance with the chronic toxicity requirements, as specified in the MRP (Attachment E, sections V.B.8 and V.C).

K. Average Dry Weather Flow

Compliance with the average dry weather flow prohibition in section III.H of this Order will be determined once each calendar year by evaluating all flow data collected in a calendar year. The flow through the Facility, measured daily and averaged monthly, must be 21.34 mgd or less for the month with the lowest average monthly flow, until such time as the Regional Water Board Executive Officer determines that sufficient treatment, storage, and/or water recycling capacity has been added to accommodate the full average dry weather design capacity of 25.9 mgd.

L. Peak Weekly Wet Weather Flow

The peak weekly wet weather flow in section III.H of this Order will be determined by evaluating flow through the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001, measured daily and averaged weekly. No average weekly flow shall exceed 64 mgd.

M. Peak Monthly Wet Weather Flow

The peak monthly wet weather flow is the highest average monthly influent flow that is allowed. Compliance with the peak monthly wet weather flow prohibition in section III.H of this Order will be determined by averaging all of the average daily flows at Monitoring Location INF-001 each calendar month. If the calculated average monthly flow exceeds 47.3 mgd in any calendar month, the discharge does not comply with Prohibition III.H of this Order.

N. Receiving Water Objectives

Compliance with the surface water limitations for dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, and temperature for the discharge from Discharge Point 012B shall be determined at Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S as specified below:

1. The Permittee shall monitor flow, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, pH and temperature in effluent and upstream receiving waters and use this information to modulate each day (or more frequently if receiving water conditions are variable) the amount of discharge such that receiving water quality objectives in section V of this Order are not exceeded at

Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S, the edge of the Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID), as determined according to the model incorporated into and described in the Laguna Subregional Water Reclamation System Receiving Water Quality Limit Compliance Assurance and Monitoring Plan.

Note: the ZID applies only to compliance with receiving water quality objectives for dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, and temperature at Discharge Point 012B. The ZID concept was not used for determining reasonable potential or establishing water quality-based effluent limitations for priority pollutants or water quality objectives other than dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, and temperature.

O. Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations for Total Phosphorus

The Permittee shall comply with the WQBEL for total phosphorus (Effluent Limitation IV.A.2.a.i of this Order). Compliance with the total phosphorus effluent limitation may be demonstrated in one of two ways as described in 1 and 2, below. Selection of either Option 1 or 2 must be made in writing and submitted to the Regional Water Board by **February 1, 2021**.

- 1. Option 1.** The Permittee may demonstrate compliance with the total phosphorus effluent limitations using the Water Quality Trading Framework for the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed (WQTF) included as Attachment I to this Order. The WQTF in Attachment I includes modifications, as summarized in Fact Sheet section IV.I.
- 2. Option 2.** The Permittee may demonstrate compliance with the total phosphorus effluent limitation by selecting the Alternative Compliance Option (ACO) which consists of meeting all of the following conditions:
 - a.** Develop, submit, and receive approval for two pre-qualified practices (PQPs) consistent with the Laguna WQTF; and
 - b.** Plan, design, and implement restoration project(s) that meet all of the following eligibility and performance criteria:
 - i.** Not already be required by law, regulation, permit, enforcement action, or any other legally binding agreement;
 - ii.** Provide restoration of the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa by;
 - (a)** Enhancing environmental values (e.g., habitat or ecosystem restoration, recognized priority or multi-benefit actions);
 - (b)** Adding assimilative capacity to the Laguna de Santa Rosa; and
 - (c)** Adding auxiliary benefits (e.g., wildlife habitat, increased riparian vegetation).
 - iii.** Be designed to reduce sediment and nutrient loads and/or impacts, increase dissolved oxygen levels, and reduce water temperature in the Laguna de Santa Rosa; and,
 - iv.** Phosphorus reductions to be demonstrated through direct measurement.
 - c.** By **August 1, 2021**, the Permittee shall submit an Alternative Compliance Option Workplan (ACO Work Plan) for review and approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. The ACO Work Plan shall include:

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

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

Arithmetic mean = $\mu = \Sigma x / n$ where: Σx is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and n is the number of samples.

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

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

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

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

Bioaccumulative Pollutants

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

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

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

Daily Discharge

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

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

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

Sample results that are less than the reported Minimum Level, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

Dilution Credit

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

Effective Concentration (EC)

A point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an adverse effect on a quantal, “all or nothing,” response (such as death, immobilization, or serious incapacitation) in a given percent of the test organisms. If the effect is death or immobility, the term lethal concentration (LC) may be used. EC values may be calculated using point estimation techniques such as probit, logit, and Spearman-Kärber. EC25 is the concentration of toxicant (in percent effluent) that causes a response in 25 percent of the test organisms.

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

A value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as wasteload allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

Enclosed Bays

Indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. This definition includes but is not limited to: Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drakes Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay.

Estimated Chemical Concentrations

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

Estuaries and Coastal Lagoons are waters at the mouths of streams that serve as mixing zones for fresh and ocean waters during a major portion of the year. Mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered as estuaries. Estuarine waters will generally be considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to the upstream limit of tidal action but may be considered to extend seaward if significant mixing of fresh and salt water occurs in the open coastal waters. The waters described by this definition include but are not limited to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as defined by section 12220 of the California Water Code, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait downstream to Carquinez Bridge, and appropriate areas of the Smith, Klamath, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, San Diego, and Otay Rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Geometric Mean (GM).

The geometric mean is a type of mean or average that indicates the central tendency or typical value of a set of numbers by using the product of their values (as opposed to the arithmetic mean which uses their sum). The geometric mean is defined as the n th root of the product of n numbers. The formula is expressed as: $GM = \sqrt[n]{(x_1)(x_2)(x_3)...(x_n)}$, where x is the sample value and n is the number of samples taken.

Inhibition Concentration

The IC25 is typically calculated as a percentage of effluent. It is the level at which the organisms exhibit 25 percent reduction in biological measurement such as reproduction or growth. It is calculated statistically and used in chronic toxicity testing.

Inland Surface Waters

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

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

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

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

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

Lowest Observed Effect Concentration (LOEC)

The lowest concentration of an effluent or toxicant that results in adverse effects on the test organism (i.e., where the values for the observed endpoints are statistically different from the control).

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

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

Median

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

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

The minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

Minimum Level (ML)

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

Mixing Zone

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

Not Detected (ND)

Those sample results less than the laboratory's MDL.

No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC)

The highest tested concentration of an effluent or a test sample at which the effect is no different from the control effect, according to the statistical test used (see LOEC). The NOEC is usually the highest tested concentration of an effluent or toxicant that causes no observable effects on the aquatic test organisms (i.e., the highest concentration of toxicity at which the values for the observed responses do not statistically differ from the controls). It is determined using hypothesis testing.

Persistent Pollutants

Substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

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

Pollution Prevention

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

Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)

A treatment works as defined in section 212 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), which is owned by a state or municipality as defined by section 502(4) of the CWA. [Section 502(4) of the CWA defines a municipality as a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body created by or pursuant to state law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes). This definition includes any devices and systems used in the storage, treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature. It also includes sewers, pipes and other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW Treatment Plant. The term also means the municipality as defined in section 502(4) of the CWA, which has jurisdiction over the Indirect Discharges to and the discharges from such a treatment works.

Recycled Water

Water which, as a result of treatment of municipal wastewater, is suitable for a direct beneficial use or a controlled use that would not otherwise occur and is therefore considered a valuable resource (Water Code section 13050). The terms “recycled water” and “reclaimed water” have the same meaning (Water Code section 26).

Reporting Level (RL)

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

Septage

Defined as the liquid or solid material removed from a septic tank, cesspool, portable toilet, type III marine sanitation device, recreational vehicle’s sanitation tank, or similar storage or treatment works that receives domestic waste.

Source of Drinking Water

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

Standard Deviation (σ)

A measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

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

where:

x is the observed value;

μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.

Statistical Threshold Value (STV)

For the bacteria water quality objective, the statistical threshold value is a set value that approximates the 90th percentile of the water quality distribution of a bacterial population. Typically, (1) The data set is be ranked from low to high, ranking any ND concentrations lowest, followed by quantified values. (2) The number of sample results is then be multiplied by 90 percent then rounded up to the nearest whole number. (3) The values in the data set are counted starting from lowest to highest until the number indicated in step (2) is reached. (4) To be compliant with the statistical threshold value, all sample results less than the point described in step 3 must be less than the STV.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)


A study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then

confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. (A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.)


Test of Significant Toxicity (TST)

The statistical approach described in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document (EPA 833-R10-003, 2010). TST was developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for analyzing WET and ambient toxicity data. Using the TST approach, the sample is declared toxic if there is greater than or equal to a 25% effect in chronic tests, or if there is greater than or equal to a 20% effect in acute tests at the permitted instream waste concentration (IWC) (referred to as the toxic regulatory management decision (RMD)). The sample is declared non-toxic if there is less than or equal to a 10% effect at the IWC in acute or chronic tests (referred to as the non-toxic RMD).


ATTACHMENT B - MAP



ATTACHMENT C-1 - FACILITY FLOW SCHEMATIC



ATTACHMENT C-2 – RECLAMATION FLOW SCHEMATIC



ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

1. The Permittee must comply with all of the conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 130001, 13304, 13350, 13385)
2. The Permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1))

B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

It shall not be a defense for a Permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c))

C. Duty to Mitigate

The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d))

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Permittee only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e))

E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g))
2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c))

F. Inspection and Entry

The Permittee shall allow the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative),

upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(b); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383):

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

G. Bypass

1. Definitions

- a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i))
- b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii))

2. **Bypass not exceeding limitations.** The Permittee may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)

3. **Prohibition of bypass.** Bypass is prohibited, and the Regional Water Board may take enforcement action against a Permittee for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):

- a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
- b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
- c. The Permittee submitted notice to the Regional Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C))

4. **Burden of Proof.** In any enforcement proceeding, the permittee seeking to establish the bypass defense has the burden of proof.

5. The Regional Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii))

6. Notice

a. Anticipated bypass. If the Permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a prior notice, if possible, at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i))

b. **Unanticipated bypass.** The Permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii))

H. Upset

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

1. **Effect of an upset.** An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology-based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2))

2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Permittee who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):

a. An upset occurred and that the Permittee can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));

b. The Facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));

c. The Permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and

d. The Permittee complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv))

3. **Burden of Proof.** In any enforcement proceeding, the Permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4))

II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Permittee for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f))

B. Duty to Reapply

If the Permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Permittee must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b))

C. Transfers

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Regional Water Board. The Regional Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Permittee and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3); § 122.61)

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

- A.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1))
- B.** Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapters N or O. Monitoring must be conducted according to sufficiently sensitive test procedures (i.e., methods) approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O. For the purposes of this paragraph, a method is “sufficiently sensitive” when:
 - 1.** The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the level of the effluent limitation established in the permit for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, and, either the method ML is at or below the level of the applicable water quality criterion for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter or the method ML is above the applicable water quality criterion, but the amount of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in a facility’s discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the discharge; or
 - 2.** The method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter.

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

In the case of sludge use or disposal approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures in part 503 unless otherwise specified in 40 C.F.R. or other test procedures have been specified in this Order.

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Permittee's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report, or application. This

period may be extended by request of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer at any time.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2))

B. Records of monitoring information shall include:

1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi))

C. Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):

1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Permittee (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2))

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

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

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

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

manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and

- c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3))
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the Facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c))
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d))
6. Any person providing the electronic signature for documents described in Standard Provisions – V.B.1, V.B.2, or V.B.3 that are submitted electronically shall meet all relevant requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B, and shall ensure that all relevant requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 3 (Cross-Media Electronic Reporting) and 40 C.F.R. part 127 (NPDES Electronic Reporting Requirements) are met for that submission. (40 C.F.R § 122.22(e))

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the MRP (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4))
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring, sludge use, or disposal practices. As of December 21, 2016, all reports and forms must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J and comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i))
3. If the Permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Regional Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii))

4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii))

D. Compliance Schedules

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5))

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

1. The Permittee shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i))

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

As of December 21, 2020, all reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events must be submitted to the Regional Water Board and must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J. The reports shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Regional Water Board may also require the Permittee to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i))

2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
 - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A))
 - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B))
3. The Regional Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii))

F. Planned Changes

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

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or
2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii))
3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Permittee's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii))

G. Anticipated Noncompliance

The Permittee shall give advance notice to the Regional Water Board of any planned changes in the Facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2))

H. Other Noncompliance

The Permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.C, V.D, and V.E above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E above. For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports shall contain the information described in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E and the applicable required data in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Regional Water Board may also require the Permittee to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7))

I. Other Information

When the Permittee becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Permittee shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8))

J. Initial Recipient for Electronic Reporting Data

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

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

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

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2))
3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3))

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

Contents

I. General Monitoring Provisions E-3

II. Monitoring Locations E-4

III. Influent Monitoring Requirements E-6

A. Monitoring Location INF-001 E-6

IV. Effluent Monitoring Requirements E-7

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 (Monitoring Prior to Discharge to Storage at Discharge Point 001) E-7

B. Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B E-10

C. Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B E-12

V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements E-13

A. Acute Toxicity Testing E-13

B. Chronic Toxicity Testing E-16

C. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Process E-20

VI. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – NOT APPLICABLE E-21

VII. Recycling Monitoring Requirements E-21

A. Recycled Water Monitoring Location EFF-001 E-21

VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Surface Water and Groundwater E-22

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and RSW-012BU E-22

B. Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S E-23

C. Groundwater Monitoring to Assess Impacts of Storage Ponds and Recycled Water Use E-24

IX. Other Monitoring Requirements E-25

A. Filtration Process Monitoring E-25

B. Disinfection Process Monitoring for UV Disinfection System (Monitoring Location INT-002) E-26

C. Visual Monitoring (Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(1), EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-012A(1), EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, EFF-015, RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, RSW-LTR, and RSW-012BD-S) E-26

D. Sludge Monitoring (Monitoring Location BIO-001) E-27

X. Reporting Requirements E-27

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements E-27

B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) E-27

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) E-30

D. Other Reports E-30

E. Spill and Unauthorized Discharge Notification E-37

Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations E-4

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INF-001 E-6

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001 (Prior to Discharges to Storage at Discharge Point 001) E-7

Table E-4. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001 (For Discharges at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015) E-8

Table E-5. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006BE-10
Table E-6. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012BE-12
Table E-7. Recycled Water Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001E-21
**Table E-8. Receiving Water Monitoring – Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and
RSW-012BU.E-22**
Table E-9. Receiving Water Monitoring – Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S.....E-24
Table E-10. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule¹E-28
Table E-11. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports.....E-30

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. California Water Code section 13383 also authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

- A. **Wastewater Monitoring Provision.** Composite samples may be taken by a proportional sampling device or by grab samples composited in proportion to flow. In compositing grab samples, the sampling interval shall not exceed 1 hour.
- B. **Supplemental Monitoring Provision.** If the Permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, using test procedures approved by 40 C.F.R. part 136 or as specified in this Order, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the monthly and annual discharge monitoring reports.
- C. **Data Quality Assurance Provision.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) in accordance with the provisions of Water Code section 13176 and must include quality assurance / quality control data with their analytical reports. The Permittee may analyze pollutants with short hold times (e.g., pH, chlorine residual, etc.) with field equipment or its on-site laboratory provided that the Permittee has standard operating procedures (SOPs) that identify quality assurance/quality control procedures to be followed to ensure accurate results.

The Permittee shall keep a manual onsite containing the steps followed in this program and must demonstrate sufficient capability to adequately perform these field tests (e.g., qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments). The program shall conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or other approved procedures.

- D. **Instrumentation and Calibration Provision.** All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Permittee to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated no less than the manufacturer's recommended intervals or one-year intervals, (whichever comes first) to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E. **Minimum Levels (ML) and Reporting Levels (RL).** Unless otherwise specified by this MRP, all monitoring shall be conducted according to test procedures established at 40 C.F.R. 136, *Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for Analysis of Pollutants*. All analyses shall be conducted using the lowest practical quantitation limit achievable using U.S. EPA approved methods. For the purposes of the NPDES program, when more than one test procedure is approved under 40 C.F.R., part 136 for the analysis of a pollutant or pollutant parameter, the test procedure must be sufficiently sensitive as defined at 40 C.F.R. 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv). Where effluent limitations are set below the lowest achievable quantitation limits, pollutants not detected at the lowest practical quantitation limits will be considered in compliance with effluent limitations. Analysis for toxics listed by the California Toxics Rule (CTR) shall also adhere to guidance and requirements contained in the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (2005) (SIP). However, there may be situations when analytical methods are published with MLs that are more sensitive than the MLs for analytical methods listed in the SIP. For instance, U.S. EPA Method 1631E for mercury is not currently listed in SIP Appendix 4, but it is published with an ML of 0.5 ng/L that makes it a

sufficiently sensitive analytical method. Similarly, U.S. EPA Method 245.7 for mercury is published with an ML of 5 ng/L.

- F. Discharge Monitoring Report Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study.** The Permittee shall ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board at the following address:

State Water Resources Control Board
 Quality Assurance Program Officer
 Office of Information Management and Analysis
 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

The Permittee shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements in this Order:

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

Discharge/ Distribution Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Associated Receiving Water Monitoring Locations ¹	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	--	Untreated influent wastewater collected at the plant headworks at a representative point preceding primary treatment.
--	INT-001A	--	Location for reporting the surface loading rate of the advanced wastewater (AWT) filtration process. The flow rate through the effluent filters is measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001. Filter flow is the sum of meters EFF-001 and backwash supply flow.
--	INT-001B	--	Treated wastewater immediately following the AWT process and prior to ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection.
--	INT-002	--	A location for monitoring UV radiation dose and UV transmittance of the UV disinfection system.
001 ² (Discharge and Distribution)	EFF-001	--	Treated wastewater following all treatment and before it enters the recycled water storage ponds and/or Geysers Project distribution system.
002 ² (Distribution)	EFF-001	--	Treated wastewater following all treatment and before it enters the irrigation distribution system.
006A(1) (Discharge)	EFF-001	RSW-LSP RSW-LTR	Treated wastewater that is discharged directly to the Laguna de Santa Rosa from the distribution trunk line rather than being stored in Meadow Lane Pond D, which is monitored prior to discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa.
006A(2) Formerly 006A (Discharge)	EFF-006A(2) Formerly EFF- 006A	RSW-LSP RSW-LTR	Treated wastewater following all treatment and storage in Meadow Lane Pond D, and prior to discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa.
006B (Discharge)	EFF-006B	RSW-LSP RSW-006U-C RSW-LTR	Treated wastewater following all treatment and storage in Meadow Lane Pond D, and prior to discharge to the confluence of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Colgan Creek. Monitoring Location EFF-006B is also the downstream receiving water monitoring location for Discharge Point 006B.

Discharge/ Distribution Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Associated Receiving Water Monitoring Locations ¹	Monitoring Location Description
012A(1) (Discharge)	EFF-001	RSW-012BU RSW-012BD-S	Treated wastewater that is discharged directly to Santa Rosa Creek from the distribution trunk line rather than being stored in Delta Pond, which is monitored prior to discharge to Santa Rosa Creek. EFF-001 is also the downstream receiving water monitoring location for Discharge Point 012A(1).
012A(2) (Discharge)	EFF-012A(2)	RSW-012BU RSW-012BD-S	Treated wastewater following all treatment and storage in Delta Pond, and prior to discharge to Santa Rosa Creek. EFF-012A(2) is also the downstream receiving water monitoring location for Discharge Point 012A(2).
012B (Discharge)	EFF-012B	RSW-012BU RSW-12BD-S	Treated wastewater following all treatment and storage in Delta Pond, and prior to discharge to the confluence of Santa Rosa Creek and the Laguna de Santa Rosa. This Discharge Point is equipped with a multi-port diffuser and is intended to be the primary discharge point.
015 (Discharge)	EFF-001	RSW-LSP RSW-LTR	Treated wastewater following all treatment but prior to discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, prior to discharge to the recycled water system, and prior to storage in Meadow Lane and Delta Ponds.
--	RSW-LSP ³	--	Laguna de Santa Rosa at Stony Point Road (38°21'08.7" N, 122°44'28.1" W), upstream of the discharge from Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, and 015.
--	RSW-006AU (Historic) ³	--	At a point in the Laguna de Santa Rosa just upstream of Meadow Lane D-Pond incline pump discharge. (Also, formerly R-007)
--	RSW-006BU-C	--	Colgan Creek at Llano Road (38°22'25" N, 122°46'07.5" W), upstream of the discharge from Discharge Point 006B. (Formerly R-001)
--	RSW-LTR	--	Laguna de Santa Rosa at Todd Road, downstream of discharges from Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), and 015. Alternatively, the Permittee may propose an alternative means of monitoring downstream of Discharge Points 006A(1), 016A(2), 006B, and 015. ⁴
--	RSW-006BU-L (Historic) ³	--	At a point in the Laguna de Santa Rosa upstream of the discharge from Discharge Point 006B. (Also, formerly R-002)
--	RSW-012AU (Historic)	--	At a point in Santa Rosa Creek upstream of the discharge from Discharge Point 012A. (Also, formerly R-004)
--	RSW-012BU	--	Santa Rosa Creek at Willowside Road Bridge (38°26'43.01"N, 122°48'24.64"W), upstream of the discharge from Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B. This site is monitored using data sondes. (Formerly R-105)
--	RSW-012BD-L (Historic)	--	At a point in the Laguna de Santa Rosa approximately 75 feet upstream of the confluence of Santa Rosa Creek and the Laguna de Santa Rosa. (Formerly R-019)

Discharge/ Distribution Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Associated Receiving Water Monitoring Locations ¹	Monitoring Location Description
--	RSW-012BD-S	--	A point in Santa Rosa Creek near the confluence with the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The Exact location will be determined by the Model and will vary depending on flows. (Formerly R-018)
--	RSW-015U (Historic)	--	At a point in the Laguna de Santa Rosa approximately 100 feet upstream of Llano Bridge Road. (Also, formerly R-006)
--	BIO-001	--	A representative sample of the sludge or biosolids generated when removed for disposal.

Table Notes:

- Associated receiving water monitoring locations are noted in this column for each discharge point and further described in their individual entries in this table.
- Use of Discharge Point 001/Monitoring Location EFF-001 for transfer of effluent to recycled water storage and direct discharges to surface waters is regulated under this Order. References to Distribution Locations 001 and 002 are for information purposes only.
- Receiving water monitoring location, RSW-LSP has been newly established in this Order. Formerly, each discharge point to the Laguna de Santa Rosa (006A, 006B, and 015) had a unique receiving water location (RSW-006AU, RSW-006BU-L, and RSW-015U) immediately upstream of each discharge point, but these discharge points were not safely or easily accessible during periods of high flow and flooding. The Permittee has requested that all upstream receiving water for discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa be conducted at monitoring location RSW-LSP. This table also retains the historic receiving water monitoring locations RSW-006AU, 006BU-L, and 015U for historical reference and because data from these receiving water monitoring locations is used for the reasonable potential analyses conducted in this Order.
- The Permittee may propose an alternative means of monitoring downstream of Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, and 015 by submitting a technical report documenting an alternate receiving water monitoring method and/or location for Regional Water Board Executive Officer review and approval. This MRP may be modified upon approval of an alternative receiving water monitoring method and/or location.

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

- The Permittee shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INF-001

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Influent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week	Part 136 ²
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week	Part 136 ²
CTR Priority Pollutants ³	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	Annual/Quarterly ^{5,6}	Part 136 ^{2,7}

Table Notes:

- The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.
- Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of *Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater* (American Public Health Administration).

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
3. Those pollutants identified by the California Toxics Rule at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos.				
4. CTR priority pollutant samples shall be collected using 24-hour composite sampling, except for pollutants that are volatile. Samples for volatile pollutants may be collected as a grab sample.				
5. Influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall be conducted concurrently.				
6. Influent monitoring shall consist of an annual full CTR priority pollutant scan with quarterly samples analyzed for those pollutants detected in the scan.				
7. Analytical methods must achieve the lowest ML specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP and, in accordance with section 2.4 of the SIP, the Permittee shall report the ML and method detection limit (MDL) for each sample result.				

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 (Monitoring Prior to Discharge to Storage at Discharge Point 001)

1. The Permittee shall monitor advanced treated wastewater immediately following disinfection at Monitoring Location EFF-001 prior to discharge to the Meadow Lane Ponds or Delta Pond or direct discharges from the treatment plant to Santa Rosa Creek or the Laguna de Santa Rosa, as follows:

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001 (Prior to Discharges to Storage at Discharge Point 001)

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Effluent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week ²	Part 136 ³
	% Removal	Calculate	Monthly	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week ²	Part 136 ³
	% Removal	Calculate	Monthly	--
pH	standard units	Grab	Twice per Week ²	Part 136 ³
Total Coliform Bacteria	MPN/100 mL	Grab	Daily ^{4,5}	Part 136 ³

Table Notes:

1. The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.
2. Accelerated monitoring (twice per week monitoring frequency). If two consecutive twice per week test results exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take steps, including additional monitoring if necessary, to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.
3. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of *Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater* (American Public Health Administration).
4. Accelerated Monitoring (daily monitoring frequency). If a test result exceeds an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall increase monitoring frequency to a minimum of twice a day for a week to evaluate whether an exceedance is persisting. If two of more samples in a week exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.
5. Report daily values, rolling seven-day median values, and maximum monthly values. The daily result of total coliform bacteria sampling must be reported as individual reported value for each operational UV channel. Compliance will be based on the maximum reported value of all operational UV channels.

2. The Permittee shall monitor advanced treated wastewater immediately following disinfection at Monitoring Location EFF-001 during periods of discharge to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 012A(1), or the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 as follows:

Table E-4. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001 (For Discharges at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015)

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Effluent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Discharge Dilution Rate	% of stream flow	Calculate	Daily	--
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week ²	Part 136 ³
	% Removal	Calculate	Monthly	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week ²	Part 136 ³
	% Removal	Calculate	Monthly	--
pH	standard units	Grab	Daily ^{4, 5}	Part 136 ³
Total Coliform Bacteria	MPN/ 100 mL	Grab	Daily ^{5, 18}	Part 136 ³
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	Grab	Daily ⁵	Part 136 ³
Copper, Total Recoverable ^{6, 7}	µg/L	Grab	Monthly	Part 136 ³
Copper Impact Ratio ⁶	Ratio	Calculate	Monthly ⁸	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	Grab	Monthly ⁸	Part 136 ³
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	Monthly ⁸	Part 136 ³
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	Quarterly ⁸	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly ⁴	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Unionized (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Organic Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Total Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly ⁹	Part 136 ³
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Temperature	°F	Continuous	Weekly ⁴	Part 136 ³
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Turbidity	NTU	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
CTR Priority Pollutants ¹⁰	µg/L	24-hr Composite ¹¹	Twice per year ^{12, 15}	Part 136 ^{3, 13}
Acute Toxicity ¹⁴	% Survival, Pass or Fail, and % Effect	Grab	Annually	See Section V.A Below

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Chronic Toxicity ^{14, 19}	Pass or Fail, and % Effect	24-hr Composite	Quarterly	See Section V.B Below
Radioactivity ¹⁶	pCi/L ¹⁷	Grab	Once per Permit Term	Standard Methods

Table Notes:

1. The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.
2. Accelerated monitoring (twice per week monitoring frequency). If two consecutive twice per week test results exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take steps, including additional monitoring if necessary, to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.
3. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of *Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater* (American Public Health Administration).
4. pH and temperature shall be measured at Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-012AU or RSW-LSP concurrently with ammonia sampling at Monitoring Location EFF-001, when discharging at Discharge Points 012A(1) or 015, respectively. Monitoring for pH and temperature at Monitoring Location RSW-012AU must be conducted concurrently with the ammonia effluent sample when discharging directly to the Laguna de Santa Rosa or Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 001.
5. Accelerated Monitoring (daily monitoring frequency). If a test result exceeds an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall increase monitoring frequency to a minimum of twice a day for a week to evaluate whether an exceedance is persisting. If two of more samples in a week exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.
6. Monitoring for copper and calculation and reporting of the copper impact ratio is only required when discharging to Discharge Point 015.
7. Monitoring for hardness at Monitoring Location RSW-LSP must be conducted concurrently with the copper effluent sample in order for the AMEL and MDEL CIR to be calculated properly.
8. Accelerated monitoring (monthly and quarterly monitoring frequency). If a test result exceeds an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take two more samples, one within 7 days and one within 14 days following receipt of the initial sample result. During the intervening period, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance. For CTR Priority Pollutant monitoring, accelerated monitoring requirements apply to pentachlorophenol.
9. Accelerated monitoring (weekly monitoring frequency). If two consecutive weekly test results exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take two samples each of the 2 weeks following receipt of the second sample result. During the intervening period, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.
10. Those pollutants identified by the California Toxics Rule at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Hardness shall be monitored concurrently with the priority pollutant sample. Holding times for unpreserved cyanide shall not exceed one hour.
11. CTR priority pollutant samples shall be collected using 24-hour composite sampling, except for pollutants that are volatile. Samples for volatile pollutants may be collected as a grab sample.
12. Influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall be conducted concurrently.
13. Analytical methods must achieve the lowest ML specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP and, in accordance with section 2.4 of the SIP, the Permittee shall report the ML and MDL for each sample result. Total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2). The analysis of total mercury shall be by U.S. EPA method 1631 (Revision E) with a reporting limit of 0.5 ng/L (0.0005 µg/L).
14. Whole effluent acute and chronic toxicity shall be monitored in accordance with the requirements of section V of this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
15. Monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall occur at least two times per year. The sampling shall coincide with such discharges whenever they occur. If no discharges occur, sampling must be conducted between the months of December and April to ensure that representative data is available to assess reasonable potential.				
16. Radionuclides measured shall include combined radium-226 and radium-228, gross alpha, gross beta, tritium, strontium-90, and uranium.				
17. Results for gross beta shall be reported in units of millirem/year in accordance with EPA's <i>Implementation Guidance for Radionuclides</i> [EPA 816-F-00-002, March 2002].				
18. Report daily values, rolling seven-day median values, and maximum monthly values. The daily result of total coliform bacteria sampling must be reported as individual reported value for each operational UV channel. Compliance will be based on the maximum reported value of all operational UV channels.				
19. For chronic toxicity testing, quarterly routine monitoring shall be for any quarter having at least 15 days of continuous discharge.				

B. Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B

The Permittee shall monitor advanced treated wastewater following storage in Meadow Lane Pond D at Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B during periods of discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Point 006A(2), and the confluence of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and to Colgan Creek at Discharge Point 006B as follows:

Table E-5. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Effluent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Discharge Dilution Rate	% of stream flow	Calculate	Daily	--
pH	standard units	Grab	Daily ²	Part 136 ³
<i>E. coli</i> Bacteria ^{4, 15}	MPN or CFU/100mL ⁵	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly ³	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Unionized (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Organic Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Total Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly ⁶	Part 136 ³
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Temperature	°F	Continuous	Weekly ²	Part 136 ³
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Turbidity	NTU	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
CTR Priority Pollutants ⁷	µg/L	Grab	Twice per year ^{8, 10}	Part 136 ^{3,9}
Acute Toxicity ¹¹	% Survival, Pass or Fail, and % Effect	Grab	Annually	See Section V.A Below
Chronic Toxicity ¹¹	Pass or Fail, and % Effect	Grab	Quarterly ¹²	See Section V.B Below
Radioactivity ¹³	pCi/L ¹⁴	Grab	Once per Permit Term	Standard Methods

Table Notes:

1. The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.
2. pH and temperature shall be measured at Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP for discharges at Discharge Point 006A(2) or RSW-006BU-C and RSW-LSP concurrently for discharges at Discharge Point 006B with ammonia sampling at Monitoring Locations EFF-006A or EFF-006B, when discharging at Discharge Points 006A or 006B, respectively.
3. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of *Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater* (American Public Health Administration).
4. With approval by the Executive Officer, the minimum sampling frequency may be modified or superseded to conform to the monitoring frequency within the approved Pathogen Special Study Work Plan required by section VI.C.2.b of this Order.
5. MPN and CFU are comparable units. The permittee may use any *E. coli* method specified in 40 CFR 136 for compliance monitoring.
6. Accelerated monitoring (weekly monitoring frequency). If two consecutive weekly test results exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take two samples each of the 2 weeks following receipt of the second sample result. During the intervening period, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance
7. Those pollutants identified by the California Toxics Rule at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Hardness shall be monitored concurrently with the priority pollutant sample. Holding times for unpreserved cyanide shall not exceed one hour.
8. Influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall be conducted concurrently.
9. Analytical methods must achieve the lowest ML specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP and, in accordance with section 2.4 of the SIP, the Permittee shall report the ML and MDL for each sample result. Total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2). The analysis of total mercury shall be by U.S. EPA method 1631 (Revision E) with a reporting limit of 0.5 ng/L (0.0005 µg/L).
10. Monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall occur at least two times per year between the months of December and April during periods of discharge to surface waters.
11. Whole effluent acute and chronic toxicity shall be monitored in accordance with the requirements of section V of this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
12. For chronic toxicity testing, quarterly routine monitoring shall be for any quarter having at least 15 days of continuous discharge.
13. Radionuclides measured shall include combined radium-226 and radium-228, gross alpha, gross beta, tritium, strontium-90, and uranium.
14. Results for gross beta shall be reported in units of millirem/year in accordance with EPA's Implementation Guidance for Radionuclides [EPA 816-F-00-002, March 2002].
15. A minimum of three samples over a six-week period is necessary to calculate the geometric mean. See also Order section VII.H.2, Footnote 11.

C. Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B

The Permittee shall monitor advanced treated wastewater following storage in Delta Pond at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B during periods of discharge to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B as follows:

Table E-6. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Effluent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Discharge Dilution Rate	% of stream flow	Calculate	Daily	--
pH	standard units	Continuous	Daily ²	Part 136 ³
<i>E. coli</i> Bacteria ^{4, 16}	MPN or CFU/100mL ⁵	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate ⁶	µg/L	Grab	Monthly ⁷	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly ²	Part 136 ³
Ammonia Nitrogen, Unionized (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Organic Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Total Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Weekly ⁷	Part 136 ³
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Temperature	°F	Continuous	Weekly ²	Part 136 ³
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	Weekly	Part 136 ³
Turbidity	NTU	Continuous	Weekly	Part 136 ³
CTR Priority Pollutants ⁸	µg/L	Grab	Twice per year ^{9, 11}	Part 136 ^{3, 10}
Acute Toxicity ¹²	% Survival, Pass or Fail, and % Effect	Grab	Annually	See Section V.A Below
Chronic Toxicity ¹²	Pass or Fail, and % Effect	Grab	Quarterly ¹³	See Section V.B Below
Radioactivity ¹⁴	pCi/L ¹⁵	Grab	Once per Permit Term	Standard Methods

Table Notes:

1. The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<p>2. pH and temperature shall be measured at Monitoring Locations RSW-012AU or RSW-012BU concurrently with ammonia sampling at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) or EFF-012B, when discharging at Discharge Points 012A or 012B, respectively.</p> <p>3. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of <i>Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater</i> (American Public Health Administration).</p> <p>4. With approval by the Executive Officer, the minimum sampling frequency may be modified or superseded to conform to the monitoring frequency within the approved Pathogen Special Study Work Plan required by section VI.C.2.b of this Order.</p> <p>5. MPN and CFU are comparable units. The permittee may use any <i>E. coli</i> method specified in 40 CFR 136 for compliance monitoring.</p> <p>6. In order to verify bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent discharge, the Permittee shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.</p> <p>7. Accelerated monitoring (weekly monitoring frequency). If two consecutive weekly test results exceed an effluent limitation, the Permittee shall take two samples each of the 2 weeks following receipt of the second sample result. During the intervening period, the Permittee shall take steps to identify the cause of the exceedance and take steps needed to return to compliance.</p> <p>8. Those pollutants identified by the California Toxics Rule at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Hardness shall be monitored concurrently with the priority pollutant sample. Holding times for unpreserved cyanide shall not exceed one hour.</p> <p>9. Influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall be conducted concurrently.</p> <p>10. Analytical methods must achieve the lowest ML specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP and, in accordance with section 2.4 of the SIP, the Permittee shall report the ML and MDL for each sample result. Total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2). The analysis of total mercury shall be by U.S. EPA method 1631 (Revision E) with a reporting limit of 0.5 ng/L (0.0005 µg/L).</p> <p>11. Monitoring for CTR priority pollutants and chronic toxicity shall occur at least two times per year between the months of December and April during periods of discharge to surface waters.</p> <p>12. Whole effluent acute and chronic toxicity shall be monitored in accordance with the requirements of section V of this Monitoring and Reporting Program.</p> <p>13. For chronic toxicity testing, quarterly routine monitoring shall be for any quarter having at least 15 days of continuous discharge.</p> <p>14. Radionuclides measured shall include combined radium-226 and radium-228, gross alpha, gross beta, tritium, strontium-90, and uranium.</p> <p>15. Results for gross beta shall be reported in units of millirem/year in accordance with EPA's Implementation Guidance for Radionuclides [EPA 816-F-00-002, March 2002].</p> <p>16. A minimum of three samples over a six-week period is necessary to calculate the geometric mean. See also Order section VII.H.2, Footnote 11.</p>				

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Acute Toxicity Testing

The Permittee shall conduct acute whole effluent toxicity testing (WET) in accordance with the following acute toxicity testing requirements.

- 1. Test Frequency.** The Permittee shall conduct acute WET testing in accordance with the schedule established by this MRP while discharging at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1)

and 015, Discharge Points 006A and 006B, and Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B as summarized in Tables E-4, E-5, and E-6, respectively, above.

2. **Discharge In-stream Waste Concentration (IWC) for Acute Toxicity.** The IWC for this discharge is 100 percent effluent.¹
3. **Sample Volume and Holding Time.** The total sample volume shall be determined by the specific toxicity test method used. Sufficient sample volume shall be collected to perform the required toxicity test. All toxicity tests shall be conducted as soon as possible following sample collection. No more than 36 hours shall elapse before the conclusion of sample collection and test initiation.
4. **Freshwater Test Species and Test Methods.** The Permittee shall conduct the following acute toxicity tests in accordance with species and test methods in *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms* (U.S. EPA Report No. EPA-821-R-02-012, 5th edition or subsequent editions). In no case shall these species be substituted with another test species unless written authorization from the Regional Water Board Executive Officer is received.
 - a. A 96-hour static renewal toxicity test with an invertebrate, the water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (Survival Test Method 2002.0).
 - b. A 96-hour static renewal toxicity test with a vertebrate, the rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (Survival Test Method 2019.0).
5. **Species Sensitivity Screening.** Species sensitivity screening shall be conducted during this Order's first required sample collection. The Permittee shall collect a single effluent sample and concurrently conduct two acute toxicity tests using the invertebrate and fish species identified in section V.A.4, above. This sample shall also be analyzed for the parameters required for the discharge. The species that exhibits the highest "Percent (%) Effect" at the discharge IWC during species sensitivity screening shall be used for routine acute toxicity monitoring during the permit term.²
6. **Quality Assurance and Additional Requirements.** Quality assurance measures, instructions, and other recommendations and requirements are found in the test methods manual referenced in section V.A.4, above. Additional requirements are specified below.
 - a. The discharge is subject to determination of "Pass" or "Fail" and "Percent (%) Effect" from acute toxicity tests using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) approach described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1, and Table A-1. The null hypothesis (H_0) for the TST approach is: Mean discharge IWC response $\leq 0.80 \times$ Mean control response. A test result that rejects this null hypothesis is reported as "Pass". A test result that does not reject this null hypothesis is reported as "Fail". The relative "Percent (%) Effect" at the discharge IWC is defined and reported

¹ The acute toxicity test shall be conducted using 100 percent effluent collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001.

² If the percent effect is equal to zero percent effect for each species, or all percent effect are the same value, in the species sensitivity test, the Permittee shall either use the species that was most sensitive during the previous permit term for routine monitoring or repeat the species sensitivity screening for all species to confirm the results of the first screening before selecting the most sensitive species to use for routine monitoring. If two consecutive species sensitivity screening tests demonstrate that the percent effect for all species exhibit less than or equal to zero percent, the Permittee may select the species to be used for routine monitoring during the permit term.

as: $((\text{Mean control response} - \text{Mean discharge IWC response}) \div \text{Mean control response}) \times 100$.

- b. If the effluent toxicity test does not meet the minimum effluent test acceptability criteria (TAC) specified in the referenced test method, then the Permittee shall re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but not later than 7 days following notification of the test failure.
 - c. Dilution water and control water shall be laboratory water prepared and used as specified in the test methods manual. If dilution water and control water is different from test organism culture water, then a second control using culture water shall also be used.
 - d. Test procedures related to pH control, sample filtration, aeration, temperature control and sample dechlorination shall be performed in accordance with the U.S. EPA method and fully explained and justified in each acute toxicity report submitted to the Regional Water Board. The control of pH in acute toxicity tests is allowed, provided the test pH is maintained at the effluent pH measured at the time of sample collection, and the control of pH is done in a manner that has the least influence on the test water chemistry and on the toxicity of other pH sensitive materials such as some heavy metals, sulfide and cyanide.
 - e. **Ammonia Toxicity.** The acute toxicity test shall be conducted without modifications to eliminate ammonia toxicity.
7. **Notification.** The Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board verbally within 72 hours and in writing 14 days after receipt of test results exceeding the acute toxicity effluent limitation during regular or accelerated monitoring. The notification shall describe actions the Permittee has taken or will take to investigate and correct the cause(s) of toxicity. It may also include a status report on any actions required by this Order, with a schedule for actions not yet completed. If no actions have been taken, the reasons shall be given.
8. **Accelerated Monitoring Requirements.** If the result of any acute toxicity test fails to meet the single test minimum limitation (70 percent survival), and the testing meets all TAC, the Permittee shall take two more samples, one within 14 days and one within 21 days following receipt of the initial sample result. If any one of the additional samples do not comply with the three-sample median minimum limitation (90 percent survival), the Permittee shall initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with section V.C of the MRP. If the two additional samples are in compliance with the acute toxicity requirement and testing meets all TAC, then a TRE will not be required. If the discharge stops before additional samples can be collected, the Permittee shall contact the Regional Water Board Executive Officer within 21 days with a plan to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation.
9. **Reporting.** The Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) shall include a full laboratory report for each toxicity test (WET report). The WET report shall be prepared using the format and content of section 12 (Report Preparation) of *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms* (U.S. EPA Report No. EPA-821-R-02-012, 5th edition or subsequent editions), including:
- a. The toxicity test results in percent (%) survival for the 100 percent effluent sample.

- b. The toxicity test results for the TST approach, reported as “Pass” or “Fail” and “Percent (%) Effect” at the acute toxicity IWC for the discharge.
- c. Water quality measurements for each toxicity test (e.g., pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductivity, hardness, salinity, chlorine, ammonia).
- d. TRE/toxicity identification evaluation (TIE) results. The Regional Water Board Executive Officer shall be notified no later than 30 days from completion of each aspect of TRE/TIE analyses.
- e. Statistical program (e.g., TST calculator, CETIS, etc.) output results for each toxicity test.

B. Chronic Toxicity Testing

The Permittee shall conduct chronic toxicity testing in accordance with the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. **Test Frequency.** The Permittee shall conduct chronic toxicity testing in accordance with the schedule established by this MRP while discharging at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015, Discharge Points 006A and 006B, and Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B as summarized in Tables E-4, E-5, and E-6, respectively, above.
2. **Discharge In-stream Waste Concentration (IWC) for Chronic Toxicity.** The chronic toxicity IWC for this discharge is 100 percent effluent.³
3. **Sample Volume and Holding Time.** The total sample volume shall be determined by the specific toxicity test method used. Sufficient sample volume shall be collected to perform the required toxicity test. All toxicity tests shall be conducted as soon as possible following sample collection. For toxicity tests requiring renewals, a minimum of three 24-hour composite samples shall be collected. The lapsed time (holding time) from sample collection to first use of each sample must not exceed 36 hours.
4. **Freshwater Test Species and Test Methods.** The Permittee shall conduct the following chronic toxicity tests in accordance with species and test methods in *Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Water to Freshwater Organisms* (U.S. EPA Report No. EPA-821-R-02-013, or subsequent editions). In no case shall these species be substituted with another test species unless written authorization from the Regional Water Board Executive Officer is received.
 - a. A 7-day static renewal toxicity test with a vertebrate, the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (Larval Survival and Growth Test Method 1000.0).
 - b. A static renewal toxicity test with an invertebrate, the water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (Survival and Reproduction Test Method 1002.0).
 - c. A 96-hour static renewal toxicity test with a plant, the green algae, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (also named *Raphidocelis subcapitata*) (Growth Test Method 1003.0).
5. **Species Sensitivity Screening.** Species sensitivity screening shall be conducted during this Order’s first required sample collection. The Permittee shall collect a single effluent sample and concurrently conduct three chronic toxicity tests using the fish, the invertebrate, and the algae species identified in section V.B.4, above. This sample shall also be analyzed for the

³ The chronic toxicity test shall be conducted using a series of five dilutions and a control. The series shall consist of the following dilutions: 12.5, 25, 50, 75, and 100 percent. Compliance determination will be based on the IWC (100 percent effluent) and a control as further described in Fact Sheet section IV.C.5.c.

parameters required for the discharge. The species that exhibits the highest “Percent (%) Effect” at the discharge IWC during species sensitivity screening shall be used for routine monitoring during the permit term.⁴

- 6. Quality Assurance and Additional Requirements.** Quality assurance measures, instructions, and other recommendations and requirements are found in the test methods manual previously referenced. Additional requirements are specified below.
- a.** The discharge is subject to determination of “Pass” or “Fail” and “Percent (%) Effect” for chronic toxicity tests using the TST approach described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1, and Table A-1. The null hypothesis (H_0) for the TST approach is Mean discharge IWC response $0.75 \times$ Mean control response. A test result that rejects this null hypothesis is reported as “Pass”. A test result that does not reject this null hypothesis is reported as “Fail”. The relative “Percent (%) Effect” at the discharge IWC is defined and reported as: $((\text{Mean control response} - \text{Mean discharge IWC response}) \div \text{Mean control response}) \times 100$.
 - b.** If the effluent toxicity test does not meet the minimum effluent or reference toxicant TAC specified in the referenced test method, then the Permittee shall re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but not later than 14 days following notification of the test failure.
 - c.** Dilution water and control water shall be laboratory water prepared and used as specified in the test methods manual. If dilution water and control water is different from test organism culture water, then a second control using culture water shall also be used.
 - d.** Monthly reference toxicant testing is sufficient. All reference toxicant test results should be reviewed and reported.
 - e.** The Permittee shall perform toxicity tests on final effluent samples. Chlorine and ammonia shall not be removed from the effluent sample prior to toxicity testing, unless explicitly authorized under this section of the MRP and the rationale is explained in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).
 - f. Ammonia Removal.** Except with prior approval from the Regional Water Board Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board, ammonia shall not be removed from bioassay samples. The Permittee must demonstrate the effluent toxicity is caused by ammonia because of increasing test pH when conducting the toxicity test. It is important to distinguish the potential toxic effects of ammonia from other pH sensitive chemicals, such as certain heavy metals, sulfide, and cyanide. The following may be steps to demonstrate that the toxicity is caused by ammonia and not other toxicants

⁴ If the percent effect is less than or equal to zero percent effect for each species, or all percent effect are the same value, in the species sensitivity screening test, the Permittee shall either use the species that was most sensitive during the previous permit term for routine monitoring or repeat the species sensitivity screening for all species to confirm the results of the first screening before selecting the most sensitive species to use for routine monitoring. If two consecutive species sensitivity screening tests demonstrate that the percent effect for all species exhibit less than or equal to zero percent, the Permittee may select the species to be used for routine monitoring during the permit term.

before the Regional Water Board Executive Officer would allow for control of pH in the test.

- i. There is consistent toxicity in the effluent and the maximum pH in the toxicity test is in the range to cause toxicity due to increased pH.
- ii. Chronic ammonia concentrations in the effluent are greater than 4 mg/L total ammonia.
- iii. Conduct graduated pH tests as specified in the TIE methods. For example, mortality should be higher at pH 8 and lower at pH 6.
- iv. Treat the effluent with a zeolite column to remove ammonia. Mortality in the zeolite treated effluent should be lower than the non-zeolite treated effluent. Then add ammonia back to the zeolite-treated samples to confirm toxicity due to ammonia.

When it has been demonstrated that toxicity is due to ammonia because of increasing test pH, pH may be controlled using appropriate procedures which do not significantly alter the nature of the effluent.

7. **Notification.** The Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board verbally within 72 hours and in writing within 14 days after the receipt of a result of “Fail” during routine or accelerated monitoring.
8. **Accelerated Monitoring Requirements.** Accelerated monitoring for chronic toxicity is triggered when a chronic toxicity test, analyzed using the TST approach, results in “Fail” and the “Percent Effect” is ≥ 0.50 . Within 24 hours of the time the Permittee becomes aware of a summary result of “Fail”, the Permittee shall implement an accelerated monitoring schedule consisting of four toxicity tests—consisting of 5-effluent concentrations (including the discharge IWC) and a control—conducted at approximately 2-week intervals, over an 8-week period. If each of the accelerated toxicity tests results is “Pass,” the Permittee shall return to routine monitoring for the next monitoring period. If one of the accelerated toxicity tests results is “Fail”, the Permittee shall immediately implement the TRE Process conditions set forth in section V.C, below.
9. **Reporting**
 - a. **Routine Reporting.** Chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be submitted with the monthly SMR for the month that chronic toxicity monitoring was performed. Routine reporting shall include the following in order to demonstrate compliance with permit requirements:
 - i. WET reports shall include the contracting laboratory’s complete report provided to the Permittee and shall be consistent with the appropriate “Report Preparation and Test Review” sections of the methods manual and this MRP. The WET test reports shall contain a narrative report that includes details about WET test procedures and results, including the following:
 - (a) Receipt and handling of the effluent sample that includes a tabular summary of initial water quality characteristics (e.g., pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductivity, hardness, salinity, chlorine, ammonia);
 - (b) The source and make-up of the lab control/diluent water used for the test;

- (c) Any manipulations done to lab control/diluent and effluent such as filtration, nutrient addition, etc.;
- (d) Tabular summary of test results for control water and each effluent dilution and statistics summary to include calculation of the NOEC, TUC, and IC25;
- (e) Identification of any anomalies or nuances in the test procedures or results;
- (f) WET test results shall include, at a minimum, for each test:
 - (1) Sample date(s);
 - (2) Test initiation date;
 - (3) Test species;
 - (4) Determination of "Pass" or "Fail" and "Percent Effect" following the Test of Significant Toxicity hypothesis testing approach in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010). The "Percent Effect" shall be calculated as follows:
$$\text{"Percent Effect" (or Effect, in \%)} = ((\text{Control mean response} - \text{IWC mean response}) \div \text{Control mean response}) \times 100$$
 - (5) End point values for each dilution (e.g., number of young, growth rate, percent survival);
 - (6) NOEC value(s) in percent effluent;
 - (7) IC15, IC25, IC40, and IC50 values (or EC15, EC25...etc.) in percent effluent;
 - (8) TUC values (100/NOEC);
 - (9) Mean percent mortality (\pm s.d.) after 96 hours in 100 percent effluent (if applicable);
 - (10) NOEC and LOEC values for reference toxicant test(s);
 - (11) IC50 or EC50 value(s) for reference toxicant test(s);
 - (12) Available water quality measurements for each test (e.g., pH, DO, temperature, conductivity, hardness, salinity, ammonia);
 - (13) Statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
 - (14) The statistical program (e.g., TST calculator, CETIS, etc.) output results, which includes the calculation of percent minimum significant difference (PMSD); and
 - (15) Results of applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page identifying the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD and dates tested; the reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, to include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory; and any information on deviations from standard test procedures or

problems encountered in completing the test and how the problems were resolved.

- b. **TRE/TIE results.** The Regional Water Board Executive Officer shall be notified no later than 30 days from completion of each aspect of TRE/TIE analyses. TRE/TIE results shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board within 60 days of completion.

C. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Process

- 1. **TRE Work Plan.** The Permittee submitted a TRE Work Plan, dated November 2015, to the Regional Water Board. The Permittee's TRE Work Plan shall be reviewed, and revised if necessary, by **November 1, 2020** and once every five years thereafter. The TRE Work Plan shall be updated as necessary in order to remain current and applicable to the discharge and discharge facilities.

The Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board of this review and submit any revisions of the TRE Work Plan within 90 days of the notification, to be ready to respond to toxicity events. The TRE Work Plan shall describe the steps the Permittee intends to follow if toxicity is detected, and should include at least the following items:

- a. A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that would be used to identify potential causes and sources of toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency.
 - b. A description of the Facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency, good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in the operation of this Facility.
 - c. If a TIE is necessary, an indication of the person who would conduct the TIEs (i.e., an in-house expert or an outside contractor).
- 2. **Preparation and Implementation of a Detailed TRE Work Plan.** If one of the accelerated toxicity tests described in section V.A.8 (above) does not comply with the three sample median minimum limitation (90 percent survival) or in section V.B.8 (above) results in "Fail", the Permittee shall immediately initiate a TRE using EPA manual *Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations* (EPA/600/2-88/070, 1989) and within 30 days of receipt submit the accelerated monitoring result to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. The Permittee shall also submit a Detailed TRE Work Plan, which shall follow the generic TRE Work Plan revised as appropriate for the toxicity event described in section V.A.8 or V.B.8 of this MRP. The Detailed TRE Work Plan shall include the following information, and comply with additional conditions set by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer:
 - a. Further actions by the Permittee to investigate, identify, and correct causes of toxicity.
 - b. Actions the Permittee will take to mitigate effects of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity.
 - c. A schedule for these actions, progress reports, and the final report.
 - 3. **TIE Implementation.** The Permittee may initiate a TIE as part of a TRE to identify the causes of toxicity using the same species and test methods and, as guidance, EPA manuals: *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures* (EPA/600/6-91/003, 1991); *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations, Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and*

Chronic Toxicity (EPA/600/R-92/080, 1993); *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations, Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity* (EPA/600/R-92/081, 1993); and *Marine Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE): Phase I Guidance Document* (EPA/600/R-96-054, 1996). The TIE should be conducted on the species demonstrating the most sensitive toxicity response.

4. Many recommended TRE elements parallel required or recommended efforts for source control, pollution prevention, and storm water control programs. TRE efforts should be coordinated with such efforts. As toxic substances are identified or characterized, the Permittee shall continue the TRE by determining the sources and evaluating alternative strategies for reducing or eliminating the substances from the discharge. All reasonable steps shall be taken to reduce toxicity to levels consistent with toxicity evaluation parameters.
5. The Permittee shall conduct routine effluent monitoring for the duration of the TRE process. Additional accelerated monitoring and TRE work plans are not required once a TRE has begun.
6. The Regional Water Board recognizes that toxicity may be episodic and identification of the causes and reduction of sources of toxicity may not be successful in all cases. The TRE may be ended at any stage, pending Regional Water Board approval, if monitoring finds there is no longer toxicity.

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Recycled Water Monitoring Location EFF-001

1. The Permittee shall monitor treated, disinfected wastewater that will be recycled prior storage and distribution to the Geysers Project distribution system at Distribution Point 001 or the irrigation distribution system at Distribution Point 002 at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as follows:

Table E-7. Recycled Water Monitoring – Monitoring Location EFF-001

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Effluent Flow ¹	mgd	Meter	Continuous	--
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week	Part 136 ²
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	Twice per Week	Part 136 ²
pH	standard units	Grab	Twice per Week	Part 136 ²
Total Coliform Bacteria ³	MPN/ 100 mL	Grab	Daily	4

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Table Notes:				
1. The Permittee shall report the daily average and monthly average flows.				
2. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of <i>Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater</i> (American Public Health Administration).				
3. The Permittee shall collect, analyze, and report samples from each operating UV disinfection channel for total coliform bacteria. The highest value will be used to determine compliance with coliform bacteria effluent limitations.				
4. The SM9223 B Colilert test method will be used to quantify total coliform concentrations in recycled water.				

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER AND GROUNDWATER

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and RSW-012BU

1. The Permittee shall monitor upstream receiving water conditions in the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Monitoring Location RSW-LSP during periods of discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Colgan Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-C and the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Monitoring Location RSW-LSP during periods of discharge to the confluence of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Colgan Creek, and Santa Rosa Creek at Monitoring Locations RSW-012AU and RSW-012BU during periods of discharge to Santa Rosa Creek as follows:

Table E-8. Receiving Water Monitoring – Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and RSW-012BU.

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Gauge ¹	Daily	--
pH	standard units	Continuous	Daily ^{2, 3}	Part 136 ⁴
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Monthly ²	Part 136 ⁴
Ammonia Nitrogen, Unionized (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Organic Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Total Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	Grab	Monthly	Part 136 ⁴
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Continuous	Daily	Part 136 ⁴
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	Quarterly/Monthly ⁵	Part 136 ⁴
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Continuous	Daily	Part 136 ⁴
Temperature	°F	Continuous	Daily ^{2, 3}	Part 136 ⁴
Turbidity	NTU	Continuous	Daily	Part 136 ⁴
CTR Priority Pollutants ⁶	µg/L	Grab	Twice per year ^{7, 8}	Part 136 ^{4, 9}

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<p>Table Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The flow rate shall be determined using the flow in the Russian River at the Hacienda Bridge at United States Geological Survey (USGS) Gauge No. 11467000. 2. Effluent and receiving water pH, temperature, and ammonia samples shall be collected on the same day and at approximately the same time for calculation of the un-ionized fraction. 3. pH and temperature shall be measured at Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-012AU concurrently with ammonia sampling at Monitoring Location EFF-001, when discharging at Discharge Point 012A(1) in order for the AMEL and MDEL AIR to be calculated properly. 4. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater (American Public Health Administration). 5. Receiving water monitoring for hardness shall be conducted quarterly to coincide with CTR priority pollutant monitoring and monthly when discharging from Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and/or 015, concurrently with effluent monitoring for copper, in order for the AMEL and MDEL copper impact ratios (CIRs) to be calculated properly. 6. Those pollutants identified by the California Toxics Rule at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Hardness shall be monitored concurrently with the priority pollutant sample. 7. Influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants shall be conducted concurrently. 8. Monitoring for CTR priority pollutants and chronic toxicity shall occur at least two times per year between the months of December and April during periods of discharge to surface waters. 9. Analytical methods must achieve the lowest ML specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP and, in accordance with section 2.4 of the SIP, the Permittee shall report the ML and MDL for each sample result. 				

B. Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S

1. The Permittee shall monitor downstream receiving water conditions in Santa Rosa Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S during periods of discharge to Santa Rosa Creek as follows:
 - a. When discharging from Discharge Point 012B, the Permittee shall monitor flow, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and temperature in the effluent and upstream receiving waters continuously and use this information to modulate each day (or more frequently as necessary if receiving water conditions are variable) the amount of discharge such that receiving water quality limits are not exceeded at the edge of the Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID)⁵, as determined according to the model incorporated into and described in the *Laguna Subregional Water Reclamation System Receiving Water Quality Limit Compliance Assurance and Monitoring Plan* (the Model). Downstream receiving water conditions at Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S will be determined via the Model outputs. The Permittee shall use the Model at least once per day of discharge to determine daily average receiving water turbidity impact and hourly average receiving water pH, dissolved oxygen, and temperature impacts at Monitoring

⁵ The Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID) was developed based on concepts contained in the California Ocean Plan, which defines initial dilution as “the process which results in the rapid and irreversible turbulent mixing of wastewater with ocean water around the point of discharge.” The framework for the ZID in the Model recognizes that the momentum of treated wastewater exiting the outfall results in initial mixing (or dilution) in very close proximity to the outfall. The area of mixing is referred to as the ZID.

Location RSW-012BD-S. Compliance with receiving water limitations for pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and temperature shall be determined using the respective daily and hourly averages produced by the Model. The Permittee shall monitor downstream receiving waters at Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S once per permit cycle during discharge to surface waters to verify the accuracy of the model calculations, as shown in Table E-9. The Model verification shall occur during the first discharge event after the effective date of this Order or as soon as physically feasible.

Table E-9. Receiving Water Monitoring – Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
pH	standard units	Model Calculation	Hourly	Model Calculation
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Model Calculation	Hourly	Model Calculation
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Model Calculation	Hourly	Model Calculation
Temperature	°F	Model Calculation	Hourly	Model Calculation
Turbidity	NTU	Model Calculation	Daily	Model Calculation
pH	standard units	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²
Specific Conductance @ 77°F	µmhos/cm	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²
Temperature	°F	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²
Turbidity	NTU	Continuous	Once per Permit Term ¹	Part 136 ²

Table Notes:

- For Model verification, “Once per Permit Term” means a single monitoring period that extends 2 weeks or the length of the first discharge period if the duration of the discharge is less than 2 weeks.
- Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board, such as with the current edition of *Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater* (American Public Health Administration).

C. Groundwater Monitoring to Assess Impacts of Storage Ponds and Recycled Water Use

By **August 1, 2021**, the Permittee shall submit a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Plan to the Regional Water Board for Executive Officer approval that describes the Permittee’s plan and schedule for developing a monitoring and reporting program to assess the impacts of storage ponds and recycled water use on the water quality of the underlying groundwater basin. The Plan must include the specific components identified in the September 1, 2015 Regional Water Board letter to the Permittee (Subject line: Santa Rosa Plain Salt and Nutrient Management Plan) describing the necessary components of a basin-specific Monitoring and Reporting Program, including the following components: Basin/Watershed Characterization and Baseline, Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan, Sampling Design Plan, Primary Constituents of Concern, Sampling Frequency, Quality Assurance Project Plan, and Reporting. This letter is included as Attachment J to this Order.

Upon approval of the SNMP Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Plan by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, the Permittee shall implement the Plan for the Permittee’s effluent/recycled water storage ponds and recycled water use.

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Filtration Process Monitoring

Filtration process monitoring shall demonstrate compliance with section IV.D.1 (Filtration Process Requirements) of the Order and applies to all treated wastewater flows. The following filtration process monitoring shall be implemented:

1. Effluent Filter Monitoring (Monitoring Location INT-001A)

- a. **Monitoring.** The Permittee shall calculate, on a daily basis, the surface loading rate in gallons per minute per square foot and report the maximum surface loading rate, tertiary filter flow, and any exceedances of the surface loading rate limitations specified in section IV.D.1.a or any exceedances of tertiary filter flow specified in section IV.D.2 of the Order. The rate of flow through the advanced wastewater treatment process filters shall be measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
- b. **Compliance.** Compliance with the maximum daily filter surface loading rate, as specified in section 60301.320 of the CCR Water Recycling Criteria (title 22) and the February 12, 2020 DDW title 22 report acceptance letter, shall be calculated based on the flow rate through each filter unit.
- c. **Reporting.**
 - i. The daily instantaneous maximum average daily filter surface loading rate, maximum daily tertiary filter flow rate, and daily average flow rate shall be reported in the monthly SMRs.
 - ii. If the tertiary filter loading rate exceeds a daily average of 7.5 gpm/ft² or instantaneous maximum of 8.0 gpm/ft² at any time, or the tertiary filter flow rate exceeds 90.7 mgd, the incident shall be reported in the monthly SMR.

2. Effluent Filter Monitoring (Monitoring Location INT-001B)

- a. **Monitoring.** Turbidity monitoring for each individual filter shall be conducted in accordance with the current SOP (approved by CDPH which is now DDW) for filter loading rates above 5 gal/ft²-min. At all times, the turbidity of the filter effluent shall be continuously measured and recorded. Should the turbidity meter and recorder fail, grab sampling at a minimum frequency of 1.2 hours may be substituted for a period of up to 24 hours. The recorded data shall be maintained by the Permittee for at least 3 years. The daily maximum, daily average, and 95th percentile turbidity results shall be reported for Monitoring Location INT-001B in the monthly SMRs.
- b. **Compliance.** Compliance with the 95th percentile effluent turbidity limitation specified in title 22, as referenced in section IV.D.1.b of the Order, shall be determined using the levels of recorded combined filter effluent turbidity taken at intervals of no more than 1.2 hours over a 24-hour period. Exceedances of the maximum turbidity requirement referenced in section IV.D.1.b of this Order shall not be considered a violation of these waste discharge requirements if such exceedance does not exceed a duration of one minute. Mitigation of the event shall consist of diverting all inadequately treated wastewater to temporary storage or an upstream process or automatically activated chemical addition to comply with title 22 requirements (sections 60304 and 60307)

c. Reporting.

- i.** The daily average, maximum, and 95th percentile values of combined effluent turbidity shall be reported in the monthly SMRs.
- ii.** If the filtered effluent turbidity exceeds 2 NTU, based on a daily average, 5 NTU for more than 15 minutes, or 10 NTU at any time, during normal filter loading conditions (≤ 5 gpm/ft²); or 1.5 NTU, based on a daily average, 2.5 NTU for more than 15 minutes, or 5 NTU at any time during high filter loading rate operation (> 5 gpm/ft²), the incident shall be reported in the monthly SMR and to the Regional Water Board and DDW by telephone within 24 hours in accordance with Provision VI.A.2.c of the Order. A written report describing the incident and the actions undertaken in response shall be included in the monthly SMR.
- iii.** A summary of compliance with all effluent filter requirements shall be included as part of the Permittee's Annual Report submitted to the Regional Water Board.

B. Disinfection Process Monitoring for UV Disinfection System (Monitoring Location INT-002)

1. Monitoring Location INT-002

- a. Monitoring.** The UV transmittance of the influent to the UV disinfection system shall be monitored continuously and recorded at Monitoring Location INT-002. The operational UV dose shall be calculated from UV transmittance, flow rate per channel, UV power, and using lamp age and sleeve fouling factors, in accordance with DDW recommendations.
- b. Compliance.** The UV transmittance shall not fall below 50 percent of maximum at any time, unless otherwise approved by DDW. The operational UV dose shall not fall below 100 millijoules per square centimeter (mJ/cm²) at any time, unless otherwise approved by DDW. Any inadequately treated and disinfected wastewater shall be diverted to a storage basin or an upstream process for adequate treatment. Flow through the UV disinfection system shall not exceed 22.3 mgd per channel in operation, or 67.0 mgd with three channels in operation at any time, unless otherwise approved by DDW.
- c. Reporting.** The Permittee shall report daily average and lowest daily transmittance and operational UV dose on its monthly SMRs. The Permittee shall report daily average and maximum flow through the UV disinfection system. If the UV transmittance falls below 50 percent or UV dose falls below 100 mJ/cm², the event shall be reported to the Regional Water Board by telephone within 24 hours.

C. Visual Monitoring (Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(1), EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-012A(1), EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, EFF-015, RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, RSW-LTR, and RSW-012BD-S)

- 1.** Visual observations of the discharge (Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(1), EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-012A(1), EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, EFF-015) and the receiving water (Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, RSW-LTR and RSW-012BD-S) shall be recorded monthly and on the first day of each intermittent discharge. Visual monitoring shall include, but not be limited to, observations for floating materials, coloration, objectionable aquatic growths, oil and grease films, and odors. Visual observations shall be recorded and included in the Permittee's monthly SMRs.

D. Sludge Monitoring (Monitoring Location BIO-001)

1. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected quarterly at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with EPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document (USEPA Report No. EPA 833-B-89-100) and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).
2. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of 5 years. A log shall be maintained for sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for developing the Sludge Handling and Disposal report that is required as part of the Annual Report.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Permittee shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.

B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. The Permittee shall submit electronic Self-Monitoring Reports (eSMRs) using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional directions for SMR submittal in the event there will be service interruption for electronic submittal. The Permittee shall maintain sufficient staffing and resources to ensure it submits eSMRs that are complete and timely. This includes provision of training and supervision of individuals (e.g., Permittee personnel or consultant) on how to prepare and submit eSMRs.
2. The Permittee shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX and operational records specified in Order Provision VI.C.4.d. The Permittee shall submit monthly SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.
3. All monitoring results reported shall be supported by the inclusion of the complete analytical report from the laboratory that conducted the analyses.
4. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-10. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule¹

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	First day of second calendar month following the end of each quarter (February 1, May 1, August 1, November 1)
Hourly	Permit effective date	Hourly	First day of second calendar month following the end of each quarter (February 1, May 1, August 1, November 1)
Daily	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling	First day of second calendar month following the month of sampling
Twice per Week	Sunday following permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday	Sunday through Saturday	First day of second calendar month following the month of sampling
Weekly	Sunday following permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday	Sunday through Saturday	First day of second calendar month following the month of sampling
Monthly	First day of calendar month following permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month	First day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following the month of sampling
Quarterly	Closest of January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1 following (or on) permit effective date	January through March April through June July through September October through January	First day of second calendar month following the end of each quarter (February 1, May 1, August 1, November 1) ¹
Annually MRP sections X.D.2-5	January 1 following (or on) permit effective date	January 1 through December 31	March 1, each year
Once per permit term	Permit effective date	All	As stated in MRP tables or by July 31, 2024.

Table Notes:

- Quarterly reporting periods are as follows: January 1 through March 31; April 1 through June 30; July 1 through September 30; and October 1 through December 31.

5. Reporting Protocols. The Permittee shall report with each sample result the applicable ML, the RL, and the current MDL, as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

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

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

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

- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
 - d. The Permittee is to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the ML value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Permittee to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
6. The Permittee shall submit SMRs in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Permittee shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the Facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The reported data shall include calculations of all effluent limitations that require averaging, taking of a median, or other computation. The Permittee is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Permittee shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
 - b. The Permittee shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify:
 - i. Facility name and address;
 - ii. WDID number;
 - iii. Applicable period of monitoring and reporting;
 - iv. Violations of the WDRs (identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation);
 - v. Corrective actions taken or planned; and
 - vi. The proposed time schedule for corrective actions.
 - c. SMRs must be submitted to the Regional Water Board, signed and certified as required by the Standard Provisions (Attachment D), to the CIWQS Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>).

The Permittee shall also submit all groundwater monitoring data to the State Water Board's Geographic Environmental Information Management System database

(GeoTracker) at
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ust/electronic_submittal/index.shtml.

In the event that an alternate method for submittal of SMRs is required, the Permittee shall submit the SMR electronically via e-mail to NorthCoast@waterboards.ca.gov or on disk (CD or DVD) in Portable Document Format (PDF) file in lieu of paper-sourced documents. The guidelines for electronic submittal of documents can be found on the Regional Water Board website at <http://waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast>.

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)

- DMRs are U.S. EPA reporting requirements. The Permittee shall electronically certify and submit DMRs together with SMRs using Electronic Self-Monitoring Reports module eSMR 2.5 or any upgraded version. DMRs shall be submitted monthly on the first day of second calendar month following the month of sampling. Electronic DMR submittal shall be in addition to electronic SMR submittal. Information regarding electronic DMR submittal is available at the DMR website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring/.

D. Other Reports

- Special Study Reports and Progress Reports.** As specified in the Special Provisions contained in sections VI and VII of the Order, and sections I, V, IX, and X of the MRP, special study and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements.

Table E-11. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports

Order Section	Special Provision Requirement	Reporting Requirements
Special Provision VI.C.2.b	Pathogen Special Study Work Plan	August 1, 2021
Special Provision VI.C.2.b	Pathogen Special Study Final Report	July 31, 2024
Special Provision VI.C.2.c	Engineering Evaluation of Discharge Outfalls Work Plan	February 1, 2021
Special Provision VI.C.2.c	Engineering Evaluation of Discharge Outfalls Final Report	July 31, 2024
Special Provision VI.C.2.d	Local Limits Evaluation Report	February 1, 2024
Special Provision VI.C.2.d	Updated Local Limits	As necessary , in accordance with schedule submitted with the local limits evaluation report.
Special Provision VI.C.2.e	Updated Sewer Use Ordinance Evaluation Report	February 1, 2024
Special Provision VI.C.2.e	Sewer Use Ordinance Evaluation	As necessary , in accordance with schedule submitted with the sewer use evaluation report
Special Provision VI.C.2.f	Disaster Preparedness Assessment Report and Action Plan.	August 1, 2023
Special Provision VI.C.3.a.i	Pollutant Minimization Program	If required by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer

Order Section	Special Provision Requirement	Reporting Requirements
Special Provision VI.C.3.a.ii(e)	Pollutant Minimization Program, Annual Facility Report	March 1 , annually, following development of Pollutant Minimization Program
Special Provision VI.C.4.c	Standard Operating Procedures for Chlorine Usage	November 1, 2020
Special Provision VI.C.5.f	Adequate Capacity, Technical Report	Within 120 days of notification that the Facility will reach capacity within 4 years
Special Provision VI.C.5.h	Anaerobically Digestible Material, Standard Operating Procedures	Update as necessary
Special Provision VI.C.6.a	Recycled Water Operation and Discharge Management Plan	Update as necessary
Special Provision VI.C.6.b	Capacity Increase Engineering Report	Update as necessary
Compliance Determination VII.O	Identify Selected Total Phosphorus Compliance Option in writing	February 1, 2021
Compliance Determination VII.O.2.c	Alternative Total Phosphorus Compliance Option Workplan	August 1, 2021
MRP General Monitoring Provision I.F	DMR-QA Study Report	Annually , per State Water Board instructions
MRP Effluent Monitoring Requirement V.B.9.b	Notification of TRE/TIE Results	No later than 30 days from the completion of each aspect of the TRE/TIE analyses.
MRP Effluent Monitoring Requirement V.B.9.b	TRE/TIE Results	Within 60 days of completion of TRE/TIE analyses
MRP Effluent Monitoring Requirement V.C.1	TRE Work Plan review and update (as necessary)	November 1, 2020
MRP Effluent Monitoring Requirement V.C.2	Detailed TRE Work Plan	Within 30 days of an accelerated monitoring test that results in "Fail"
MRP Receiving Water Monitoring Requirement VIII.C.	SNMP Groundwater Monitoring Work Plan	August 1, 2021
MRP Reporting Requirement X.D.2	Annual Report	March 1, annually
Special Provision VI.C.2.g and MRP Other Monitoring Requirement X.D.2.i	Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program Implementation and Reporting	Annually , with Annual Report
MRP Reporting Requirement X.D.3	Annual Pretreatment Report	March 1, annually
MRP Reporting Requirement X.D.4	Annual Biosolids Report to EPA	February 19, annually

Order Section	Special Provision Requirement	Reporting Requirements
MRP Reporting Requirement X.D.5	Annual Volumetric Reporting to Geotracker	April 30, annually
MRP Reporting Requirement X.D.6	Discharge Season Annual Report	July 1 annually
MRP Reporting Requirement X.E.1	Notification of spills and unauthorized discharges.	Oral reporting within 24 hours and written report within 5 days
MRP Reporting Requirement X.E.4.a.i	Notification of secondary recycled water spills greater than 1,000 gallons	Notification as soon as becoming aware of the discharge and notification is possible

2. **Annual Report.** By March 1 of the following year, the Permittee shall submit an annual report to the Regional Water Board for each calendar year through the CIWQS Program Web site. In the event that an alternate method for submittal of the annual report is required, the Permittee shall submit the report electronically via the email address in section X.B.6.c., above. The report shall be submitted by March 1st of the following year and certified as required by Standard Provisions of this Order (Attachment D, section V.B). The report shall, at a minimum, include the following:
 - a. Where appropriate, tabular and/or graphical summaries of the monitoring data and disposal records from the previous year. If the Permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or as specified in this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and report of the data submitted in the SMR.
 - b. A comprehensive discussion of the Facility’s compliance (or lack thereof) with all effluent limitations and other WDRs, and the corrective actions taken or planned, which may be needed to bring the discharge into full compliance with the Order.
 - c. The names and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility;
 - d. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the Facility for emergency and routine situations; and
 - e. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
 - f. A statement certifying whether the current operations and management manual, spill contingency plan, and SOPs reflect the Facility as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when documents were last reviewed and revised for adequacy, and a statement certifying that operators have received training as required by section IV.D.3.b of the Order.
 - g. **Sludge Handling and Disposal Activity Reporting.** The Permittee shall submit, as part of its annual report to the Regional Water Board, a description of the Permittee’s solids handling, disposal and reuse activities over the previous 12 months. At a minimum, the report shall contain:
 - i. Annual sludge production, in dry tons and percent solids;
 - ii. Sludge monitoring results;

- iii. A schematic diagram showing sludge handling facilities (e.g., digesters, thickeners, drying beds, etc.), if any and a solids flow diagram;
 - iv. Methods of final disposal of sludge:
 - (a) For any portion of sludge discharged to a sanitary landfill, the Permittee shall provide the volume of sludge transported to the landfill, the names and locations of the facilities receiving sludge, the Regional Water Board's WDRs Order number for the regulated landfill, and the landfill classification.
 - (b) For any portion of sludge discharged through land application, the Permittee shall provide the volume of biosolids applied, the date and locations where biosolids were applied, the Regional Water Board's WDRs Order number for the regulated discharge, a demonstration that the discharge was conducted in compliance with applicable permits and regulations, and, if applicable, corrective actions taken or planned to bring the discharge into compliance with WDRs.
 - (c) For any portion of sludge further treated through composting, the Permittee shall provide a summary of the composting process, the volume of sludge composted, and a demonstration and signed certification statement that the composting process and final product met all requirements for Class A biosolids.
 - h. **Biosolids Management Reporting.** Results of internal or external third-party audits of the Biosolids Management System, including reported program deficiencies and recommendations, required corrective actions, and a schedule to complete corrective actions.
 - i. **Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program.** The Permittee shall submit a report documenting activities that were implemented under the Permittee's Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program.
3. **Annual Pretreatment Reporting Requirements.** The Permittee shall submit annually a report to the Regional Water Board, with copies to U.S. EPA Region 9 and the State Water Board, describing the Permittee's pretreatment activities over the previous 12 months. In the event that the Permittee is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this Order, including noncompliance with pretreatment audit/compliance inspection requirements, then the Permittee shall also include the reasons for noncompliance and state how and when the Permittee shall comply with such conditions and requirements.

An annual report shall be submitted by March 1 of the following year, and include at least the following items:

- a. A summary of analytical results from representative, flow proportioned, 24-hour composite sampling of the POTWs influent and effluent for those pollutants U.S. EPA has identified under section 307(a) of the CWA which are known or suspected to be discharged by industrial users.

Sludge shall be sampled during the same 24-hour period and analyzed for the same pollutants as influent and effluent sampling and analysis. The sludge analyzed shall be a composite sample of a minimum of 12 discrete samples taken at equal time intervals over the 24-hour period. Wastewater and sludge sampling and analysis shall be

performed at least annually. The Permittee shall also provide any influent, effluent or sludge monitoring data for nonpriority pollutants which may be causing or contributing to Interference, Pass-Through or adversely impacting sludge quality. Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with the techniques prescribed in 40 C.F.R. part 136 and amendments thereto.

- b.** A discussion of Upset, Interference, or Pass-Through incidents, if any, at the treatment plant, which the Permittee knows or suspects were caused by industrial users of the POTW. The discussion shall include the reasons why the incidents occurred, the corrective actions taken and, if known, the name and address of, the industrial user(s) responsible. The discussion shall also include a review of the applicable pollutant limitations to determine whether any additional limitations, or changes to existing requirements, may be necessary to prevent Pass-Through, Interference, or noncompliance with sludge disposal requirements.
- c.** The cumulative number of industrial users that the Permittee has notified regarding Baseline Monitoring Reports and the cumulative number of industrial user responses.
- d.** An updated list of the Permittee's industrial users including their names and addresses, or a list of deletions and additions keyed to a previously submitted list. The Permittee shall provide a brief explanation for each deletion. The list shall identify the industrial users subject to federal categorical standards by specifying which set(s) of standards are applicable. The list shall indicate which categorical industries, or specific pollutants from each industry, are subject to local limitations that are more stringent than the federal categorical standards. The Permittee shall also list the noncategorical industrial users that are subject only to local discharge limitations. The Permittee shall characterize the compliance status through the year of record of each industrial user by employing the following descriptions:
 - i.** complied with baseline monitoring report requirements (where applicable);
 - ii.** consistently achieved compliance;
 - iii.** inconsistently achieved compliance;
 - iv.** significantly violated applicable pretreatment requirements as defined by 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2)(vii);
 - v.** complied with schedule to achieve compliance (include the date final compliance is required);
 - vi.** did not achieve compliance and not on a compliance schedule; and
 - vii.** compliance status unknown.
- e.** A summary of the inspection and sampling activities conducted by the Permittee during the past year to gather information and data regarding the industrial users. The summary shall include:
 - i.** The names and addresses of the industrial users subjected to surveillance and an explanation of whether they were inspected, sampled, or both and the frequency of these activities at each user; and
 - ii.** The conclusions or results from the inspection or sampling of each industrial user.

- iii. A summary of the compliance and enforcement activities during the past year. The summary shall include the names and addresses of the industrial users affected by the following actions:
 - iv. Warning letters or notices of violation regarding the industrial users' apparent noncompliance with federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations. For each industrial user, identify whether the apparent violation concerned the federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations.
 - v. Administrative orders regarding the industrial users noncompliance with federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations. For each industrial user, identify whether the violation concerned the federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations.
 - vi. Civil actions regarding the industrial users' noncompliance with federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations. For each industrial user, identify whether the violation concerned the federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations.
 - vii. Criminal actions regarding the industrial users' noncompliance with federal categorical standards or local discharge limitations. For each industrial user, identify whether the violation concerned the federal categorical standards or local discharge limits.
 - viii. Assessment of monetary penalties. For each industrial user identify the amount of the penalties.
 - ix. Restriction of flow to the POTW.
 - x. Disconnection from discharge to the POTW.
 - xi. A description of any significant changes in operating the pretreatment program which differ from the information in the Permittee's approved Pretreatment Program including, but not limited to, changes concerning: the program's administrative structure, local industrial discharge limitations, monitoring program or monitoring frequencies, legal authority or enforcement policy, funding mechanisms, resource requirements, or staffing levels.
 - xii. A summary of the annual pretreatment budget, including the cost of pretreatment staff services, equipment purchases, and supplies.
4. **Annual Biosolids Reporting.** The Permittee shall electronically certify and submit an annual biosolids report to U.S. EPA by February 19 of the following year using U.S. EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) Web Site (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>). Information regarding registration and use of U.S. EPA's CDX system is also available at the Web Site.
5. **Annual Volumetric Reporting.** The Permittee shall electronically certify and submit an annual volumetric report, containing monthly data in electronic format, to State Water Board's [GeoTracker system](#) by **April 30** of the following year. Required data shall be submitted to the GeoTracker database under a site-specific global identification number. The Permittee shall report in accordance with each of the items in Section 3 of the Recycled Water Policy as described below:

- a. **Influent.** Monthly volume of wastewater collected and treated by the Facility.
 - b. **Production.** Monthly volume of waster treated, specifying level of treatment.
 - c. **Discharge.** Monthly volume of treated wastewater discharged to each of the following, specifying level of treatment:
 - i. Inland surface waters, specifying volume required to maintain minimum instream flow, if any; and
 - ii. Land, where beneficial use is not taking place, including evaporation or percolation ponds, overland flow, or spray irrigation disposal, excluding pasture or fields with harvested crops.
 - d. **Reuse.**
 - i. Monthly Volume of treated wastewater distributed.
 - ii. Annual volume of treated wastewater distributed for beneficial use in compliance with California Code of Regulations, title 22 in each of the use categories listed below:
 - (a) Agricultural irrigation: pasture or crop irrigation.
 - (b) Landscape irrigation: irrigation of parks, greenbelts, and playgrounds; school yards; athletic fields; cemeteries; residential landscaping, common areas; commercial landscaping; industrial landscaping; and freeway, highway, and street landscaping.
 - (c) Golf course irrigation: irrigation of golf courses, including water used to maintain aesthetic impoundments within golf courses.
 - (d) Commercial application: commercial facilities, business use (such as laundries and office buildings), car washes, retail nurseries, and appurtenant landscaping that is not separately metered.
 - (e) Industrial application: manufacturing facilities, cooling towers, process water, and appurtenant landscaping that is not separately metered.
 - (f) Geothermal energy production: augmentation of geothermal fields.
 - (g) Other non-potable uses: including but not limited to dust control, flushing sewers, fire protection, fill stations, snow making, and recreational impoundments.
6. **Discharge Season Annual Report.** By July 1 of each year, the Permittee shall submit an annual report to the Regional Water Board for the prior discharge season through the CIWQS Program Web site and certify the report as required by Standard Provisions of this Order (Attachment D, section V.B). In the event that an alternate method for submittal of the annual report is required, the Permittee shall submit the report electronically via the email address in section X.B.6.c., above. The report shall, at a minimum, include the following:
- a. **Discharge Management Reporting.** The Permittee shall submit a report documenting that storage and discharges were managed pursuant to the most current Regional Water Board Executive Officer approved Discharge Management Plan to demonstrate that the Permittee maximized reclamation and minimized discharges to surface waters.

- b. Phosphorus Effluent Limitation Compliance Reporting.** The Permittee shall submit a report documenting compliance with phosphorus effluent limitations as follows:
- i.** If the Permittee opts to utilize the Laguna WQTF identified in section VII.O.1 of the Order, as a means of compliance, the annual reports must include sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the water quality credits used were appropriately certified under the Laguna WQTF and were sufficient to meet effluent limitations. In addition, the Permittee must include total gallons discharged, phosphorous concentration, discharge location, and days of discharge. All phosphorus discharged and any credits generated used shall be tracked in the WQTF Accounting Ledger which is available on the Regional Water Board's Nutrient Offset Program Website https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/nutrient_offset_program/.
 - ii.** If the Permittee opts to utilize the ACO identified in section VII.O.2 of the Order, as a means of compliance, the annual reports must show compliance with all compliance dates in Order section VII.O.2, the submitted ACO Workplan, and all deadlines specified therein. In addition, the Permittee must include total gallons discharged, phosphorous concentration, discharge location, and days of discharge. All phosphorus discharged and any credits generated used shall be tracked in the WQTF Accounting Ledger which is available on the Regional Water Board's Nutrient Offset Program Website noted in 6.b, immediately above.

E. Spill and Unauthorized Discharge Notification

- 1. Spills and Unauthorized Discharges.** Information regarding all spills and unauthorized discharges (except SSOs) that may endanger health or the environment shall be provided orally to the Regional Water Board⁶ within 24 hours from the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances and a written report shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances, in accordance with section V.E of Attachment D.

Information to be provided verbally to the Regional Water Board includes:

- a.** Name and contact information of caller;
- b.** Date, time, and location of spill occurrence;
- c.** Estimates of spill or unauthorized discharge volume, rate of flow, and spill duration, if available and reasonably accurate;
- d.** Surface water bodies impacted, if any;
- e.** Cause of spill or unauthorized discharge, if known at the time of the notification;
- f.** Cleanup actions taken or repairs made at the time of the notification;

⁶ The contact number of the Regional Water Board during normal business hours is (707) 576-2220. After normal business hours, spill reporting to the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services Warning Center (CalOES) will satisfy the 24 hour spill reporting requirement for the Regional Water Board. The contact number for spill reporting for the CalOES is (800) 852-7550.

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Contents

I. Permit Information..... F-3

II. Facility Description..... F-4

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls F-4

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters..... F-6

C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data F-8

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 the CWA section 303(d) List F-16

E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations F-18

IV. Rationale for Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications F-20

A. Discharge Prohibitions F-20

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-24

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)..... F-26

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations F-61

E. Interim Effluent Limitations..... F-63

F. Land Discharge Specifications and Requirements – Not Applicable..... F-63

G. Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements F-63

H. Other Requirements F-66

I. Compliance Determination for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations for Total Phosphorus (Compliance Determination Section VII.O)..... F-68

V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations..... F-72

A. Surface Water F-72

B. Groundwater..... F-73

VI. Rationale for Provisions F-73

A. Standard Provisions..... F-73

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements..... F-74

C. Special Provisions..... F-74

VII. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements..... F-81

A. Influent Monitoring..... F-81

B. Effluent Monitoring..... F-82

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements F-85

D. Recycled Water Monitoring Requirements (EFF-001) F-85

E. Receiving Water Monitoring F-86

F. Other Monitoring Requirements F-88

VIII. Public Participation..... F-89

A. Notification of Interested Parties F-90

B. Written Comments F-90

C. Public Hearing..... F-90

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions F-90

E. Information and Copying..... F-91
 F. Register of Interested Persons..... F-91
 G. Additional Information..... F-91

Tables

Table F-1. Facility Information F-3
Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Points 006A(1), 006B and 012B..... F-8
Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Points 006A(1) and 006B..... F-10
Table F-4. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Point 012B..... F-10
Table F-5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses F-13
Table F-6. U.S. EPA Recommended Biostimulatory Substance Criteria F-34
Table F-7. California Recommended Biostimulatory Substance Criteria¹ F-34
Table F-8. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B..... F-42
Table F-9. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Point 012A(1)..... F-44
Table F-10. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B..... F-45
Table F-11. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 F-47
Table F-12. Determination of Long Term Averages F-54
Table F-13. Determination of Final WQBELs Based on Human Health Criteria..... F-55
Table F-14. Summary of Chronic Toxicity Results at Monitoring Location EFF-006B..... F-57
Table F-15. Summary of Chronic Toxicity Results at Monitoring Location EFF-012B..... F-57
Table F-16: Total Mass of Phosphorus Discharged per Discharge Season..... F-71
Table F-17. Summary of Activities to Support the Use of Recycled Water and Protection of Groundwater F-77
Attachment F-1 – City of Santa Rosa RPA Summary F-92

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in Order section I, the Regional Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Regional 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 Permittee. Sections or subsections of this Order not specifically identified as “not applicable” are fully applicable to this Permittee.

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	1B830990SON
Permittee	City of Santa Rosa
Name of Facility	Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System, Laguna Treatment Plant
Facility Address	4300 Llano Road
	Santa Rosa, CA 95407
	Sonoma County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Jennifer Burke, Director of Santa Rosa Water, (707) 543-3838
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Jennifer Burke, Director of Santa Rosa Water, (707) 543-3838
Mailing Address	69 Stony Circle, Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Billing Address	Same as Mailing Address
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
Major or Minor Facility	Major
Threat to Water Quality	1
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	Yes
Recycling Requirements	Producer
Facility Permitted Flow	25.9 million gallons per day (mgd) (average dry weather flow)
Facility Design Flow	21.34 mgd (average dry weather design flow)
	64 mgd (peak wet weather design flow)
	47.3 mgd (peak monthly wet weather design flow)
Watershed	Russian River Hydrologic Unit, Guerneville Hydrologic Subarea
Receiving Water	Santa Rosa Creek, unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and the Laguna de Santa Rosa
Receiving Water Type	Inland surface water

- A. The City of Santa Rosa (hereinafter Permittee) is the owner and operator of the Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System, Laguna Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a POTW.

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 Permittee herein.

The Permittee is authorized to discharge subject to waste discharge requirements (WDRs) in this Order at the discharge and distribution locations described in Tables 2 and 3 on the cover page of this Order. The Code of Federal Regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.46 limits the duration of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to be effective for a fixed term not to exceed five years. Accordingly, Table 4 of this Order limits the effective period for the discharge authorized by this Order. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 23, section 2235.4, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending issuance of a new permit if all requirements of the federal NPDES regulations on continuation of expired permits are complied with.

- B.** The Facility discharges advanced treated wastewater to Santa Rosa Creek, an unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and the Laguna de Santa Rosa, all of which are tributary to the Russian River, and all of which are waters of the United States. The Permittee was previously regulated by Order No. R1-2013-0001 and NPDES Permit No. CA0022764 adopted on November 21, 2013 with an expiration date of January 31, 2019. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C-1 provides a flow schematic of the Facility and Attachment C-2 provides a flow schematic of the reclamation system. A site visit was conducted on September 27, 2018 to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.
- C.** The Permittee filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its WDRs and NPDES permit on August 3, 2018. The ROWD was deemed incomplete and additional information was requested on September 25, 2018. Supplemental information was submitted by the Permittee on November 15, 2018 and December 16, 2019. The application was deemed complete on December 16, 2019.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Permittee owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facility and provides sewerage service to a population of approximately 237,800 residential, commercial, and institutional customers. The Permittee provides wastewater treatment and disposal services for residences, businesses, and industries within the Santa Rosa area and provides service to the cities of Cotati, Rohnert Park, Sebastopol, and South Park County Sanitation District, an unincorporated area of Sonoma County. The Facility accepts wastewater, septic waste, landfill leachate, and high strength wastes (primarily grease and food production wastes) from the surrounding communities.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

1. Collection System

The Permittee's collection system consists of 582 miles of gravity sewers ranging in size from 4 to 66 inches, 6.3 miles of pressure sewers, and 17 pumping stations. In addition to the wastewater collection system owned and operated by the Permittee, satellite wastewater collection systems individually owned, operated, and maintained by the cities of Cotati, Rohnert Park, and Sebastopol convey wastewater from those communities to the Facility. The Permittee also accepts hauled wastes, including domestic septage, chemical toilet waste, grease trap waste, non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste, groundwater, grey water, and landfill leachate, in accordance with its established Trucked Waste Management Plan. The trucked waste program has been growing steadily since 2015, coinciding with the commissioning and start-up of a High Strength Waste (HSW) receiving station at the Facility.

2. Wastewater Treatment Facility

The Facility is designed to treat an average dry weather flow of 21.3 mgd, a peak weekly wet weather flow of 64 mgd, and a peak monthly wet weather flow of 47.3 mgd of advanced treated wastewater. The treatment system consists of grit removal in aerated grit chambers, sludge and scum removal in primary sedimentation tanks, biological secondary treatment (activated sludge) with alum coagulation, flocculation, and clarification followed by tertiary filtration and ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection.

Advanced treated effluent is discharged to an effluent storage pond system prior to discharge to the water reclamation system or the surface water discharge system. The pond system consists of Brown Pond; Meadow Lane Ponds A, B, C, and D; and Delta Pond. The combined maximum capacity of the existing storage ponds is 1,650 million gallons. The storage ponds allow the Permittee to control the timing, location, and volume of discharge to protect beneficial uses of the receiving water and provide a source of recycled water during the discharge prohibition period.

From October 1 through May 14, treated wastewater is permitted to be discharged through Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), and 006B to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, to Discharge Point 015 to an unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and to Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B to Santa Rosa Creek. The Facility has a distribution trunk line which allows effluent to either be directly discharged, mixed with Delta Pond storage water, or stored in the Delta Pond. Source water for Discharge Points 006A(1) and 012A(1) comes directly from Discharge Point 015, while source water for Discharge Points 006A(2) and 012A(2) comes from Meadow Lane and Delta Ponds, respectively. Therefore, wastewater characteristics for Discharge Points 012A(1) and 012A(2) will differ as will discharge characteristics for Discharge Points 006A(1) and 006A(2). These differences have resulted in separate analyses with respect to determining reasonable potential, as described in this Fact Sheet.

To minimize and mitigate discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, the Permittee's Discharge Management Plan states that discharges will preferentially occur at Discharge Point 012B, where a multi-port diffuser extending 37 feet from the 48-inch outfall in Santa Rosa Creek is installed. The other identified discharge points are used, only as necessary to maintain operational flexibility. Year round, the Permittee distributes a portion of advanced treated wastewater to the Geysers Recharge project at Distribution Point 001 for recharge of the steam fields to enhance steam production for electrical energy generation. Recycled water is also distributed via Distribution Point 002 for agricultural and urban irrigation use.

The Permittee recycles approximately 6.6 billion gallons of wastewater each year. During dry to normal water years, nearly 100 percent of the advanced treated effluent is beneficially used as recycled water. Approximately two-thirds of the recycled water is sent to recharge the Geysers steam fields to produce renewable green energy for the region; the other one-third is used for urban and agricultural irrigation on approximately 6,400 acres of farm, vineyards, urban landscaping, including parks and golf courses in both Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park.

Sonoma Water's Airport Larkfield Wikiup Sanitation Zone (ALWSZ) occasionally transfers recycled water to the Permittee's system upon approval from the Permittee. This water is used to meet recycled water demands north of Delta Pond. The water from ALWSZ is not stored in recycled water ponds from which discharge occurs and is used for irrigation only.

3. Biosolids Management

Biosolids generated during the treatment process are thickened, anaerobically digested, dewatered using belt filters and polymer addition, and beneficially used as soil amendment on City-owned property as well as privately owned property. All land application sites are properly permitted under the statewide general order for land application of biosolids.

As part of its Permittee's Biosolids Management System, the Permittee also produces Class A compost during the winter and spring months when land application cannot take place due to wet weather conditions.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located within the Guerneville Hydrologic Subarea of the Russian River Hydrologic Unit.
2. Advanced treated wastewater is discharged from the storage pond system to Santa Rosa Creek, an unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and the Laguna de Santa Rosa, waters of the United States, all tributary to the Russian River, during the allowed discharge period from October 1 to May 14. The rate of discharge is governed by flow conditions in the Russian River monitored at Hacienda Bridge and is limited to five percent of the flow of the Russian River, as provided by the Basin Plan, where exceptions to the Basin Plan's one percent flow limitation are allowed provided that the Permittee meets conditions described in the Basin Plan (Section 4 Implementation Plans, North Coastal Basin). Descriptions of the surface water discharges are provided in a. through g. below.

- a. **Discharge Point 006A(1).** The discharge at Discharge Point 006A(1) is wastewater that is discharged directly to the Laguna de Santa Rosa via the distribution trunk line. The appropriate discharge flow to avoid exceeding receiving water quality limitations is calculated manually using upstream and effluent water quality and receiving water flow data obtained from data sondes. In the previous permit, the upstream receiving water monitoring location, RSW-006AU, was located in the Laguna de Santa Rosa, 50 to 100 feet upstream of Discharge Point 006A.

For this Order, the Permittee has requested that there be a single upstream receiving water location for all discharge points to the Laguna de Santa Rosa (Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, and 015). The new upstream monitoring location, RSW-LSP, is in the Laguna de Santa Rosa at the Stony Point Road Bridge and replaces former Monitoring Locations RSW-006AU, and RSW-006BU-L. RSW-LSP is approximately 2 miles upstream of the four discharge points to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. This new monitoring location provides safer access for collecting receiving water samples under all weather conditions than the previous receiving water monitoring locations (RSW-006AU, RSW-006BU-L, and RSW-015) that it replaces.

- b. **Discharge Point 006A(2).** The discharge at Discharge Point 006A is from the southeast corner of Meadow Lane Pond D, through a pipe into a square concrete flume that empties directly into the ordinary high water mark of the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The appropriate discharge flow to avoid exceeding receiving water quality limitations is calculated manually using upstream and pond effluent water quality and receiving water flow data obtained from data sondes. As discussed in section II.B.2.a, immediately above, the formerly used upstream receiving water location RSW-006BU-L, which was 50 to 100 feet upstream of Discharge Point 006A will be replaced with the new upstream receiving water monitoring location, Monitoring Location RSW-LSP.

- c. Discharge Point 006B.** The discharge at Discharge Point 006B is through a 36-inch pipe located at the northwest corner of the Meadow Lane Pond D. Treated effluent is discharged from the storage pond into a rip-rap and concrete lined trapezoidal flume/ditch that empties into the ordinary high water mark of the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The appropriate discharge flow to avoid exceeding receiving water quality limitations is calculated manually using upstream and pond recycled water quality and receiving water flow data obtained from data sondes. Upstream conditions in Colgan Creek are measured in Colgan Creek, upstream of the confluence with the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-C. As discussed in section II.B.2.a, immediately above, the formerly used upstream receiving water location RSW-006BU-L, which was approximately 1,500 feet upstream of Discharge Point 006B in the Laguna de Santa Rosa will be replaced with the new upstream receiving water monitoring location, Monitoring Location RSW-LSP.
- d. Discharge Point 012A(1).** The discharge at Discharge Point 012A(1) is wastewater that is discharged directly to Santa Rosa Creek via the distribution trunk line. Based on discussions with Facility representatives during a September 2018 site visit, Discharge Point 012A(1) has not been used for many years, its condition is currently unknown, and it would require assessment and rehabilitation before discharges would be authorized at this location.
- e. Discharge Point 012A(2).** The discharge at Discharge Point 012A(2) is from the blending valve on the 24-inch pipeline located mid-way along the north side of Delta Pond to the ordinary high water mark of Santa Rosa Creek. Historically, the blending vault received water from three potential sources: the distribution trunk line, Delta Pond, and West College Pond system. The blending valves were constructed along with the Delta Pond in 1983. During this time period, the West College wastewater treatment plant was operational during wet weather events. The effluent from the West College plant was of lower quality than that of the Laguna Treatment Plant and plans were to blend the lower quality West College effluent with either stored water from Delta Pond or treated wastewater pumped directly from the Laguna Treatment Plant. The West College plant has not been utilized since the 1988 upgrades to the Laguna Treatment Plant. During the past 30 years the 012A discharge has only been used as an alternate Delta Pond discharge point and the last time it was used was over 15 years ago. The current configuration allows water to be pumped directly from the Facility to Discharge Point 012A(1), or to discharge Delta Pond water at Discharge Point 012A(2). Based on discussion with Facility representatives during a September 2018 site visit, the condition of Discharge Point 012A(2) is currently unknown, and it would require assessment and rehabilitation before discharges would be authorized at this location.
- f. Discharge Point 012B.** The discharge at Discharge Point 012B is Delta Pond water discharged via a 48-inch discharge pipe fitted with a 37-foot, multiport diffuser directly to the confluence of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek. Discharges from this Discharge Point are automated through a Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) system installed at Delta Pond. The PLC system allows near real-time calculation of compliant discharge flow rates based on receiving water flow and water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH and turbidity) compared to Delta Pond water quality. Valves are automatically adjusted to control the discharge to avoid exceeding limitations. Upstream receiving water is monitored in Santa Rosa Creek, approximately

75 feet upstream of the effluent discharge point. Discharge from Delta Pond will preferentially occur via Discharge Point 012B.

- g. **Discharge Point 015.** Effluent from Discharge Point 015 is discharged directly from the Facility via a gate in the effluent vault to a tiled outfall. The outfall is 11-feet across at the weir and tapers down to a 6-foot channel. Flow in the channel is transported approximately 130 feet where it discharges into the Laguna de Santa Rosa upstream of the Meadow Lane Pond discharge locations. The appropriate discharge flow to avoid exceeding receiving water quality limits is calculated manually using upstream and recycled water quality and receiving water flow data obtained from data sondes. As discussed in section II.B.2.a, above, the formerly used upstream receiving water location RSW-015U, which was approximately 100 feet upstream of the Llano Road bridge will be replaced with the new upstream receiving water monitoring location, Monitoring Location RSW-LSP.
3. During the dry weather season (May 15 to September 30), and other periods as allowed under this Order, tertiary treated recycled water from effluent storage is distributed for irrigation on authorized use sites, generally referred to as Distribution Point 002. The Permittee also provides recycled water to the Geysers Recharge Project year-round for the use of the current owner of the Geysers, Calpine Corporation, for recharge of steam fields used to generate electricity. The location for recycled water transferred to The Geysers Recharge Project is referred to as Distribution Point 001.

The Permittee and the City of Rohnert Park have obtained coverage separately under State Water Board Order No. WQ 2016-0068-DDW, Water Reclamation Requirements for Recycled Water Use (Recycled Water General Order) to regulate recycled water distribution and use.

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

The Facility discharged at three outfalls, Discharge Points 006A(1), 006B, and 012B during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Discharge Point 006A(1) was rediscovered by Permittee staff during the 2019/2020 discharge season but is similar to Discharge Point 015 because it is a direct discharge from the treatment plant to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and is a short distance downstream from Discharge Point 015. Both Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 are represented by effluent data collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001.

Effluent limitations contained in Order No. R1-2013-0001 for discharges from Discharge Points 006A(1) (Monitoring Location EFF-001), 006B (Monitoring Location EFF-006B) and Discharge Point 012B (Monitoring Location EFF-012B) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Points 006A(1), 006B and 012B

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (February 2014 – May 2019)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C (BOD ₅) ¹	mg/L	10	15	--	4.2	6.3	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	98.8 ²	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (February 2014 – May 2019)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) ¹	mg/L	10	15	--	2.9	9.9	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	99.2 ²	--	--
Phosphorus, Total (as P) ³	mg/L	--	--	4	--	--	5
Total Coliform Organisms ¹	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 ⁶	23 ⁷ /240 ⁸	--	7.9 ^{6,9}	920 ¹⁰

Table Notes:

1. As measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
2. Represents the minimum observed percent removal.
3. Represents the net loading of phosphorus discharged to the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed from all Discharge Points.
4. There shall be no net loading of total phosphorus to the water bodies of the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed.
5. In the 2018 Total Phosphorus Effluent Limitation Report, the Permittee reported a net reduction of total phosphorus through offset projects in the previous three discharge seasons (i.e., 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018). In the 2019 Total Phosphorus Effluent Limitation Report, the Permittee reported a net reduction of total phosphorus through offset projects in the previous three discharge seasons (i.e., 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019).
6. Expressed as a 7-day median.
7. The number of coliform bacteria shall not exceed an MPN of 23 per 100 mL in more than one sample in any 30-day period.
8. No sample shall exceed an MPN of 240 coliform bacteria per 100 mL.
9. The Permittee sampled total coliform daily from February 2014 through April 2020. There were 181 violations of the 7-day median total coliform effluent limitation. The effluent was compliant with the 7-day median coliform limitation for all periods of discharge to surface waters and during the months preceding discharges from storage (Discharge Points 006B and 012B) except for April 2017 when the 7-day median of 2.2 MPN/100 mL was exceeded three times with results of 2.8, 2.8, and 2.9 MPN/100 mL on April 7 through 9, 2017.
10. The effluent compliant was compliant with the maximum total coliform limitation for all periods of direct discharge (Discharge Point 006A(1)) and during the months preceding discharges from storage (Discharge Points 006B and 012B), except for April 2017 when the total coliform maximum of 23 MPN/100 mL not to be exceeded more than once in any 30 day period was exceeded twice with results of 33 and 49 MPN/100 mL on April 3 and 6, 2017, respectively.

Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Points 006A(1) and 006B

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (February 2014 – May 2019)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge ⁶	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge ⁶
pH	standard units	--	--	6.5 – 8.5 ¹	--	--	6.5 – 7.7 7.4 – 8.1
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.40	--	1.0	1.24/ <0.05	--	1.24/ <0.05
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.3	7.12/0.33	--	7.12/0.33
Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	10.6	--	--	10.5 ²	--	--
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	70 ³ /90 ⁴	--	--	100 ⁵	--	--

Table Notes:

1. Represents instantaneous minimum and instantaneous maximum effluent limitations.
2. The sum of nitrate and nitrite results and total organic nitrogen results when available.
3. Minimum for one bioassay.
4. Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays.
5. Represents the minimum observed percent survival.
6. Where two sets of values are listed, the first represents Discharge Point 006A(1) (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and the second represents Discharge Point 012B (Monitoring Location EFF-012B).

Table F-4. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Point 012B

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (February 2014 – May 2019)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
pH	standard units	--	--	6.5 – 8.5 ¹	--	--	7.3 – 8.0
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.40	--	1.0	<0.05	--	<0.05
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.3	0.2	--	0.2
Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	10.6	--	--	9.1 ²	--	--
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	70 ³ /90 ⁴	--	--	100 ⁵	--	--

Table Notes:

1. Represents instantaneous minimum and instantaneous maximum effluent limitations.
2. The sum of nitrate and nitrite results and total organic nitrogen results when available.
3. Minimum for one bioassay.
4. Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays.
5. Represents the minimum observed percent survival.

D. Compliance Summary

On March 24, 2014, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Complaint No. R1-2014-0024 for one partial filtration and/or disinfection violation during discharges to the recycling facilities and two discharge violations that resulted in sediment laden recycled water and/or recycled water discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and other tributaries that are tributary to the Russian River and waters of the United States under Order No. R1-2006-0045. The ACL Complaint assessed a penalty of \$74,776 for these violations. On March 10, 2015, the Assistant Executive Officer issued a Settlement Agreement and Stipulation for Entry of ACL Order No. R1-2014-0052, which assessed \$74,776 in total penalties. The Permittee agreed to pay \$37,388 within 30 days of the issuance of Settlement Agreement and Stipulation for Entry of ACL Order No. R1-2014-0052 which was paid to the State Water Board Cleanup and Abatement Account on April 23, 2015 and the remaining \$37,388 was suspended pending completion of a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP). The SEP involved construction of exclusionary fencing to reduce pollutants at three creek crossings in the Santa Rosa area. This project was completed in October 2015.

On February 1, 2016, the Executive Officer issued Acceptance of Conditional Resolution and Waiver of Right to Hearing (Acceptance and Waiver) Order No. R1-2015-0067 for seven violations of effluent limitations for total coliform organisms in Order No. R1-2013-0001. Exhibit A to the Acceptance and Waiver Order served as an ACL Order pursuant to Article 2.5 of the Water Code so that no separate ACL Complaint was required. The Acceptance and Waiver assessed an Expedited Payment Amount of \$12,000 for these violations that the Permittee paid to the State Water Board Cleanup and Abatement Account on March 3, 2016.

E. Planned Changes

The Permittee anticipates completing numerous projects during the upcoming permit term. The Permittee plans to construct an on-site diversion system to allow non-compliant effluent from the UV system to be diverted to a dedicated storage pond and replace the outdated UV disinfection system with new UV disinfection system. This Order includes a compliance schedule for completion of the UV disinfection system due to the fact that this upgrade is critical to ensuring consistent compliance with total coliform effluent limitations for the use of recycled water that is necessary for the protection of public health. Additional projects include completing phase two of the primary treatment super-structure upgrade project, replacing the primary influent pump drives, design of a flood wall at the treatment plant, making repairs to the roofs of digesters one and two, replacing the waste gas flare, rehabilitating digesters three and four, replacing the emergency generator fuel tank, completing phase two of the refurbishment of the filter valves and actuators, evaluating and seismically retrofitting the chemical building, upgrading the recycled water distribution system to fill Delta Pond from the Geysers pipeline, improving the Delta Pond diffuser, and completing slope protection on the levees of Meadow Lane Ponds C and D, and Delta Pond.

The Facility currently has design treatment capacities of 21.34 mgd (average dry weather flow), 64 mgd (peak weekly wet weather flow), and 47.3 mgd (peak monthly wet weather flow). Order No. R1-2013-0001 includes a discussion of future plant expansion, disposal, and reuse projects that could lead to increased flows from the Facility. These projects include the Laguna Plant Upgrade Project, Geysers Expansion Project, the Santa Rosa Urban Reuse Project, and the Discharge Compliance Project. The Permittee anticipates that increased flows would be for recycling and reuse, and would, therefore, not increase discharge volumes to surface waters above currently permitted levels. The Permittee has identified portions of the Incremental

Recycled Water Program Master Plan (August 2007) and the Discharge Compliance Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (December 2008) that demonstrate that permitting wastewater flows to the Facility above 21.3 mgd (average dry weather flow) up to 25.9 mgd would not result in discharges to surface waters above the currently permitted level. As a condition of acceptance by the Regional Water Board of the higher permitted average dry weather flow, the Permittee is required to submit to the Regional Water Board, an engineering report demonstrating that treatment and/or total water recycling capacity has been added to the Facility that would allow the Facility to accept wastewater flows above the current design treatment capacity without increasing discharge flows to surface water.

In the supplemental material provided with the ROWD, the Permittee evaluated the 5-year projected flow increase against the current system capacity and concluded that expansion during the permit term would not be necessary and is therefore not planned.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authorities

This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit authorizing the Permittee to discharge into waters of the U.S. at the discharge locations described in Table 2 subject to the WDRs in this Order. This Order also serves as WDRs pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of division 13 of the Public Resources Code. Accordingly, this exemption from CEQA applies to the Regional Water Board's action to adopt those portions of the Order that regulate NPDES discharges.

This action also involves the re-issuance of WDRs for an existing Facility that discharges treated wastewater to land. The Regional Water Board's action in approving those parts of the Order that regulate WDR-related discharges is also exempt from CEQA as an existing Facility for which no expansion of design flow is being permitted at the time of the lead agency's determination pursuant to title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 15301.

This CEQA exemption does not apply to those portions of the Order that regulate non-NPDES discharges, or projects that may be approved under the WQTF Option or ACO Option to comply with the "No Net Loading" Phosphorus effluent limitation.

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

- 1. Water Quality Control Plan.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region* (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water 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.

In 1972, the State Water Board adopted a uniform list of beneficial uses, including descriptions, to be applied throughout all basins of the State. This list was updated in 1996. In addition to the beneficial uses identified on the statewide list, three wetland beneficial uses, recognizing the value of protecting these unique waterbodies have been identified in the North Coast Region: Wetland Habitat (WET); Water Quality Enhancement (WQE); and Flood Peak Attenuation/ Flood Water Storage (FLD). The Native American Cultural (CUL) use and Subsistence Fishing (FISH) use have also been added, identifying the traditional and cultural uses of waters within the North Coast Region.

There is evidence to conclude that the following are beneficial uses of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek:

- a. **Wetland Habitat (WET) and Water Quality Enhancement (WQE).** The Laguna de Santa Rosa is described by the Laguna Foundation as the “largest freshwater wetlands complex on the northern California coast...draining a 254-square-mile watershed which encompasses nearly the entire Santa Rosa Plain.” It further describes the Laguna de Santa Rosa as “a unique ecological system covering more than 30,000 acres; a mosaic of creeks, open water, perennial marshes, seasonal wetlands, riparian forests, oak woodlands, and grassland.” In addition, the Laguna de Santa Rosa Wetland Complex was designated by the Ramsar Convention in 2011 as a Wetland of International Significance because of the ecosystem services the Laguna de Santa Rosa provides.
- b. **Flood Peak Attenuation/Flood Water Storage (FLD).** According to the Sonoma County’s Hazard Migration Plan (adopted in 2011), the Laguna de Santa Rosa acts as a “huge reservoir, storing up to 80,000 acre-feet of water.” Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and other publicly available maps clearly identify the Laguna floodplain, which extend from the City of Cotati in the south to the Town of Windsor to the north and includes portions of Santa Rosa Creek. Flood control is also provided by Santa Rosa Creek; a primary function of Spring Lake and Lake Ralphine, located off Santa Rosa Creek, is to provide downstream flow and volume attenuation through storage of flood flows generated in the Santa Rosa Creek watershed.
- c. **Subsistence Fishing (FISH).** Fishing is a historic and existing use of the Laguna de Santa Rosa. In addition to sport fishing, it is logical to assume that fish caught in the Laguna de Santa Rosa is consumed to supplement the diet of local and transient residents.

Beneficial uses applicable to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Creek, and the unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, within the Laguna and Santa Rosa Hydrologic Subareas of the Middle Russian River Hydrologic Area, are summarized in Table F-4, below:

Table F-5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 015	Laguna de Santa Rosa within the Laguna Hydrologic Subarea of the	<u>Existing:</u> Agricultural supply (AGR); Industrial service supply (IND);

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
	Middle Russian River Hydrologic Area	Groundwater recharge (GWR); Freshwater replenishment (FRSH); Navigation (NAV); Hydropower generation (POW); Water contact recreation (REC-1); Non-contact water recreation (REC-2); Commercial and sport fishing (COMM); Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM); Cold freshwater habitat (COLD); Wildlife habitat (WILD); Rare, threatened, or endangered species (RARE); Migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); Spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); Water Quality Enhancement (WQE); Wetland Habitat (WET); Flood Attenuation (FLD); and Subsistence Fishing (FISH). <u>Potential:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Industrial process supply (PRO); Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL), and Aquaculture (AQUA).
012A(1), 012A(2), 012B	Santa Rosa Creek within the Santa Rosa Hydrologic Subarea of the Middle Russian River Hydrologic Area	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Agricultural supply (AGR); Industrial service supply (IND); Groundwater recharge (GWR); Navigation (NAV); Water contact recreation (REC-1); Non-contact water recreation (REC-2); Commercial and sport fishing (COMM); Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM); Cold freshwater habitat (COLD); Wildlife habitat (WILD); Rare, threatened, or endangered species (RARE); Migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); Spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); and Flood Attenuation (FLD). <u>Potential:</u> Industrial process supply (PRO); Hydropower generation (POW); Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL), and Aquaculture (AQUA).

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
--	Groundwater	<p><u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Agricultural supply (AGR); Industrial service supply (IND); and Native American Culture (CUL).</p> <p><u>Potential</u> Industrial Process Supply (PRO); and Aquaculture (AQUA).</p>

In addition to the beneficial uses set out in the Basin Plan, there are several implementation plans that include actions intended to meet water quality objectives and protect beneficial uses of the North Coast Basin. For the Russian River and its tributaries, no point source waste discharges are allowed during the period of May 15 through September 30 and for all other periods, the receiving stream’s flow must be at least 100 times greater than the waste flow unless an exception to the requirements is granted by the Regional Water Board. Additionally, the discharge of municipal waste during October 1 through May 14 shall be of advanced treated wastewater and shall meet a median coliform level of 2.2 MPN/100 mL.

Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, and later amended it on May 4, 1995 and November 9, 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On May 18, 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on February 13, 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
3. **State Implementation Policy.** On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005, that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) implemented by the Basin Plan that are designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
5. **Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** The State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2008-0025 on April 15, 2008, titled *Policy for Compliance Schedules in*

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits, which includes compliance schedule policies for pollutants that are not addressed by the SIP. This Policy became effective on August 27, 2008.

This Order does not include a compliance schedule and interim effluent limitations.

6. **Antidegradation Policy.** 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. As discussed in detail in section IV.D.2 of this Fact Sheet, the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.
7. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed. Some effluent limitations from the previous Order have been removed or are less stringent than those in the previous Order. As discussed in detail in section IV.D.1 of this Fact Sheet, removal or relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.
8. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize an act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A sections 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Permittee is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

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

Section 303(d) of the federal CWA requires states to identify waterbodies that do not meet water quality standards and are not supporting their beneficial uses after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources. Each state must submit an updated list, the 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies every two years. In addition to identifying the waterbodies that are not supporting beneficial uses, the 303(d) list also identifies the pollutant or stressor causing impairment and establishes a schedule for developing a control plan to address the impairment. The CWA requires development of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) or alternate program of implementation for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body to remedy the impairment. TMDLs establish the maximum quantity of a given pollutant that can be added to a water body from all sources without exceeding the applicable water quality standard for that pollutant and determine wasteload allocations (the portion of a TMDL allocated to existing and future point sources) and load allocations (the portion of a TMDL attributed to existing and future nonpoint sources).

On April 6, 2018, the U.S. EPA provided final approval of the 2014 and 2016 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies prepared by the state. The list identifies the entire Russian River watershed, including the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Creek, and Mark West Creek hydrologic subareas as impaired by sedimentation/siltation and temperature. In addition, Santa Rosa Creek, the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and portions of the Lower Russian River are identified as impaired by pathogenic indicator bacteria, and the Laguna de Santa Rosa is identified as impaired by low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, and mercury. Pursuant to CWA section 303(d), the Regional Water Board will develop TMDLs to address the impairment for sediment, temperature, nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and mercury which will be implemented through various programs, including through provisions of NPDES permits.

On August 14, 2019, the Regional Water Board adopted the Action Plan for the Russian River Watershed Pathogen TMDL (TMDL Action Plan or Action Plan) and Prohibition of the Discharge of Fecal Waste Materials as an amendment to the Basin Plan. The Action Plan describes the Program of Implementation designed to control fecal waste pollution, achieve bacterial water quality objectives, and restore the water contact recreation (REC-1) beneficial use to protect public health within the Russian River watershed. The Action Plan establishes wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point source discharges and load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint source discharges. Both WLAs and LAs are expressed as receiving water concentrations of *E. coli* bacteria in freshwater and enterococci in saline waters identical to the statewide bacteria objective for the protection of REC-1 for those sources that are permitted to discharge. For municipal wastewater discharges to freshwater surface waters within the Russian River Watershed, the *E. coli* bacteria WLAs are less than or equal to 100 colony forming units (CFU) per 100 milliliters (mL) as a six-week rolling geometric mean, calculated weekly, and a statistical threshold value (STV) of 320 cfu/ mL not to be exceeded more than ten percent of the time, calculated monthly. There are no municipal wastewater discharges to saline water in the Russian River Watershed, so therefore there are no applicable WLAs for enterococci bacteria.

For direct discharges from the Facility to surface waters, the total coliform effluent limitations derived from title 22 requirements for disinfected tertiary recycled water are sufficient to ensure compliance with WLAs for *E. coli* bacteria because the title 22 total coliform limitations are more stringent than the applicable *E. coli* bacteria water quality objectives.

The TMDL Action Plan further identifies wastewater holding pond discharges to surface waters as a special area of concern due to the potential for regrowth of bacteria in these ponds. The Action Plan states that the Regional Water Board will begin to conduct reasonable potential analyses based on information submitted by the implementing party for entities that discharge wastewater from wastewater holding ponds to surface water. For discharges with reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the WLAs, water quality-based effluent limitations will be established in the applicable waste discharge requirements that will ensure compliance with WLAs for bacteria. This Order requires the Permittee to monitor for *E. coli* bacteria for discharges from storage ponds to surface waters and to conduct a Pathogen Special Study in order to develop data needed to assess whether or not the Permittee's discharge is a source of pathogens as defined in the TMDL Action Plan. If there is reasonable potential for pond discharges to exceed the *E. coli* bacteria water quality objectives, a pathogen source study is required to determine if bacteria discharged from the storage ponds is of human origin and, if so, effluent limitations would be established in the next permit.

Regional Water Board staff is currently developing TMDLs for phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and sediment for the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed to address legacy

and continuing water quality impairments. Development of a mercury TMDL for the Laguna de Santa Rosa is not yet scheduled.

Aspects of the sediment impairing the Russian River watershed include settleable solids, suspended solids, and turbidity. The impact of settleable solids results when they collect on the bottom of a waterbody over time, making them a persistent or accumulative constituent. The impact of suspended solids and turbidity, by contrast, results from their concentration in the water column. An analysis of the Permittee's effluent monitoring data for discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek indicates levels of BOD₅, TSS, and total coliform bacteria in the effluent are generally less than the effluent limitations required by this Order. Thus, the discharge does not typically contain sediment (e.g., settleable solids, suspended solids, and turbidity) at levels which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to increases in sediment levels in the Russian River watershed. This finding is based, in part, on the advanced level of treatment provided by the Facility, which removes settleable solids and reduces TSS and turbidity to negligible levels in wastewater discharged to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek. This finding is also supported by the summer discharge prohibition, and the five percent flow limitation for the winter discharge.

With regard to temperature, the critical time period for temperature is in the summer, which is also the time period when point source discharges from the Facility are prohibited. Because of the summer discharge prohibition, the Facility does not contribute to temperature loadings in the receiving water during the hottest, most critical season of the year.

TMDLs for nitrogen, ammonia and dissolved oxygen were approved by the U.S. EPA in 1995 in the form of the *Waste Reduction Strategy for the Laguna de Santa Rosa*. The Waste Reduction Strategy called for the reduction of nitrogen loads to address ammonia toxicity concerns along the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa. The Strategy was implemented via improvements to municipal wastewater treatment facilities and dairy management practices in the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed. These improvements are the likely cause of observed reductions in nutrient and ammonia concentrations in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa between the late 1990s and 2000s.

E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations

1. On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems and on August 6, 2013 adopted Order No. WQ 2013-0058-EXEC Amending Monitoring and Reporting Program for Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDRs. The deadline for dischargers to apply for coverage was November 2, 2006. The Permittee applied for coverage and is subject to the requirements of Order Nos. 2006-0003-DWQ and WQ 2013-0058-EXEC and any future revisions thereto for operation of its wastewater collection system.
2. The State Water Board Water Quality Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (Industrial Storm Water General Permit) regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities with design flows greater than 1.0 mgd. Storm water that falls within the confines of the Facility is not returned to the headworks for treatment, therefore the Permittee is enrolled under the Industrial Storm Water General Permit.

3. On July 22, 2004, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2004-0012-DWQ, General Waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land for Use as a Soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural, Horticultural, and Recycled Water Activities. The Order acknowledges that the Permittee is regulated under the General Order for land application of Class B biosolids on City property.
4. On February 3, 2009, the State Water Board adopted Resolution 2009-0011, Adoption of a Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water (Recycled Water Policy) (Revised December 11, 2018, effective April 8, 2019) for the purpose of increasing the use of recycled water from municipal wastewater sources in a manner that implements state and federal water quality laws. The Recycled Water Policy provides direction to the regional water boards regarding the appropriate criteria to be used in issuing permits for recycled water projects and describes permitting criteria intended to streamline, and provide consistency for, the permitting of the vast majority of recycled water projects. Pertinent provisions and requirements of the Policy have been incorporated into this Order to address conditions specific to the Permittee's plan to implement water recycling.

The Recycled Water Policy recognizes the fact that some groundwater basins in the state contain salts and nutrients that exceed or threaten to exceed water quality objectives in the applicable Basin Plans, and that not all Basin Plans include adequate implementation procedures for achieving or ensuring compliance with the water quality objectives for salt or nutrients. The Recycled Water Policy further recognizes that these conditions can be caused by natural soils/conditions, discharges of waste, irrigation using surface water, groundwater or recycled water, and water supply augmentation using surface or recycled water, and that regulation of recycled water alone will not address these conditions. It is the intent of the Recycled Water Policy that salts and nutrients from all sources be managed on a basin-wide or watershed-wide basis in a manner that ensures attainment of water quality objectives and protection of beneficial uses. The Recycled Water Policy finds that the appropriate way to address salt and nutrient issues is through the development of regional or subregional Salt and Nutrient Management Plans (SNMPs) rather than through imposing requirements solely on individual recycled water projects. This Order is consistent with the requirements of the Recycled Water Policy to implement an SNMP.

Beginning in 2010, the Permittee has organized and has helped fund a SNMP development process. This Order may be reopened to incorporate provisions consistent with any salt and nutrient management plan(s) adopted by the Regional Water Board.

5. The Permittee and the City of Rohnert Park have each separately obtained coverage under the Recycled Water General Order to regulate recycled water distribution and use. The Recycled Water General Order includes requirements and provisions that apply to the use of recycled water and includes monitoring requirements for total coliform organisms and turbidity, as well as use area monitoring requirements that include recycled water flow, acreage applied, application rate and observations for soil saturation/ponding, nuisance conditions (odors, vectors), runoff, and notification signs. This NPDES permit additionally includes filtration process requirements and UV disinfection requirements because these requirements apply to both recycled water and surface water discharges.
6. When applicable, state law requires dischargers to file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that decreases the flow in any portion of the watercourse. The State Water Board retains separate jurisdictional authority to

enforce any applicable requirements under Water Code section 1211. This is not an NPDES permit requirement. The Permittee filed a petition on September 30, 1999 with regard to its plans to further decrease discharges to Santa Rosa Creek and the Laguna de Santa Rosa upon completion of its Geysers Recharge Project and received approval from the Division of Water Rights on May 15, 2000.

7. On August 4, 2015, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0121_DWQ, General Waste Discharge Requirements for Composting Operations (Composting General Order). Regional Water Board staff determined that the Permittee's Class A composting operation qualified for an exemption from the Composting General Order because composting activities occurred within a fully enclosed vessel (Finding No. 30 of the Composting General Order).

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits.

There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations:

40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where a reasonable potential to exceed those criteria exists.

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Discharge Prohibition III.A.** The discharge of any waste not disclosed by the Permittee or not within the reasonable contemplation of the Regional Water Board is prohibited.

This prohibition is based on the Basin Plan, the previous Order, and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2002-0012 regarding the petition of WDRs Order No. 01-072 for the East Bay Municipal Utility District and Bay Area Clean Water Agencies. In State Water Board Order No. WQO 2002-0012, the State Water Board found that this prohibition is acceptable in Orders, but should be interpreted to apply only to constituents that are not disclosed by the Permittee, and are not reasonably anticipated to be present in the discharge. It specifically does not apply to constituents in the discharge that do not have "reasonable potential" to exceed water quality objectives.

The State Water Board has stated that the only pollutants not covered by this prohibition are those which were "*disclosed to the permitting authority and...can be reasonably contemplated.*" [In re the Petition of East Bay Municipal Utilities District et al., (State Water Board, 2002) Order No. WQO 2002-0012, p. 24.] In that Order, the State Water Board cited a case which held the Permittee is liable for the discharge of pollutants "*not within the reasonable contemplation of the permitting authority...whether spills or otherwise...*" [*Piney Run Preservation Assn. v. County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland* (4th Cir. 2001) 268 F. 3d 255, 268.] Thus, the State Water Board authority provides that, to be permissible, the constituent discharged (1) must have been disclosed by the Permittee and (2) can be reasonably contemplated by the Regional Water Board.

2. **Discharge Prohibition III.B.** Creation of pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined by section 13050 of the Water Code is prohibited.

This prohibition has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and is based on section 13050 of the Water Code and section 5411 of the California Health and Safety Code.

3. **Discharge Prohibition III.C.** The discharge of sludge or digester supernatant is prohibited, except as authorized under section VI.C.5.c of this Order (Sludge Disposal and Handling Requirements).

This prohibition has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and is based on restrictions on the disposal of sewage sludge found in federal regulations [40 C.F.R. part 503 (Biosolids), part 527, and part 258] and title 27 of the CCR.

4. **Discharge Prohibition III.D.** The discharge or recycling use of untreated or partially treated waste (receiving a lower level of treatment than described in section II.A of the Fact Sheet) from anywhere within the collection, treatment, or disposal systems is prohibited, except as provided for in Attachment D, Standard Provisions G (Bypass) and H (Upset).

This prohibition has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 with minor modifications. The term “reclamation” has been replaced with the term “recycling” and detailed reclamation specifications have been removed, as recycled water distribution and use requirements are now covered under the Permittee’s enrollment under the Recycled Water General Permit. This prohibition is based on the Basin Plan to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water from unpermitted discharges, and the intent of the Water Code sections 13260 through 13264 relating to the discharge of waste to waters of the state without filing for and being issued an Order. This prohibition applies to spills not related to sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) and other unauthorized discharges of wastewater within the collection, treatment, and disposal facilities. The discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater from the collection, treatment, or disposal facility represents an unauthorized bypass pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 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 III.E.** Any sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) that results in a discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater to (a) waters of the state or (b) land that creates pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined in Water Code section 13050(m) is prohibited.

This prohibition is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001. This prohibition applies to spills related to SSOs and is based on state standards, including section 13050 of the Water Code and the Basin Plan. This prohibition is consistent with the state’s antidegradation policy as specified in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 (*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Water in California*) in that the prohibition imposes conditions to prevent impacts to water quality, the degradation of water quality, negative effects on receiving water beneficial uses, and lessening of water quality beyond that prescribed in State Water Board or Regional Water Board plans and policies.

This prohibition is stricter than the prohibitions stated in State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ prohibits SSOs that result in the discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater to waters of the United States and SSOs that cause a nuisance, compared to Prohibition III.E of this Order, which prohibits SSO discharges that create nuisance or pollution to waters of the state and land for a more complete protection of human health. The rationale for this prohibition is based on the prevalence of high

groundwater in the North Coast Region, and this Region's reliance on groundwater as a drinking water source.

6. **Discharge Prohibition III.F.** The discharge of waste to land that is not owned by the Permittee, governed by City ordinance, or under agreement to use by the Permittee, or for which the Permittee has explicitly permitted such use, is prohibited, except for use for fire suppression as provided in title 22, sections 60307(a) and 60307(b) of the CCR.

This prohibition is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001. Land used for the application of wastewater must be owned by the Permittee or be under the control of the Permittee by contract so that the Permittee maintains a means for ultimate disposal of treated wastewater.

7. **Discharge Prohibition III.G.** The discharge of waste at any point not described in Finding II.B of the Fact Sheet or authorized by a permit issued by the State Water Board or another Regional Water Board is prohibited.

This prohibition has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 with a minor modification to remove the language "except for use for fire suppression." This prohibition is a general prohibition that allows the Permittee to discharge waste only in accordance with WDRs. It is based on sections 301 and 402 of the federal CWA and section 13263 of the Water Code.

8. **Discharge Prohibition III.H.** The average dry weather flow of waste through the Facility in excess of 21.34 mgd is prohibited until such time as additional treatment, storage, and/or total water recycling capacity has been added to accommodate a higher average dry weather flow, not to exceed 25.9 mgd. The peak weekly wet weather flow of waste through the Facility shall not exceed 64 mgd and the peak monthly wet weather flow of waste through the Facility shall not exceed 47.3 mgd. Compliance with this prohibition shall be determined as defined in sections VII.K, VII.L, and VII.M of this Order.

The average dry weather flow prohibition is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and is based on the average daily dry weather treatment capacity of the Facility. In Order No. R1-2013-0001, the Permittee requested that the treatment and disposal capacity be increased from 21.34 mgd to 25.9 mgd as a result of the Facility's ability to manage increased recycled water flows through treatment plant expansion, disposal and reuse projects such as the Laguna Treatment Plant Upgrade Project, Geysers Expansion Project, the Santa Rosa Urban Reuse Project, and the Discharge Compliance Project. The Permittee provided supplemental information to the ROWD which included a 5-year projected flow increase, and a determination that expansion during the next permit term will not be necessary and is therefore not planned.

9. **Discharge Prohibition III.I.** The discharge of waste to the Russian River and its tributaries is prohibited during the period from May 15 through September 30 of each year.

This prohibition is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and is required by the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan prohibits discharges to the Russian River and its tributaries during the period May 15 through September 30 (chapter 4, Waste Discharge prohibitions for the North Coast Basin). The original intent of this prohibition was to prevent the contribution of wastewater to the baseline flow of the Russian River during the period of the year when the Russian River and its tributaries experience the heaviest water-contact recreation use.

10. **Discharge Prohibition III.J.** During the period from October 1 through May 14, discharges of treated wastewater to the unnamed ditch tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, the

Laguna de Santa Rosa, and Santa Rosa Creek, tributaries to the Russian River, shall not exceed five percent of the flow of the Russian River, as measured at the Hacienda Bridge at United States Geological Survey (USGS) Gauge No. 11467000. For the purposes of this Order, compliance with this discharge prohibition shall be determined as follows:

- a. The discharge of advanced treated wastewater shall be adjusted at least once daily to avoid exceeding, to the extent practicable, five percent of the most recent daily flow measurement of the Russian River at the Hacienda Bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000. Daily flow shall be based on flow meter comparisons reasonably read between the hours of 12:01 am and 12:00 midnight; and,
- b. In no case shall the total volume of advanced treated wastewater discharged in a calendar month exceed five percent of the total volume of the Russian River measured at the Hacienda Bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000 in the same calendar month. At the beginning of the discharge season, the monthly flow volume comparisons shall be based on the date when the discharge commenced to the end of the calendar month. At the end of the discharge season, the monthly flow volume comparisons shall be based on the first day of the calendar month to the date when the discharge ceased for the season.

This prohibition has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 with a minor modification. The term “or” has been replaced with “and” to ensure the cumulative discharge from the Facility from all Discharge Points does not exceed five percent of the total volume of the Russian River.

The Basin Plan (chapter 4, North Coastal Basin Discharge Prohibition No. 4) prohibits discharges to the Russian River and its tributaries when the waste discharge flow is greater than one percent of the receiving water’s flow during the allowable discharge season, unless an exception to the requirement is granted by the Regional Water Board through an NPDES permit. The Basin Plan allows the Regional Water Board to consider for cause exceptions to the one percent waste discharge rate limitation and requires that exceptions be defined in NPDES permits for each permittee, on a case by case basis in accordance with specific requirements that are identified in Chapter 4, Implementation Plans, Point Source Measures, North Coastal Basin, Item 5.

On March 15, 2000, the State Water Board adopted Water Quality Order No. 2000-03, in which the Board determined that the Facility qualified for the exception and authorized the discharge up to five percent of the flow in the Russian River upon implementation of the Geysers Recharge Project. The subsequent permits, Orders No. R1-2006-0045 and R1-2013-0001, retained the authorization which provides day-to-day operational flexibility for the Permittee while retaining the intent of the prohibition.

Prohibition III.J of this Order specifies that the discharge may comply with the 5 percent discharge limitation as a monthly average for the surface water discharge season, provided the Permittee adjusts the discharge of treated wastewater to five percent of the most recent daily flow measurement of the Russian River, as measured at Hacienda Bridge (USGS Gage No. 11467000) to the extent practicable. This modification provides day-to-day operational flexibility for the Permittee while retaining the intent of the prohibition.

- 11. Discharge Prohibition III.K.** The discharge of any radiological, chemical, or biological warfare agent into waters of the state is prohibited under Water Code section 13375.

This prohibition is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and is based on the discharge prohibitions contained in section 13375 of the Water Code as well as 33 U.S. Code section 1311

- 12. Discharge Prohibition III.L.** The discharge of septage to a location other than an approved septage receiving station, or equivalent location within the Facility, is prohibited.

This prohibition is newly established by this Order and is necessary to ensure that septage received is monitored and introduced into the waste stream in a manner that ensures that pollutants associated with domestic septage do not pass through or interfere with the operation or performance of the Facility. A proper septage waste receiving plan must ensure that the strength and characteristics of the septage waste does not interfere with the operation and performance of the Facility.

- 13. Discharge Prohibition III.M.** The discharge of waste from Discharge Points 012A(1) and 012A(2) is prohibited until the Permittee has demonstrated that these discharge points are operationally functional and are being properly operated and maintained in accordance with Special Provision VI.C.4.a.

This prohibition is newly established by this Order and is based on the Permittee's statement that these Discharge Points which have not been used or exercised in approximately 15 years and the functionality of these Discharge Points is unknown.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133.

In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(d)(2) states that technology-based permit limits shall be stated as average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations, unless impracticable, for POTWs. 40 C.F.R. section 103.102 provides detailed specifications for establishing effluent limitations for the technology-based constituents, BOD₅, TSS, and pH. Effluent limitations for BOD₅, TSS, and pH in Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a (Table 5) and IV.A.1.b of this Order were established as required by 40 C.F.R. section 103.102 and have been retained in this Order.

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTWs [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all

municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of BOD₅, TSS, and pH, as follows:

a. BOD₅ and TSS

- i. The 30-day average shall not exceed 30 mg/L.
- ii. The 7-day average shall not exceed 45 mg/L.
- iii. The 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85%.

b. pH

The pH shall be maintained within the limits of 6.0 to 9.0.

The effluent limitation for pH required to meet the water quality objective is contained in the Basin Plan, Table 3-1.

In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f) requires the establishment of mass-based effluent limitations for all pollutants limited in Orders, except for 1) pH, temperature, radiation, or other pollutants, which cannot be appropriately expressed by mass, 2) when applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measure.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

The effluent limitations in this Order for BOD₅, TSS, and pH not only meet the technology-based requirements for secondary treatment set forth in section 133.102, but they also are required to meet the water quality-based requirements set forth in the Basin Plan.

In addition to the minimum federal technology-based requirements, the Basin Plan requires that discharges of municipal waste “*shall be of advanced treated wastewater in accordance with effluent limitations contained in NPDES permits for each affected discharger, and shall meet a median coliform level of 2.2 MPN/100 mL*” for discharges to the Russian River and its tributaries during October 1 through May 14. This requirement leaves discretion to the Regional Water Board to define advanced wastewater treatment by the implementation of effluent limitations in individual permits.

- a. BOD₅ and TSS.** As described above, the secondary treatment standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133 establish the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of BOD₅, TSS, and pH. For the purpose of regulating municipal waste discharges from the Facility to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Santa Rosa Creek, advanced wastewater treatment is defined as achieving a monthly average concentration for BOD₅ and TSS of 10 mg/L, and a weekly average concentration of 15 mg/L, which are technically achievable based on the capability of a tertiary treatment system. In addition, 40 C.F.R. 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. These effluent limitations are retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- b. pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units. Note that a more stringent effluent limitation range of 6.5 – 8.5 for pH is required to meet the water quality objective for hydrogen ion concentration (pH) in the Russian River contained in Basin Plan, Table 3-1.

- c. Mass-Based Effluent Limitations.** Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f) require that, except under certain conditions, all permit limits, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. Among the conditions exempting the application of mass-based limitations is 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1)(i), which states “for pH, temperature, and radiation, or other pollutants which cannot appropriately be expressed by mass” and 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1)(ii), which states “when applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement.”

This Order does not include mass-based effluent limitations for the following pollutants pursuant to the exceptions in 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1)(i) and (ii):

- i.** BOD₅ and TSS, because these two parameters are expressed in terms of concentration and percent removal; and
 - ii.** pH, because this parameter cannot appropriately be expressed by mass.
- d. Coliform Bacteria.** Even though effluent limitations for coliform bacteria are not set out in the federal regulations for secondary treatment, they are included here in the section on technology-based effluent limitations because they reflect technology standards for tertiary treatment. Coliform bacteria are a pollutant of concern in all wastewaters of domestic origin, and therefore this Order retains the effluent limitations for total coliform bacteria from Order No. R1-2013-0001, with a minor modification. In Order No. R1-2013-0001 compliance with effluent limitations was evaluated based on the daily result, calculated as the geometric mean of samples analyzed from all on-line channels, whereas this Order requires compliance with the effluent limitations based on the highest coliform result at the end of each operational disinfection channel each day. These effluent limitations reflect standards for advanced wastewater treatment in the Basin Plan (section 4, Implementation Plans) and for disinfected tertiary recycled water as adopted by the State Water Board, DDW in title 22 of the CCR.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as technology equivalence requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of advanced wastewater treatment, is discussed in section IV.B.2 of this Fact Sheet. In addition, this Order contains additional requirements to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

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

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

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

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

- a. **Beneficial Uses.** Beneficial use designations for receiving waters for discharges from the Facility are presented in section III.C.1 of this Fact Sheet.
- b. **Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives.** In addition to the specific water quality objectives indicated above, the Basin Plan contains narrative objectives for color, tastes and odors, floating material, suspended material, settleable material, oil and grease, biostimulatory substances, sediment, turbidity, pH, dissolved oxygen, bacteria, temperature, toxicity, pesticides, chemical constituents, and radioactivity that apply to inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries, including the Russian River and its tributaries. For waters designated for use as MUN, the Basin Plan establishes, as applicable water quality criteria, the MCLs established by DDW for the protection of public water supplies at title 22 of the CCR section 64431 (Inorganic Chemicals) and section 64444 (Organic Chemicals).
- c. **SIP, CTR, and NTR.** Water quality criteria and objectives applicable to the receiving water are established by the CTR, established by the U.S. EPA at 40 C.F.R. section 131.38; and the NTR, established by the U.S. EPA at 40 C.F.R. section 131.36. Criteria for most of the 126 priority pollutants are contained within the CTR and the NTR.

The SIP, which is described in section III.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, includes procedures for determining the need for, and the calculation of, WQBELs and requires Permittees to submit data sufficient to do so.

At title 22, division 4, chapter 15 of the CCR, DDW has established MCLs for certain pollutants for the protection of drinking water. Chapter 3 of the Basin Plan establishes these MCLs as water quality objectives applicable to receiving waters with the beneficial use designation of municipal and domestic supply.

Aquatic life freshwater and saltwater criteria are identified as criterion maximum concentrations (CMC) and criterion continuous concentrations (CCC). The CTR defines the CMC as the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for a short period of time without deleterious effects and the CCC as the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4 days) without deleterious effects. The CMC is used to calculate an acute or 1-hour average numeric effluent limitation and the CCC is used to calculate a chronic or 4-day average numeric effluent limitation. Aquatic life freshwater criteria were used for the RPA.

Human health criteria are further identified as “water and organisms” and “organisms only”. “Water and organism” criteria are designed to address risks to human health from multiple exposure pathways. The criteria from the “water and organisms” column

of the CTR were used for the RPA because the Basin Plan identifies that the receiving waters, the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek, have the beneficial use designation of municipal and domestic supply.

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require effluent limitations to control all pollutants, which are or may be discharged at a level that will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard.

For WQBELs for toxic pollutants, Section 5.2.3 of the EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxic Controls states “in lieu of an Average Weekly Limit (AWL) for POTWs, EPA recommends establishing an Maximum Daily Limit (MDL) (or a maximum test result for chronic toxicity) for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting. This is appropriate for at least two reasons. First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge’s potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed. A MDL, which is measured by a grab sample, would be toxicologically protective of potential acute toxicity impacts.”

Section 1.4 of the SIP states that maximum daily effluent limitations shall be used for POTWs in place of average weekly effluent limitations for WQBELs. The SIP procedure of calculating an AMEL and an MDEL applies to all CTR pollutants, both those that are for protection of aquatic life and those that are for the protection of human health.

The RPAs for this Facility were conducted for discharges at all authorized points of discharge to surface waters which are further described in the following paragraphs.

Discharge Points 006A (now 006A(2) and 006B). The RPA for Discharge Points 006A and 006B was performed using the effluent monitoring data from Monitoring Locations EFF-006A and EFF-006B because effluent data from both locations is representative of effluent quality for discharges from Meadow Lane Pond D to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. Therefore, the RPA was based on effluent and receiving water samples collected at Monitoring Locations EFF-006A, EFF-006B and RSW-006BU-L (now designated as RSW-LSP) between February and March 2019. Discharge Point 006A (discharge from Meadow Lane Pond D) has been renamed to Discharge Point 006A(2) in this Order because the City has determined that it can discharge both from the Meadow Lane Pond D and directly from the treatment plant at this location, thus Discharge Point 006A(1) will designate direct discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at this location.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The Permittee did not discharge to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 012A(1) during the term of the existing permit. The RPA for Discharge Point 012A(1) was performed using the effluent monitoring data from Monitoring Location EFF-001 because effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 is representative of effluent quality for direct discharges from the treatment plant to Santa Rosa Creek. The Permittee did not conduct receiving water monitoring in Santa Rosa Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-012AU during the term of the existing permit. Receiving water data from Monitoring Location RSW-012BU was used to conduct the RPA because it is representative of the upstream receiving water quality in the absence of discharge from Discharge Point 012A(1).

Therefore, the RPA was based on effluent and receiving water samples collected at Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-012BU between February 2014 and May 2019.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. The Permittee discharged at Discharge Point 012B, but did not discharge to the Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 012A(2) during the term of the existing permit. The RPA for Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B was performed using the effluent monitoring data from Monitoring Location EFF-012B because effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-012B is representative of effluent quality for discharges from Delta Pond to Santa Rosa Creek. Therefore, the RPA was based on effluent and receiving water samples collected at Monitoring Locations EFF-012B and RSW-012BU between March 2016 and March 2019.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. The Permittee did not discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Point 015 during the term of the existing permit but did discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at a newly designated Discharge Point 006A(1). The RPA for Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 was performed using the effluent monitoring data from Monitoring Location EFF-001 because effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 is representative of effluent quality for direct discharges from the treatment plant to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The Permittee did not perform receiving water monitoring in the Laguna de Santa Rosa upstream of Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015, so the minimum observed hardness value of 67.4 mg/L, used in Order No. R1-2013-0001, was also used to conduct the RPA for hardness dependent metals at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015.

The RPAs for this Facility were conducted as follow.

a. Non-Priority Pollutants

- i. pH.** The effluent limitation for pH of 6.5 to 8.5 is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001. This limitation is based on the water quality objective for all surface waters established in chapter 3, Table 3-1 of the Basin Plan. Federal technology-based requirements prescribed in 40 C.F.R. part 133 are not sufficient to meet these Basin Plan water quality standards.
- ii. Nitrogen Compounds.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia nitrogen. Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream and inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate to the receiving stream. Treatment plants such as this Facility often experience minimal nitrification in the winter, full nitrification and denitrification during the warm season, and full nitrification but limited denitrification during transition periods. Effluent limitations for nitrate are included in the Order to assure that the Permittee protects the beneficial uses of the receiving water.
 - (a) Ammonia.** Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. The Basin Plan establishes a narrative water quality objective for toxicity, stating that “[a]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” Due to concerns regarding ammonia toxicity, the Regional Water Board relies on U.S. EPA’s recommended water quality criteria for ammonia to interpret the

Basin Plan's narrative objective for toxicity. For freshwater, the recommended criteria are from the April 2013 *Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater*, EPA 822-R-13-001 (2013 Freshwater Criteria). The 2013 Freshwater Criteria is an update to the December 1999 *Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia* (1999 Freshwater Criteria).

The 2013 Freshwater Criteria recommends acute and chronic water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life, including salmonids and sensitive freshwater mussel species in the Family Unionidae that are more sensitive to ammonia than salmonids. Like the 1999 Freshwater Criteria document, the 2013 Freshwater Criteria document recommends acute (1-hour average) criteria based on pH and the presence/absence of salmonids and chronic (30-day average) criteria based on pH and temperature and that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day chronic criterion. In addition, the 2013 Freshwater Criteria document recommends these same criteria for sensitive mussel species.

For this Order, the Regional Water Board has considered the actual conditions documented in the receiving water for discharges from the Facility for each discharge point. The analysis for each discharge point considered the actual pH and temperature conditions documented in the receiving water, the assumed presence of salmonids, and the assumed presence of mussels. The details of the analysis for all of the discharge points is described in sections (1) through (4), below. None of the discharge points demonstrated reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the chronic criterion, and WQBEL's for ammonia have not been included for ammonia

This Order requires weekly monitoring for ammonia at Discharge Points 001, 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 012A(1), 012A(2), 012B, and 015 whenever there is a discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa or Santa Rosa Creek. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding appropriate effluent limitations.

(1) Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2) and 006B. The paired receiving water pH of 7.5 and temperature of 12.8°C for the acute criterion and paired receiving water pH of 7.3 and temperature of 13.1°C for the chronic criterion at Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-L were used to calculate U.S. EPA's 2013 Freshwater Criteria, which result in acute and chronic criteria of 13 mg/L and 5.7 mg/L, respectively.

Effluent monitoring results were all non-detect based on six samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2) and 006B) between February 2017 and March 2019.

(2) Discharge Point 012A(1). The paired receiving water pH of 8.0 and temperature of 13.9°C for the acute and chronic criterion at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU were used to calculate U.S. EPA's 2013 Freshwater

Criteria, which result in acute and chronic criteria of 5.6 mg/L and 2.7 mg/L, respectively.

Effluent monitoring results ranged from non-detect to 4.2 mg/L, based on 45 samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 012A(1)) between February 2014 and May 2019, however, the only detections occurred in April and May 2014 during periods of no discharge to receiving waters. Upstream receiving water monitoring results were all non-detect based on four samples collected at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU between January 2017 and May 2019.

- (3) Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B.** The paired receiving water pH of 8.0 and temperature of 13.9°C for the acute and chronic criterion at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU, were used to calculate U.S. EPA's 2013 Freshwater Criteria, which result in acute and chronic criteria of 5.6 mg/L and 2.7 mg/L, respectively.

Effluent monitoring results were all non-detect based on 14 samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) between March 2016 and March 2019.

- (4) Discharge Points 015.** Receiving water monitoring for pH and temperature was not conducted in the Laguna de Santa Rosa, upstream of Discharge Point 015, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001, so reasonable potential for ammonia at Discharge Point 015 could not be evaluated.

- (b) Nitrate.** Nitrate is known to cause adverse health effects in humans. For waters designated as domestic or municipal supply, the Basin Plan (chapter 3) adopts the MCLs, established by DDW for the protection of public water supplies in title 22 of the CCR, sections 64431 (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64444 (Organic Chemicals), as applicable water quality criteria. The MCL for nitrate (10 mg/L as N) is therefore applicable as a water quality criterion for the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek.

- (1) Monitoring Location EFF-001.** The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015) weekly between February 2014 and May 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 6.5 mg/L to 28.6 mg/L based on 220 samples.

- (2) Monitoring Location EFF-006B.** The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006B and 006A) weekly when discharging between February 2017 and March 2017 and on February 28, 2019 and March 7, 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 6.8 mg/L to 8.2 mg/L based on five samples.

- (3) Monitoring Location EFF-012B.** The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) weekly when discharging between

March 2016 and March 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 6.1 mg/L to 9.1 mg/L based on 14 samples.

Because nitrate levels in the effluent have been measured above 10 mg/L, as N, the Regional Water Board concludes that discharges from the Facility at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015 have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality criteria for the receiving water for nitrate. Since this Order establishes an equally stringent performance-based effluent limitation for total nitrogen for protection of the receiving water against biostimulatory effects, effluent limits for nitrate and nitrite have not been established in this Order.

(c) Nitrite. Nitrite is known to cause adverse health effects in humans. For waters designated as domestic or municipal supply, the Basin Plan (chapter 3) adopts the MCLs, established by DDW for the protection of public water supplies in title 22 of the CCR, sections 64431 (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64444 (Organic Chemicals), as applicable water quality criteria. The MCL for nitrite (1.0 mg/L as N) is therefore applicable as a water quality criterion for the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Santa Rosa Creek.

(1) Monitoring Location EFF-001. The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015) weekly between February 2014 and May 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 0.015 mg/L to 3.2 mg/L based on 222 samples.

(2) Monitoring Location EFF-006B. The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006B and 006A) weekly when discharging between February 2017 and March 2017 and on February 28, 2019 and March 7, 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 0.12 mg/L to 0.19 mg/L based on six samples.

(3) Monitoring Location EFF-012B. The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) weekly when discharging between March 2016 and March 2019. Monitoring results ranged from 0.056 mg/L to 0.13 mg/L based on 14 samples.

Because nitrate levels in the effluent have been measured above 1 mg/L, as N, the Regional Water Board concludes that discharges from the Facility at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015 have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality criteria for the receiving water for nitrite. Since this Order establishes an equally stringent performance-based effluent limitation for total nitrogen for protection of the receiving water against biostimulatory effects, effluent limits for nitrate and nitrite have not been established in this Order.

iii. Total Coliform. As discussed in section IV.B.2.d of this Fact Sheet, this Order contains effluent limitations for total coliform bacteria that reflect standards for

tertiary treated effluent in the Basin Plan (section 4, Implementation Plans) and as adopted by the State Water Board, DDW in title 22 of the CCR. For direct discharges from the Facility to surface waters (no storage), the effluent limitations established for total coliform will ensure that bacterial standards for water contact recreation are maintained throughout the receiving water. For discharges from storage to receiving waters, this Order requires monitoring for *E. coli* bacteria that will be assessed prior to the next permit renewal to determine the need for bacteria water quality-based effluent limitations for discharges from the storage ponds to receiving waters.

- iv. The Permittee sampled its discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-001 daily 2,280 days between February 2014 and April 2020. When more than one of the three UV channels is in use, each channel is sampled resulting in a total number of total coliform results of 11,003 sample results. Monitoring results ranged from <1.8 MPN/100 mL to 920 MPN/100 mL. Calculations of the 7-day median ranged from <1.8 to 7.9 MPN/100 mL. This resulted in two violations of the maximum daily limit and 181 violations of the 7-day median coliform effluent limitation. Three of the 7-day median violations occurred during periods of discharge to surface waters in April 2017. It was discovered in June 2020 that the Permittee had been calculating the 7-day median incorrectly. The 7-day median was being calculated using all sample results rather than using the geometric mean of the daily sample results as required by Footnote 1 of Order No. R1-2013-0001 which states (in regard to the 7-day median) that the daily result is the geometric mean of samples analyzed from all on-line [UV disinfection] channels. **Biostimulatory Substances (Phosphorus and Nitrogen).**

The following analysis is based in part on data and information presented in an October 22, 2013 memorandum from Rebecca Fitzgerald, supervisor of the Regional Water Board's TMDL Unit, to Charles Reed et al., and on works referenced therein.

Nitrogen and phosphorus are biostimulatory substances. The Basin Plan contains a narrative water quality objective for biostimulatory substances that states “[w]aters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growths to the extent that such growths cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” The Regional Water Board is increasingly concerned about the biostimulatory properties of discharges to surface waters in the North Coast Region. Nutrients, such as phosphorus and nitrogen containing compounds, in treated wastewater stimulate the growth rate of photosynthetic bacteria, algae, and other aquatic plants. The overabundance of nitrogen and phosphorus compounds in surface water bodies can result in the excessive growth and decay of these organisms, thus accelerating the process of eutrophication, especially in lake-like waters. These phenomena cause dissolved oxygen levels to drop below concentrations needed for the survival and health of fish and aquatic life, which in turn negatively affects the aesthetic quality of water bodies and impairs other beneficial uses.

Because the Permittee's discharge is a source of nitrogen and phosphorus compounds, Regional Water Board staff have evaluated the reasonable potential for the discharge to cause, contribute to, or promote biostimulatory conditions in

the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek. Based on the evaluation, appropriate limitations and requirements, contained in Order No. R1-2013-0001, have been retained in this Order to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative water quality objective for biostimulatory substances.

In order to interpret this narrative objective, Regional Water Board staff evaluated several chemical and biological indicators against numeric threshold values, including, but not limited to numeric criteria for phosphorus, nitrogen, and chlorophyll α concentrations. U.S. EPA recommended criteria for total phosphorus (dissolved plus particulate), total nitrogen, and chlorophyll α for rivers and streams and for lakes and reservoirs are based on aggregate ecoregions. Table F-6 contains the applicable criteria for Aggregate Nutrient Ecoregion III, which includes the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed.

Table F-6. U.S. EPA Recommended Biostimulatory Substance Criteria

Constituent	(Lentic) Criteria for Lakes & Reservoirs ¹ (mg/L)	(Lotic) Criteria for Rivers & Streams ² (mg/L)
Total Phosphorus	0.017	0.02188
Total Nitrogen	0.40	0.38
Chlorophyll α	0.0034	0.00178
<u>Sources:</u>		
1. U.S. EPA. 2001. Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations: Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria: Lakes and Reservoirs in Nutrient Ecoregion III. Publication No. EPA 822-B-01-008. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC.		
2. U.S. EPA. 2000. Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations: Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria: Rivers and Streams in Nutrient Ecoregion III. Publication No. EPA 822-B-00-016. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC.		

For use in California, the State Water Board developed nutrient screening tools for assessing biostimulatory conditions in water bodies evaluated pursuant to the CWA Section 303(d) listing process. Table F-7 contains the recommended screening criteria for California water bodies.

Table F-7. California Recommended Biostimulatory Substance Criteria¹

Constituent	(Lentic) Criteria for Lakes & Reservoirs (mg/L)	(Lotic) Criteria for Rivers & Streams (mg/L)
Total Phosphorus	0.100	0.02
Total Nitrogen	1.200	0.23
Chlorophyll α	0.010	150 (mg/m ²)
<u>Source:</u>		
1. SWRCB. 2007. Staff Report; Division of Water Quality; Nutrient Screening Tools for Use in the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listing Process. December 26, 2007. State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality, Sacramento, CA.		

Receiving water concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus exceed recommended criteria for biostimulatory substances. Instream water samples for nutrients and other indicators of biostimulatory conditions have been collected in the water bodies of the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed for decades. Available data and other information suggest that harmful

biostimulatory conditions are present in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek, as demonstrated by elevated amounts of nutrients in the water column and aquatic sediments, elevated levels of chlorophyll α , frequently low dissolved oxygen levels, and the extensive presence of benthic macrophytes (including *Ludwigia* sp.) These water bodies, as well as many of their tributaries, are also facing significant water quality problems due to high levels of instream sedimentation, hydrologic and physical habitat changes, and high water temperatures.

While available data indicate apparent reductions in total nitrogen concentrations since the 1980s, concentrations measured most recently continue to exceed recommended criteria. In fact, total nitrogen concentrations in 100 percent of 86 samples collected and analyzed in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek during the period from 2001 to 2017 exceed the U.S. EPA recommended criterion of 0.40 mg-N/L, and concentrations in 67 percent of the samples exceed the California recommended criterion of 1.200 mg-N/L for lentic water bodies.

Similarly, while available data indicate significant and substantial reductions in total phosphorus concentrations since the 1970s, concentrations measured most recently continue to far exceed recommended criteria. In fact, 100 percent of 95 samples collected and analyzed in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek during the period from 2001 to 2017 exceed both the U.S. EPA recommended criterion of 0.017 mg-P/L and the California recommended criterion of 0.1 mg-P/L for lentic water bodies.

The Permittee's effluent discharge is a controllable source of nitrogen and phosphorus. Treated wastewater from the Permittee's primary point of discharge, Delta Pond, which occurs at the confluence of Santa Rosa Creek and the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa, and secondary point of discharge, Meadow Lane Pond, which occurs to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, remain controllable point source discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The Permittee discharged to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 012B in 2016, 2017, and 2019 and to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), and 006B in 2017 and 2019. The Permittee's monitoring data collected during these periods of discharge indicates the average concentration of total nitrogen in the treated effluent discharged was approximately 8.6 mg/L in 23 samples. The mass emission of total nitrogen from all discharges during the permit term was 122,797 pounds. For phosphorus, the average concentration, expressed as total phosphate was 1.6 mg/L. The mass emission of total phosphorus from all discharges during the permit term was 22,438 pounds. During the term of Order R1-2013-0001, the Permittee offset 27,048 pounds of phosphorus by implementing three projects that were designed to remove total phosphorus in order to offset total phosphorus in the Permittee's discharge. The Permittee implemented the following three projects: Nunes Ocean View Dairy Manure Reuse Project, Pepperwood Preserve erosion control treatments, and the Beretta Dairy Manure Management Project. Additional information about those projects are available on the Regional Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/nutrient_offset_program/

Although the volume discharged by the Permittee has decreased significantly since 2007 through an expansion of the Geysers Recharge Project, in combination with the Permittee's agricultural and urban water recycling program, the discharge remains a potential source of phosphorus and nitrogen given that the Permittee discharged 1.8 billion gallons to the Laguna de Santa Rosa between March 2016 and March 2019. In addition, this Order retains a provision that authorizes the Permittee to discharge up to 5 percent of the flow in the Russian River in any month from October 1 through May 14, leaving open the possibility of much larger wastewater discharges than have occurred in recent years. The effluent limitation established in Order No. R1-2013-0001 and retained in this Order for total phosphorus encourages the Permittee to minimize wastewater discharges that could contribute to harmful biostimulatory conditions in the impaired waters of the greater Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed. When wastewater discharges cannot be avoided, the effluent limitation requires that those discharges be offset.

While some of the Permittee's effluent discharge from Delta Pond and Meadow Lane Pond are presumed to enter the Russian River downstream of the discharge location and exit the watershed to the Pacific Ocean at Jenner, there is evidence that during high flows in the Russian River, the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa backs up, creating conditions that favor the capture of dissolved and particulate nutrient discharges.

Available studies describe the unique hydrology of the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa, particularly at its confluence with Mark West Creek, downstream of Delta Pond, and describe conditions under which a flow restriction is created during flood events in the Russian River. Because it is during heavy rainfall events that the Permittee is most likely to discharge, Regional Water Board staff concludes that pollutants in the Permittee's discharge are likely to be captured and stored in the channels of the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek.

Phosphorus concentrations limit biomass production and drive biostimulatory conditions. Phosphorus loads must therefore be controlled.

In addition to analyzing nutrient data measured in the Laguna de Santa Rosa over the last several decades, Regional Water Board staff reviewed scientific literature regarding the relationship between nutrients and biomass production. Based on these reviews, staff concludes that phosphorus is the limiting nutrient in the receiving water system.

Preliminary TMDL linkage analysis and modeling results support the conclusion that total phosphorus concentrations limit algal biomass production in the Laguna de Santa Rosa. Results of water quality modeling indicate that sediments in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek are highly enriched with organic material, which results in a relatively high sediment oxygen demand (SOD). SOD is caused by the oxidation of organic matter in benthic sediments. Sources of organic matter in sediments include leaf litter, soil entering the water body through erosion and deposition, particulate matter from wastewater discharges, and deposition of algal and macrophytic biomass. Regardless of the source, the oxidation of deposited benthic organic matter will exert a SOD on the

water column, and drive concentrations of dissolved oxygen to harmfully low levels.

Regional Water Board staff has established linkages between the total phosphorus concentration, algal biomass, carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (CBOD), and SOD. According to the assessment, algal biomass contributes to CBOD in the water column, and upon senescence and settling, contributes to the SOD. In the Laguna de Santa Rosa system, total phosphorus concentrations limit both phytoplankton and benthic algal biomass. Reductions in total phosphorus concentrations are therefore expected to reduce algal biomass, CBOD and SOD, which is the primary driver of low dissolved oxygen. Although the Laguna de Santa Rosa TMDL for phosphorus is not yet fully developed, the evidence is clear that biostimulatory conditions exist and that instream phosphorus concentrations drive those conditions. Currently, the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek have no apparent capacity to assimilate additional phosphorus loads without continuing to exceed the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for biostimulatory substances and dissolved oxygen. Regional Water Board staff therefore conclude that reductions in internal and external phosphorus loads to these water bodies are needed to protect their beneficial uses, and to ultimately improve water quality conditions. The total phosphorus load from the Permittee's discharge is significant because any additional load of total phosphorus exacerbates the level of degradation and impedes recovery of the impaired beneficial uses of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek. However, because phosphorus is the limiting nutrient in these water bodies and excessive phosphorus is the primary driver of biostimulatory conditions, reductions in nitrogen loads beyond current levels are not expected to result in added protection of the beneficial uses, or significant water quality improvements in the water column.

This Order establishes effluent limitations for total phosphorus and total nitrogen to meet water quality standards.

(a) Total Phosphorus

Based on its analysis of effluent and water quality data as well as information on the physical condition of the receiving water body, Regional Water Board staff has determined that permitted discharges of total phosphorus from the Facility occur at levels that promote excessive aquatic growth occurring within the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek and contribute to excursions of the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for biostimulatory substances and dissolved oxygen. Therefore, in accordance with federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. 122.44(d), this Order retains the water quality-based effluent limitation for total phosphorus contained in Order No. R1-2013-0001.

Instead of establishing a numeric water quality-based effluent limitation for total phosphorus, this Order includes a narrative (BMP-based) effluent limitation, expressed as "no net loading." This final effluent limitation was established in Order No. R1-2006-0045 and became effective on November 9, 2011. A "no net loading" effluent limitation represents a conservative effluent

limitation to control phosphorus loading to water bodies of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and to prevent further water quality degradation.

The “no net loading” limitation in this Order for phosphorus is appropriate because calculating a numeric effluent limitation is infeasible at this time, due to the lack of sufficient information upon which to base such a limitation. At this time, there is no clear guidance from U.S. EPA or the State Water Board about how to translate narrative water quality criteria for nutrients into numeric water quality standards. Recommended numeric criteria for biostimulatory substances exist (See Tables F-6 and F-7), but the values of those criteria have limited meaning if not considered within a larger context that accounts for the complex physical, biological, and chemical interactions occurring within an aquatic system. Such a comprehensive understanding is not yet available for the Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek. Furthermore, recommended criteria for total phosphorus differ by an order of magnitude, which suggests that there is no agreement about which water quality criterion would be fully protective of beneficial uses.

The use of a BMP-based permitting approach is consistent with federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. 122.44(k) where the permitting authority may include BMPs as permit conditions when numeric effluent limitations are infeasible to calculate and where BMPs are necessary to meet state water quality standards. This approach meets the goal of the CWA because the intent of the permit condition is to control phosphorus loading to impaired receiving waters and prevent further water quality degradation through the implementation of an approved nutrient offset program (in conjunction with other pollutant reduction strategies). A “no net loading” limitation also provides an indirect benefit because complying with the limitation through nutrient offsets means that discharges of nutrients from nonpoint source discharges not currently under permit by the Regional Water Board may be controlled.

Finally, Regional Water Board staff is also mindful of the costs associated with treatment plant upgrades that would likely be required to meet the existing recommended nutrient criteria that could conceivably be used as final numeric effluent limitations. In its program-level Discharge Compliance Project Environmental Impact Report (DCP EIR), the Permittee compared installation of Enhanced Nutrient Removal (ENR) facilities at its Laguna Treatment Plant to implementation of a nutrient offset program within the Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed and identified the nutrient offset approach as the “Environmentally Superior Option” concluding that a nutrient offset program would be capable of reducing impacts of nutrient loading from the Facility to zero. By comparison, construction of ENR facilities could cost as much as \$60 million in capital costs and \$4.5 million in annual operation and maintenance costs. In light of the possible financial ramifications of this limitation and the water quality benefits that are attainable through the successful implementation of a nutrient offset program, Regional Water Board staff has established this BMP-based limitation (i.e., “no net loading”) for total phosphorus that is achievable through compliance with the Laguna Water Quality Trading Framework, or alternative compliance option.

(b) Total Nitrogen

As explained in the previous section, because phosphorus is the limiting nutrient controlling biostimulatory conditions in the Laguna de Santa Rosa and lower Mark West Creek, reductions in nitrogen loads beyond current levels are not expected to result in added protection of the beneficial uses, or significant water quality improvements. Consequently, Regional Water Board staff has determined that there is no reasonable potential for the Permittee to discharge nitrogen at a level that may cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan’s water quality objective for biostimulatory substances.

However, high concentrations of total nitrogen in the water column can lead to high levels of ammonia toxicity through the conversion of nitrogen compounds to ammonia, which is toxic to fish and aquatic life in its unionized form. While the current level of total nitrogen in the Permittee’s discharge is not believed to cause exceedances of the Basin Plan’s narrative water quality objective for toxicity, concentrations beyond current levels do have a reasonable potential to violate the Federal and State Antidegradation Policies. Therefore, to remain consistent with Federal and State Antidegradation Policies, this Order retains a performance-based effluent limitation for total nitrogen of 10.6 mg/L from Order No. R1-2013-0001 that will ensure no degradation occurs.

For this Order, a reasonable potential analysis for total nitrogen was conducted using available effluent monitoring data collected during periods of discharge at Monitoring Location EFF-001, EFF-006B, and EFF-012B for total nitrogen (sum of effluent monitoring results for ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, and total organic nitrogen) from March 2016 through March 2019. A concentration-based effluent limitation was calculated using the concepts described in Appendix E of the USEPA document titled *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control*, March 1991. The upper 95th percentile limit (upper 95 percent confidence bound) of a lognormal sample distribution was calculated using reported data and the statistical program RPNcalc ((n=22, \bar{x} =8.6, s.d.=1.0551, CV=0.123). This resulted in a 95th percentile value of 11.4 mg/L. Since this value is higher than the total nitrogen effluent limitation of 10.6 mg/L from the previous Order, the limitation of 10.6 mg/L has been retained to conform with the State anti-backsliding policy.

- v. **Chlorine Residual.** The Basin Plan establishes a narrative water quality objective for toxicity which states “[a]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” The Regional Water Board considers any chlorinated discharge as having the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of this water quality objective for toxicity, and therefore this Order includes effluent limitations for chlorine. U.S. EPA has established the following criteria for chlorine-produced oxidants for protection of freshwater aquatic life in *Quality Criteria for Water 1986* (The Gold Book, 1986, EPA 440/5-86-001).

Chronic Criterion	Acute Criterion
0.011 mg/L	0.019 mg/L

Order No. R1-2013-0001 did not establish effluent limitations for chlorine residual. The cover letter to the Permittee's March 2019 self-monitoring report states, "For your information, there was a chlorine residual detected during the test discharge [at Discharge Point 006A(1) during a direct discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa on March 5, 2019]. The City uses hypochlorite injection prior to the UV channels to prevent algae growth. The hypochlorite injection was not turned off prior to direct discharge resulting in a chlorine residual of 0.25 mg/L." This incident demonstrates the need to establish chlorine residual effluent limitations in the Order for any direct discharge of effluent to receiving waters from the treatment plant, including Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A and 015. This effluent limitation does not apply to discharges from storage ponds to the receiving water because low levels of chlorine that are in the effluent transferred to storage dissipate rapidly and effluent is stored in storage ponds for long periods of time. In addition, section VI.C.4.c of the Order requires the Permittee to develop and maintain standard operating procedures for chlorine usage to ensure that future discharges do not contain chlorine.

b. Priority Pollutants

The SIP establishes procedures to implement water quality criteria from the NTR and CTR and for priority, toxic pollutant objectives established in the Basin Plan. The implementation procedures of the SIP include methods to determine reasonable potential (for pollutants to cause or contribute to excursions above state water quality standards) and to establish numeric effluent limitations, if necessary, for those pollutants showing reasonable potential.

Section 1.3 of the SIP requires the Regional Water Board to use all available, valid, relevant, and representative receiving water and effluent data and information to conduct an RPA. During the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001, priority pollutant sampling was conducted as follows:

Monitoring Locations EFF-006B and RSW-006BU-L. Priority pollutant sampling was conducted during periods of discharge on February 13, 2017 and February 28, 2019 at Monitoring Locations EFF-006B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B) and RSW-006BU-L. The Permittee also conducted weekly effluent monitoring at Monitoring Location EFF-006B for mercury during periods of discharge in February and March 2017 and March 2019.

Monitoring Locations EFF-012B and RSW-012BU. Priority pollutant sampling was conducted during periods of discharge on March 17, 2016, January 17, 2017, April 11, 2017, and March 12, 2019 at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) and on January 17, 2017, April 11, 2017, and March 12, 2019 at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU. The Permittee also conducted weekly effluent monitoring for mercury between January and February 2017, in April 2017, and in March 2019 at Monitoring Location EFF-012B.

Monitoring Location EFF-001. Priority pollutant sampling was conducted during all quarters between April 2014 and April 2019 at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015).

Title 22 sampling was conducted on December 10, 2018 and January 7, 2019 at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of effluent at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015).

Further sampling for select volatile organic compounds (VOCs), pesticides, PCBs, PAHs, and inorganic chemicals was also conducted. All of this data was used to conduct the RPAs.

Hardness: The CTR and the NTR contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness; the lower the hardness, the lower the water quality criteria. The SIP requires water quality criteria be properly adjusted for hardness, using the hardness of the receiving water. The hardness-dependent metal criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium (III), lead, nickel, silver, and zinc. The minimum observed receiving water hardness of 92 mg/L was used to calculate the criteria for discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa from Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B. The minimum observed receiving water hardness of 124 mg/L was used to calculate the criteria for discharges to Santa Rosa Creek from Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2) and 012B. Receiving water monitoring was not conducted upstream of Discharge Point 015 during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001, so the receiving water hardness of 67.4 mg/L, observed during the term of Order No. R1-2006-0045, was used to calculate the criteria for discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa from Discharge Point 015.

To conduct the RPA, Regional Water Board staff identified the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) and maximum background (B) concentration for each priority, toxic pollutant from effluent and receiving water data provided by the Permittee, and compared this information to the most stringent applicable water quality criterion (C) for each pollutant with applicable water quality criteria from the NTR, CTR, and the Basin Plan. Section 1.3 of the SIP establishes three triggers for a finding of reasonable potential.

Trigger 1. If the MEC is greater than C, there is reasonable potential, and an effluent limitation is required.

Trigger 2. If B is greater than C, and the pollutant is detected in effluent (MEC > ND), there is reasonable potential, and an effluent limitation is required.

Trigger 3. After a review of other available and relevant information, a permit writer may decide that a WQBEL is required. Such additional information may include, but is not limited to: the facility type, the discharge type, solids loading analyses, lack of dilution, history of compliance problems, potential toxic impact of the discharge, fish tissue residue data, water quality and beneficial uses of the receiving water, CWA 303(d) listing for the pollutant, and the presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat.

c. Reasonable Potential Determination

The RPA for Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B determined that there is either no reasonable potential or there was insufficient information to conclude affirmative reasonable potential for any of the 126 priority pollutants. Reasonable potential could not be determined for all pollutants, as there are not applicable water quality criteria for all pollutants.

The RPA for Discharge Point 012A(1) demonstrated reasonable potential for discharges of chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, pentachlorophenol, and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, from the Facility to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality criteria. Reasonable potential could not be determined for all pollutants, as there are not applicable water quality criteria for all pollutants. The RPA determined that there is either no reasonable potential or there was insufficient information to conclude affirmative reasonable potential for 121 of the 126 priority pollutants.

The RPA for Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B demonstrated reasonable potential for discharges of bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate from the Facility to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality criteria. Reasonable potential could not be determined for all pollutants, as there are not applicable water quality criteria for all pollutants. The RPA for Discharge Points 012A(2) and 12B determined that there is either no reasonable potential or there was insufficient information to conclude affirmative reasonable potential for 125 of the 126 priority pollutants.

The RPA for Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015 demonstrated reasonable potential for discharges of copper, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and pentachlorophenol from the Facility to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality criteria. Reasonable potential could not be determined for all pollutants, as there are not applicable water quality criteria for all pollutants. The RPA determined that there is either no reasonable potential or there was insufficient information to conclude affirmative reasonable potential for 121 of the 126 priority pollutants.

Tables F-8 through F-11 summarize the RPAs for each pollutant reported in detectable concentrations in the effluent or the receiving water. The MECs, most stringent water quality objectives/water quality criteria (WQO/WQCs), and background concentrations (B) used in the RPA are presented, along with the RPA results (Yes or No and which trigger) for each toxic pollutant analyzed. No other pollutants with applicable, numeric water quality criteria from the NTR, CTR, and the Basin Plan were measured above detectable concentrations during the monitoring events conducted by the Permittee. Attachment F-1 to this Order summarizes the RPA for all 126 priority pollutants.

Additional details regarding selected priority pollutant constituents for which reasonable potential was found and for which reasonable potential was not found but warrant further explanation are provided following Table F-11.

Table F-8. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
1	Antimony	µg/L	6.0	0.30 (DNQ)	0.15 DNQ	No
2	Arsenic	µg/L	10	2.0	2.7	No
5a	Chromium (III)	µg/L	190 ⁴	1.0	0.85	No
5b	Chromium (VI)	µg/L	--	0.96	3.6	No
6	Copper	µg/L	8.7 ⁴	2.6	4.6	No
7	Lead	µg/L	2.9 ⁴	0.17	0.75	No

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
8	Mercury	ng/L	4 ⁵	2.9 ⁶	18 ⁶	No
9	Nickel	µg/L	49 ⁴	5.8	6.8	No
10	Selenium	µg/L	5.0	0.33 (DNQ)	0.32 DNQ	No
13	Zinc	µg/L	110 ⁴	14.8	10.4	No
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	0.05	0.05	No
26	Chloroform	µg/L	No Criteria	1.48	<0.07	Uo
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	0.33 (DNQ)	<0.08	No
68	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	1.8	0.95 (DNQ) ⁷	1.7 (DNQ)	No
79	Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	23,000	0.33 (DNQ)	<0.33	No
Not Applicable	Strontium-90	pCi/L	8.0	0.30 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
Not Applicable	Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	8.2	1.7	No
Not Applicable	Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.0	0.19	Not Available	No
Not Applicable	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	500	360	Not Available	No

Table Notes:

1. The Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) or maximum background concentration (B) is the actual detected concentration unless it is preceded by “<”, in which case the value shown is the minimum detection level as the analytical result was reported as not detected (ND).
2. The MEC or B is “Not Available” when there are no monitoring data for a constituent.
3. RPA Results:
= Yes, if MEC > WQO/WQC, or B > WQO/WQC and MEC is detected.
= No, if MEC and B or < WQO/WQC or all effluent data are undetected.
= Undetermined (UD).
4. WQO calculated using the lowest receiving water hardness of 92 mg/L.
5. Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, a slow-moving waterbody, established in the State Water Board’s *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives).
6. In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the Statewide Mercury Objectives, this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
7. The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.

Table F-9. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Point 012A(1)

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
1	Antimony	µg/L	6.0	1.0	0.088 (DNQ)	No
2	Arsenic	µg/L	10	1.8 (DNQ)	1.3 (DNQ)	No
5a	Chromium (III)	µg/L	247 ⁴	0.72	2.7	No
6	Copper	µg/L	11 ⁴	7.5	2.0	No
7	Lead	µg/L	4.2 ⁴	1.9	0.44 (DNQ)	No
8	Mercury	ng/L	4 ⁵	2.3 ⁶	4.6 ⁶	No
9	Nickel	µg/L	63 ⁴	5.1	4.7	No
10	Selenium	µg/L	5.0	0.47 (DNQ)	<0.32	No
11	Silver	µg/L	5.9 ⁴	<0.031	0.079 (DNQ)	No
13	Zinc	µg/L	144 ⁴	50.2	5.4 (DNQ)	No
14	Cyanide	µg/L	5.2	2.5 (DNQ)	1.3 (DNQ)	No
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	1.24	<0.05	Yes (Trigger 1)
26	Chloroform	µg/L	No Criteria	21.2	<0.07	Uo
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	7.12	<0.08	Yes (Trigger 1)
39	Toluene	µg/L	150	0.32 (DNQ)	0.14 (DNQ)	No
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	70	1.2 (DNQ)	<0.72	No
53	Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	0.28	3.7 (DNQ)	<1.06	Yes (Trigger 1)
54	Phenol	µg/L	21,000	0.55 (DNQ)	<0.18	No
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	1.8	1.8 (DNQ) ⁷	13.3	Yes (Trigger 2)
70	Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	3,000	0.89 (DNQ)	<0.54	No
79	Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	23,000	<0.33	0.57 (DNQ)	No
81	Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	2,700	1.1	<0.42	No
84	Din-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	No Criteria	0.88 (DNQ)	1.8	Uo
94	Naphthalene	µg/L	No Criteria	0.2	<0.17	Uo
Not Applicable	Ammonia, Total as (N)	mg/L	2.7 ⁸	4.2	<0.20	No
Not Applicable	Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	28.6	0.91	Yes (Trigger 1) ⁹
Not Applicable	Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.0	3.2	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1) ⁹
Not Applicable	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	500	580 ¹⁰	Not Available	No

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
Table Notes:						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) or maximum background concentration (B) is the actual detected concentration unless it is preceded by "<", in which case the value shown is the minimum detection level as the analytical result was reported as not detected (ND). The MEC or B is "Not Available" when there are no monitoring data for a constituent. RPA Results: = Yes, if MEC > WQO/WQC, or B > WQO/WQC and MEC is detected. = No, if MEC and B or < WQO/WQC or all effluent data are undetected. = Undetermined (UD). WQO calculated using the lowest receiving water hardness of 124 mg/L. Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to Santa Rosa Creek, a tributary of the Laguna de Santa Rosa which is a slow-moving waterbody, established in the State Water Board's <i>Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions</i> (Statewide Mercury Objectives). In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the Statewide Mercury Objectives, this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration. The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound. Ammonia criteria are determined on a sliding scale based upon temperature and pH. The criterion represented in this table is based upon chronic exposure and a temperature of 13.9°C and a pH of 8.0. Since this Order establishes an equally stringent performance-based effluent limitations for total nitrogen for protection of the receiving water against biostimulatory effects, effluent limitations for nitrite and nitrate have not been established in the Order. TDS concentrations were all less than 500 mg/L during periods of discharge. 						

Table F-10. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
1	Antimony	µg/L	6.0	0.29 (DNQ)	0.088 (DNQ)	No
2	Arsenic	µg/L	10	2.5	1.3 (DNQ)	No
5a	Chromium (III)	µg/L	247 ⁴	2.5	3.1	No
6	Copper	µg/L	11 ⁴	3.1	2.0	No
7	Lead	µg/L	4.2 ⁴	0.17 (DNQ)	0.44 (DNQ)	No
8	Mercury	ng/L	4 ⁵	1.9 ⁶	4.6 ⁶	No
9	Nickel	µg/L	63 ⁴	9.1	4.7	No
10	Selenium	µg/L	5.0	0.32 (DNQ)	<0.32	No
11	Silver	µg/L	5.9 ⁴	0.031 (DNQ)	0.079 (DNQ)	No

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
13	Zinc	µg/L	144 ⁴	15	5.4	No
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	<0.05	<0.05	No
26	Chloroform	µg/L	No Criteria	0.99	<0.07	Uo
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	0.2 (DNQ)	<0.08	No
39	Toluene	µg/L	150	<0.06	0.14 (DNQ)	No
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	1.8	0.1 (DNQ) ⁷	13.3	Yes (Trigger 2)
70	Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	3,000	0.54 (DNQ)	<0.54	No
79	Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	23,000	0.33 (DNQ)	0.57 (DNQ)	No
81	Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	2,700	0.42 (DNQ)	<0.42	No
84	Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	No Criteria	<0.52	1.8	Uo
Not Applicable	Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	9.1	0.91	No
Not Applicable	Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.0	0.13	Not Available	No
Not Applicable	Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	500	410	Not Available	No

Table Notes:

- The Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) or maximum background concentration (B) is the actual detected concentration unless it is preceded by "<", in which case the value shown is the minimum detection level as the analytical result was reported as not detected (ND).
- The MEC or B is "Not Available" when there are no monitoring data for a constituent.
- RPA Results:
= Yes, if MEC > WQO/WQC, or B > WQO/WQC and MEC is detected.
= No, if MEC and B or < WQO/WQC or all effluent data are undetected.
= Undetermined (UD).
- WQO calculated using the lowest receiving water hardness of 124 mg/L.
- Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to Santa Rosa Creek, a tributary of the Laguna de Santa Rosa which is a slow-moving waterbody, established in the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives).
- In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the Statewide Mercury Objectives, this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
- The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.

Table F-11. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
1	Antimony	µg/L	6.0	1.0	Not Available	No
2	Arsenic	µg/L	10	1.8 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
5a	Chromium (III)	µg/L	150 ⁴	0.72	Not Available	No
6	Copper	µg/L	6.7 ⁴	7.5	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1)
7	Lead	µg/L	1.9 ⁴	1.9	Not Available	No
8	Mercury	ng/L	4 ⁵	2.3 ⁶	Not Available	No
9	Nickel	µg/L	37 ⁴	5.1	Not Available	No
10	Selenium	µg/L	5.0	0.47 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
13	Zinc	µg/L	86 ⁴	50.2	Not Available	No
14	Cyanide	µg/L	5.2	2.5 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	1.24	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1)
26	Chloroform	µg/L	No Criteria	21.2	Not Available	Uo
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	7.12	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1)
39	Toluene	µg/L	150	0.32 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	70	1.2 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
53	Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	0.28	3.7 (DNQ)	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1)
54	Phenol	µg/L	21,000	0.55 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	1.8	0.3 (DNQ) ⁷	Not Available	No
70	Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	3,000	0.89 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
81	Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	2,700	1.1 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
84	Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	No Criteria	0.88 (DNQ)	Not Available	No

CTR #	Pollutant	Unit	C or Most Stringent WQO/WQC	MEC or Minimum DL ¹	B or Minimum DL ^{1,2}	RPA Results ³
94	Naphthalene	µg/L	No Criteria	0.20 (DNQ)	Not Available	Uo
110	4,4-DDD	µg/L	0.00083	0.0026 (DNQ)	Not Available	No
Not Applicable	Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	28.6	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1) ⁸
Not Applicable	Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.0	3.2	Not Available	Yes (Trigger 1) ⁸
Not Applicable	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	500	580	Not Available	No

Table Notes:

1. The Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) or maximum background concentration (B) is the actual detected concentration unless it is preceded by "<", in which case the value shown is the minimum detection level as the analytical result was reported as not detected (ND).
2. The MEC or B is "Not Available" when there are no monitoring data for a constituent.
3. RPA Results:
 = Yes, if MEC > WQO/WQC, or B > WQO/WQC and MEC is detected.
 = No, if MEC and B or < WQO/WQC or all effluent data are undetected.
 = Undetermined (UD).
4. WQO calculated using the receiving water hardness of 67.4 mg/L.
5. Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, a slow-moving waterbody, established in the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives).
6. In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the Statewide Mercury Objectives, this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
7. The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.
8. Since this Order establishes an equally stringent performance-based effluent limitations for total nitrogen for protection of the receiving water against biostimulatory effects, effluent limitations for nitrite and nitrate have not been established in the Order.

The following paragraphs provide additional details regarding priority pollutant constituents for which reasonable potential was found or for which reasonable potential was not found but further explanation is warranted. The constituents are discussed in the order they appear in Table F-8 through F-11.

Copper. Order No. R1-2013-0001 includes effluent limitations for copper at Discharge Point 015. The CTR includes hardness dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. The criteria for copper are expressed in dissolved concentrations. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The U.S. EPA default conversion factors for

copper in freshwater are 0.96 for both the acute and the chronic criteria. The default WER used for calculating criteria for copper is 1.0. Using the worst-case measured hardness from the receiving water (67.4 mg/L), the U.S. EPA recommended dissolved-total translator of 0.96, and the default WER of 1.0, the applicable chronic criterion (maximum 4-day average concentration) is 6.7 µg/L and the applicable acute criterion (maximum 1-hour average concentration) is 9.7 µg/L.

The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 015 and new Discharge Point 006A(1)) for copper 16 times during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Copper was detected in the effluent in all 16 effluent samples, with results ranging from 1.6 µg/L to 7.5 µg/L. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 7.5 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 6.7 µg/L.

Mercury. The State Water Board adopted Resolution 2017-0027 on May 2, 2017, which approved Part 2 of the *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Provisions). The Statewide Mercury Provisions establish a Sport Fish Water Quality Objective of an average 0.2 mg/kg methylmercury fish tissue concentration within a calendar year for waters with the beneficial uses of commercial and sport fishing (COMM), tribal tradition and culture (CUL), wildlife habitat (WILD), and marine habitat (MAR). This fish tissue objective corresponds to a water column concentration of 4 ng/L of total mercury for slow moving water bodies (e.g., lagoons, closed estuaries, and marshes) with COMM, CUL, WILD, MAR, and/or RARE uses. The Statewide Mercury Provisions also establish a Tribal Subsistence Fishing (T-SUB) Objective that corresponds to a water column concentration of 1 ng/L of total mercury for slow moving water bodies with T-SUB beneficial use. The Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed is a slow-moving water body and, as shown in Table F-5, the beneficial uses of the Laguna de Santa Rosa include COMM, WILD, and RARE. Therefore, the water column concentration of 4 ng/L is appropriate to translate the Sport Fish Water Quality Objective fish tissue objective for the receiving water. The Regional Water Board's current Basin Planning Program Work Plan for Fiscal Years 2018 through 2021 identifies the need to update beneficial use designations and water quality objectives. This would include updating the Basin Plan to include the T-SUB beneficial use.

The Statewide Mercury Provisions specify that the RPA shall be conducted using the maximum annual average effluent and background mercury concentrations for comparison with the Sport Fish Water Quality Objective.

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B. The MEC for mercury was 2.9 ng/L, with a maximum annual average of 2.9 ng/L, based on five samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-006B during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. The maximum annual average background concentration for mercury was 18 ng/L based on two ambient samples collected at RSW-006BU-L during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Per the RPA procedures in Section IV.D.2.c.1, Step 6 of the Statewide Mercury Provisions, a WQBEL is not required since the highest observed annual effluent mercury concentration of 2.9 ng/L is not greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L. However, since the highest observed annual receiving water mercury concentration of 18 ng/L is greater than the water column

concentration of 4 ng/L, and mercury was detected in the effluent, effluent monitoring is required.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The MEC for mercury was 2.34 ng/L, with a maximum annual average of 2.3 ng/L, based on 16 samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001 during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. The maximum annual average background concentration for mercury was 4.6 ng/L based on three ambient samples collected at RSW-012BU during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Per the RPA procedures in Section IV.D.2.c.1, Step 6 of the Statewide Mercury Provisions, a WQBEL is not required since the highest observed annual effluent mercury concentration of 2.3 ng/L is not greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L. However, since the highest observed annual receiving water mercury concentration of 4.6 ng/L is greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L, and mercury was detected in the effluent, effluent monitoring is required.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. The MEC for mercury was 2.43 ng/L, with a maximum annual average of 1.9 ng/L, based on 14 samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-012B during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. The maximum annual average background concentration for mercury was 4.6 ng/L based on three ambient samples collected at RSW-012BU during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Per the RPA procedures in Section IV.D.2.c.1, Step 6 of the Statewide Mercury Provisions, a WQBEL is not required since the highest observed annual effluent mercury concentration of 1.9 ng/L is not greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L. However, since the highest observed annual receiving water mercury concentration of 4.6 ng/L is greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L, and mercury was detected in the effluent, effluent monitoring is required.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. The MEC for mercury was 2.34 ng/L, with a maximum annual average of 2.3 ng/L, based on 16 samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001 during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. The maximum annual average background concentration for mercury was 18 ng/L based on two ambient samples collected at RSW-006BU-L during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Per the RPA procedures in Section IV.D.2.c.1, Step 6 of the Statewide Mercury Provisions, a WQBEL is not required since the highest observed annual effluent mercury concentration of 2.3 ng/L is not greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L. However, since the highest observed annual receiving water mercury concentration of 18 ng/L is greater than the water column concentration of 4 ng/L, and mercury was detected in the effluent, effluent monitoring is required.

A monitoring frequency of weekly for all discharge locations has been retained from the previous Order to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential against the Tribal Subsistence Fishing Objective of 1 ng/L after the Basin Plan has been updated to include the T-SUB beneficial use.

Chlorodibromomethane. Order No. R1-2013-0001 includes effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane at Discharge Points 006A, 006B, 012A(1), and 015. The CTR establishes a water quality objective for the protection of human health for chlorodibromomethane of 0.41 µg/L.

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B. The Permittee sampled the effluent for chlorodibromomethane at Monitoring Location EFF-006B three times and the receiving water at Monitoring Location EFF-006BU-L twice during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. All effluent and receiving water monitoring results were non-detect; therefore, a determination of no reasonable potential has been made and effluent limitations for this parameter have not been retained at Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 012A(1)) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for chlorodibromomethane 18 and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Chlorodibromomethane was detected in the effluent in 13 of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 1.24 µg/L. Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the receiving water. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 1.24 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.41 µg/L.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for chlorodibromomethane four times and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. All effluent and receiving water monitoring results were non-detect; therefore, a determination of no reasonable potential has been made and effluent limitations for this parameter have not been retained at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 015 and 006A(1)) for chlorodibromomethane 18 times during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Chlorodibromomethane was detected in the effluent in 13 of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 1.24 µg/L. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 1.24 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.41 µg/L.

Dichlorobromomethane. Order No. R1-2013-0001 includes effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane at Discharge Points 006A, 006B, 012A(1), and 015. The CTR establishes a water quality objective for the protection of human health for dichlorobromomethane of 0.56 µg/L.

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B. Dichlorobromomethane was detected but not quantified (DNQ) in the effluent, with results ranging from 0.08 µg/L to 0.33 µg/L, based on three samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (also representative of Monitoring Location 006A(2)) between February 2017 and March 2019. Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the receiving water based on two samples collected at Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-L in February 2017 and February 2019. Concentrations of dichlorobromomethane did not exceed the established water quality objective for dichlorobromomethane, therefore, a determination of no reasonable potential has been made and effluent limitations for this parameter have not been retained at Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 012A(1)) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for dichlorobromomethane 18 and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Dichlorobromomethane was detected in the effluent in 15 of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 7.12 µg/L. Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the receiving water. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 7.12 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.56 µg/L.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for dichlorobromomethane four times and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Dichlorobromomethane was detected in two of the effluent samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 0.2 µg/L (DNQ). Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the receiving water. Concentrations of dichlorobromomethane did not exceed the established water quality objective for dichlorobromomethane, therefore, a determination of no reasonable potential has been made and effluent limitations for this parameter have not been retained at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 015 and new Discharge Point 006A(1)) for dichlorobromomethane 18 times during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Dichlorobromomethane was detected in the effluent in 15 of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 7.12 µg/L. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 7.12 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.56 µg/L.

Pentachlorophenol. The CTR establishes a water quality objective for the protection of human health for pentachlorophenol of 0.28 µg/L.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 012A(1)) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for pentachlorophenol 20 and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Pentachlorophenol was detected in the effluent in two of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 3.7 µg/L (DNQ). Pentachlorophenol was not detected in the receiving water. A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 3.7 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.28 µg/L.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015) for pentachlorophenol 20 times during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Pentachlorophenol was detected in the effluent in two of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 3.7 µg/L (DNQ). A determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the MEC of 3.7 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 0.28 µg/L.

Discharge Points 006A(2), 006B, 012A(2), and 012B. Effluent and receiving water monitoring data at these discharge points showed no reasonable potential.

Bis(2 Ethylhexyl) Phthalate. The CTR establishes a water quality objective for the protection of human health for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate of 1.8 µg/L. The analytical method used for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate allows for subtraction of method blank results from corresponding effluent results because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound. In the RPAs described below the recalculated MEC is compared to the water quality objective.

Discharge Point 012A(1). The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Point 012A(1)) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate 18 and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in the effluent in 11 of the samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 2.0 µg/L (DNQ). Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in two of the receiving water samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 13.3 µg/L. Using subtraction of method blank allowance described in the paragraph above, the recalculated MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is 1.8 µg/L which is also the most stringent WQO. However, a determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the ambient background concentration of 13.3 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 1.8 µg/L.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. The Permittee sampled the effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) and receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate four times and three times, respectively, during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in three of the effluent samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 1.6 µg/L (DNQ). Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in two of the receiving water samples, with results ranging from non-detect to 13.3 µg/L. Using method blank subtraction allowance, the recalculated MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is 0.1 µg/L which is less than the most stringent WQO. However, a determination of reasonable potential has been made based on the maximum background concentration of 13.3 µg/L exceeding the most stringent water quality objective of 1.8 µg/L.

Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, and 015. Effluent and receiving water monitoring data at these discharge points showed no reasonable potential.

4. **WQBEL Calculations**

Final WQBELs have been determined using the methods described in section 1.4 of the SIP.

Step 1: To calculate the effluent limitations, an effluent concentration allowance (ECA) is calculated for each pollutant found to have reasonable potential using the following equation, which takes into account dilution and background concentrations:

$$ECA = C + D (C - B),$$

Where:

C = the applicable water quality criterion (adjusted for effluent hardness and expressed as the total recoverable metal, if necessary)

D = dilution credit (here D= 0, as the discharge does not qualify for a dilution credit)

B = background concentration

Here, no credit for dilution is allowed, which results in the ECA being equal to the applicable criterion (ECA = C).

Step 2: For each ECA based on an aquatic life criterion/objective (copper), the long-term average discharge condition (LTA) is determined by multiplying the ECA by a factor (multiplier), which adjusts the ECA to account for effluent variability. The multiplier depends on the coefficient of variation (CV) of the data set and whether it is an acute or chronic criterion/objective. Table 1 of the SIP provides pre-calculated values for the multipliers based on the values of the CV. When the data set contains less than 10 sample results, or when 80 percent or more of the data set is reported as ND, the CV is set equal to 0.6. Derivation of the multipliers is presented in section 1.4 of the SIP.

From Table 1 in the SIP, the ECA multipliers for calculating LTAs at the 99th percentile occurrence probability for copper are 0.378 (acute multiplier) and 0.586 (chronic multiplier). The LTAs are determined as follows in Table F-12.

Table F-12. Determination of Long Term Averages

Pollutant	Units	ECA			ECA Multiplier			LTA		
		Acute	Chronic 4-Day	Chronic 30-Day	Acute	Chronic 4-Day	Chronic 30-Day	Acute	Chronic 4-Day	Chronic 30-Day
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	9.65	6.66	--	0.378	0.586	--	3.64	3.90	--

Step 3: WQBELs, including an AMEL and MDEL, are calculated using the most limiting (lowest) LTA. The LTA is multiplied by a factor that accounts for averaging periods and exceedance frequencies of the effluent limitations, and for the AMEL, the effluent monitoring frequency. The CV is set equal to 0.49 for copper. The sampling frequency is set equal to 4 (n = 4) for the acute criterion and chronic 4-day criterion, and 30 (n = 30) for the chronic 30-day criterion. The 99th percentile occurrence probability was used to determine the MDEL multiplier and a 95th percentile occurrence probability was used to determine the AMEL multiplier. From Table 2 of the SIP, the MDEL multiplier for copper is 2.65 and the AMEL multiplier is 1.45. Final WQBELs for copper are determined as follows.

Final WQBELs are determined by calculating the copper impact ratio (CIR) for each of the copper standards (AMEL and MDEL). Attachment G of this Order includes a table with the AMEL and MDEL copper standards.

The copper standards are calculated by taking the variable copper criteria and multiplying it by the ECA multiplier and the appropriate AMEL and MDEL multiplier.

The copper criteria are dependent on the hardness of the receiving water. For example:

$$\text{AMEL Copper Standard} = (\text{Copper Criteria (Attachment I)} * \text{AMEL Multiplier (1.45)} * \text{ECA Multiplier (0.378)})$$

$$\text{MDEL Copper Standard} = (\text{Copper Criteria (Attachment I)} * \text{MDEL Multiplier (2.65)} * \text{ECA Multiplier (0.378)})$$

The CIR, or final WQBEL, is determined by dividing the copper concentration in each sample by the appropriate copper standard (AMEL and MDEL). If the CIR is greater than 1.0 then the Permittee is not in compliance with the CIR effluent limitation.

Step 4: When the most stringent water quality criterion/objective is a human health criterion/objective (as for chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, pentachlorophenol, bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, nitrate, and nitrite the AMEL is set equal to the ECA. From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 1.23 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 5.90, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 2.17 (for chlorodibromomethane). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 1.33 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 6.29, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 2.26 (for dichlorobromomethane). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 0.60 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 3.11, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 1.55 (for pentachlorophenol). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 0.54 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 2.86, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 1.49 (for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at Discharge Points 012A(1) and 015). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 0.6 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 3.11, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 1.55 (for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 0.23 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 1.66, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 1.20 (for nitrate). From Table 2 of the SIP, when CV = 1.79 and n = 4, the MDEL multiplier at the 99th percentile occurrence probability equals 7.92, and the AMEL multiplier at the 95th percentile occurrence probability equals 2.63 (for nitrite). The MDEL for protection of human health is calculated by multiplying the ECA by the ratio of the MDEL multiplier to the AMEL multiplier. Final WQBELs for chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, pentachlorophenol, bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, nitrate, and nitrite are determined as follows.

Table F-13. Determination of Final WQBELs Based on Human Health Criteria

Pollutant	ECA (µg/L)	MDEL/AMEL	MDEL (µg/L)	AMEL (µg/L)
Chlorodibromomethane ¹	0.41	2.7	1.1	0.41
Dichlorobromomethane ¹	0.56	2.8	1.6	0.56
Pentachlorophenol	0.28	2.0	0.56	0.28
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate ²	1.8	1.9	3.6 ²	1.8
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N) ^{1,3}	10	1.4	14	10
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N) ^{1,3}	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0

Table Notes:

- For Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015.
- For Discharge Points 012A(1), 012A(2), and 012B.
- These calculations are shown for formality due to a finding of reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite. Since this Order establishes an equally stringent performance-based effluent limitation for total nitrogen for protection of the receiving water against biostimulatory effects, effluent limits for nitrate and nitrite have not been established in this Order.

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

Monitoring and effluent limitations for whole effluent toxicity protect the receiving water from the aggregate effect of a mixture of pollutants that may be present in the effluent. 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 test is conducted over a longer period of time and may measure mortality, reproduction, and/or growth.

WET requirements are derived from the CWA and the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan establishes a narrative water quality objective for toxicity that states “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, or aquatic life.*” Detrimental responses may include, but are not limited to, decreased growth rate, decreased reproductive success of resident or indicator species, and/or significant alterations in population, community ecology, or receiving water biota. For compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Permittee to conduct WET testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the MRP (Attachment E, section V).

a. Acute Aquatic Toxicity

Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order includes an effluent limitation for acute toxicity in accordance with the Basin Plan, which requires that the average survival of test organisms in undiluted effluent for any three consecutive 96-hour bioassay tests be at least 90 percent, with no single test having less than 70 percent survival.

The Order implements federal guidelines (Regions 9 and 10 Guidelines for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Programs) by requiring the Permittee to conduct acute toxicity tests on a fish species and on an invertebrate species to determine the most sensitive species. According to the U.S. EPA manual, *Methods for Estimating the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms* (EPA/600/4-90/-27F), the acceptable vertebrate species for the acute toxicity test are the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* and the rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. The acceptable invertebrate species for the acute toxicity test are the water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*, *Daphnia magna*, and *D. pulex*. This Order requires the Permittee to conduct a screening test using a vertebrate and invertebrate species. After the screening test is completed, monitoring can be reduced to the most sensitive species. Attachment E of this Order requires annual acute WET monitoring.

During the term of the previous permit, the Permittee monitored for acute toxicity three times. All samples had 100% survival. However, this Order retains the acute toxicity effluent limitation in section IV.A.2.a.iii as a standard permit requirement and annual monitoring during periods of discharge has been retained in recognition of the fact that municipal wastewater effluent may contain pollutants that could result in acute toxicity, thus continued data collection is needed to assess reasonable potential during this permit term.

b. Chronic Aquatic Toxicity

The SIP requires the use of short-term chronic toxicity tests to determine compliance with the narrative toxicity objectives for aquatic life in the Basin Plan. The SIP requires that the Permittee demonstrate the presence or absence of chronic toxicity using tests on the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*, the water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*, and

the freshwater alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (also named *Raphidocelis subcapitata*). Attachment E of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the narrative toxicity objective.

The Permittee conducted chronic toxicity testing using *P. promelas*, *C. dubia*, and *S. capricornutum*. The following tables summarize the chronic toxicity testing results from the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001.

Table F-14. Summary of Chronic Toxicity Results at Monitoring Location EFF-006B

Date	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		<i>Pimephales promelas</i> ¹		<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
February 14, 2017	1	1	2 ² /1.3 ³	1	1
March 6, 2017	--	--	1	1	--
March 4, 2019	1	1	1	1	1

Table Notes:

- Per the analytical laboratory reports, statistical analyses indicated that one or more of the test replicates at certain treatments (e.g., receiving water control, 12.5% effluent treatment) were statistical outliers. Per the U.S. EPA method manual identified in section V.B.4 of Attachment E to this Order, the laboratory report provided analyses both with and without the outlier data. The reports did not provide an explanation for the cause of the outliers. Section 3.1 of Appendix A of the method manual states, "An outlier is an *inconsistent or questionable data point that appears unrepresentative of the general trend exhibited by the majority of the data. Outliers may be detected by tabulation of the data, plotting, and by an analysis of the residuals. An explanation should be sought for any questionable data points. Without an explanation, data points should be discarded only with extreme caution. If there is no explanation, the analysis should be performed both with and without the outlier, and the results of both analyses should be reported.*"
- Outliers excluded from results.
- Outliers included in results.

Table F-15. Summary of Chronic Toxicity Results at Monitoring Location EFF-012B

Date	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> ¹		<i>Pimephales promelas</i> ¹		<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
March 17, 2016	1	1	--	--	1
May 2, 2016	--	--	1	1	--
January 17, 2017	1	1	1	1	1
April 11, 2017	1	1 ² /1 ³	1	1	1
March 4, 2019	1	1	1	1	1

Date	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> ¹		<i>Pimephales promelas</i> ¹		<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUC)	Reproduction (TUC)	Survival (TUC)	Growth (TUC)	Growth (TUC)
Table Notes:					
1. Per the analytical laboratory reports, statistical analyses indicated that one or more of the test replicates at certain treatments (e.g., receiving water control, 12.5% effluent treatment) were statistical outliers. Per the U.S. EPA method manual identified in section V.B.4 of Attachment E to this Order, the laboratory report provided analyses both with and without the outlier data. The reports did not provide an explanation for the cause of the outliers. Section 3.1 of Appendix A of the method manual states, “An outlier is an <i>inconsistent or questionable data point that appears unrepresentative of the general trend exhibited by the majority of the data. Outliers may be detected by tabulation of the data, plotting, and by an analysis of the residuals. An explanation should be sought for any questionable data points. Without an explanation, data points should be discarded only with extreme caution. If there is no explanation, the analysis should be performed both with and without the outlier, and the results of both analyses should be reported.</i> ”					
2. Outliers excluded from results.					
3. Outliers included in results.					

Chronic toxicity to *P. promelas* survival was observed in the Monitoring Location EFF-006B sample on February 14, 2017. The laboratory determined that pathogen related toxicity in the February 14, 2017 *P. promelas* sample overestimated the presence and/or magnitude of toxicity, so *P. promelas* was tested again on March 6, 2017 and no toxicity to *P. promelas* survival was observed. The laboratory also detected pathogen related toxicity in the *P. Promelas* test conducted on the March 17, 2016 sample from Monitoring Location EFF-012B, so testing was ceased after 6 days and *P. promelas* was tested again on May 2, 2016 with no toxicity to *P. promelas* observed. Based on these test results, the Regional Water Board concludes that the discharge has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. Therefore, this Order does not establish a narrative effluent limitation for chronic toxicity.

Numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations have not been included in the Order for consistency with the SIP, which implements narrative toxicity objectives in basin plans and specifies use of a numeric trigger for accelerated monitoring and implementation of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in the event that persistent toxicity is detected. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-0012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, “*In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works, that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits.*” The process to revise the state’s toxicity

control provisions is underway. The State Water Board is developing a toxicity amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (toxicity amendment) that will standardize the regulation of aquatic toxicity for all non-oceanic surface waters. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limitations in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the state's toxicity control provisions are under revision, it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity at this time. The permit may be modified, if necessary, to incorporate new statewide toxicity criteria established by toxicity amendment.

This Order includes a reopener that allows the Regional Water Board to reopen the Order and include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a revised acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE.

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the Permittee is required to conduct chronic WET testing at Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 012A(1), 012A(2), 012B, and 015 as specified in the MRP (Attachment E, section V.B). Furthermore, the MRP (Attachment E, section V.C) requires the Permittee to investigate the causes of and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates toxicity with a result of "Fail" in 100 percent effluent, the Permittee is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan. The "Pass/Fail" trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Permittee is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as the threshold to initiate a TRE if a pattern of effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

c. Test of Significant Toxicity (TST)

Order No. R1-2013-0001 established a numeric chronic toxicity trigger of 1.0 TUc = 100/NOEC, using a five-concentration hypothesis test. In 2010, U.S. EPA endorsed the peer-reviewed *Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) two-concentration hypothesis testing approach in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010) as an improved hypothesis-testing tool to evaluate data from U.S. EPA's toxicity test methods. The TST hypothesis testing approach more reliably identifies toxicity—in relation to the chronic (0.25 or more) mean response of regulatory management concern—than the No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) hypothesis-testing approach. The TST hypothesis testing approach more reliably identifies toxicity – in relation to the acute (0.20 or more) mean responses of regulatory management concern – than the NOEC approach used previously to establish effluent limitations for acute toxicity.

Since the TST approach has not previously been applied for determining reasonable potential or establishing effluent limitations for acute toxicity, this Order does not include effluent limitations for acute or chronic toxicity based on the TST approach. However, this Order does require the Permittee to monitor and report results in a manner that will allow the Regional Water Board to conduct an RPA in accordance with the TST approach at the time of the next permit renewal.

The State Water Board is developing a toxicity amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* that will standardize the regulation of aquatic toxicity for all non-oceanic surface waters. U.S. EPA's TST approach is an

essential component of this draft toxicity amendment as it forms the basis for utilizing numeric water quality objectives and acts as the primary means of determining compliance with the proposed effluent limitations.

In a letter dated February 12, 2014, the State Water Board submitted an alternative test process (ATP) request to U.S. EPA Region 9 for the statewide use of a two-concentration toxicity test design when using the TST approach. This two-concentration test design is composed of a single effluent concentration and a control concentration. U.S. EPA approved the ATP request on March 17th, 2014. In June 2014, the approval was challenged in court on procedural grounds under the Administrative Procedures Act by the Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works (SCAP) and the Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA). The U.S. EPA withdrew the approval and notified the State Water Board in a memo dated February 11, 2015.

It is important to note that U.S. EPA's rescission of its approval of the ATP is not based on the substantive TST statistical analysis or the scientific validity of a two-concentration test design. The withdrawal letter also states that currently there is a proposed rulemaking to change the language in the ATP regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The benefits of requiring the TST in new or amended permits include improving the statistical power of the toxicity test and simplifying the analysis as compared to the traditional hypothesis statistical approaches or point estimates. The calculations are straightforward and provide a clear pass/fail result. With the withdrawal of the two-concentration test design approval, an NPDES permit can still require the TST for statistical analyses. Toxicity tests shall be run using a multi-concentration test design in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 136.3, and the TST shall be utilized with the biological responses from the permitted in-stream waste concentration (IWC) and the control (effluent concentration of zero). However, even with only two of the five concentration biological responses being used, cost savings in the form of time and effort are still realized for the statistical analysis and data interpretation carried out by the Permittee, lab, and permit manager. This Order requires application of the TST for statistical analysis of whole effluent toxicity data.

Tests of Significant Toxicity Design

The TST's null hypothesis for chronic toxicity is:

H_0 : Mean response (IWC in % effluent) \leq 0.75 mean response (control)

Results are analyzed using the TST approach and an acceptable level of chronic toxicity is demonstrated by rejecting the null hypothesis and reporting "Pass" or "P".

The chronic IWC (in % effluent) for Discharge Points 006A(1), 006A(2), 006B, 012A(1), 012A(2), 012B, and 015 is 100%. The chronic toxicity trigger is expressed as a null hypothesis (H_0) and regulatory management decision (b value) of 0.75 for the chronic toxicity methods in the MRP. The null hypothesis for this discharge is:

H_0 : Mean response (100% effluent) \leq 0.75 mean response (control)

Results shall be analyzed using the TST hypothesis testing approach in section V.B.6.a of the MRP. Compliance with this chronic toxicity limitation is demonstrated by rejecting the null hypothesis and reporting "Pass" or "P".

When the chronic toxicity test results in a "Fail" or "F," the Permittee must initiate accelerated monitoring as specified in the MRP (Attachment E, section V). After accelerated monitoring, if conditions of chronic toxicity are found to persist, the Permittee will be required to conduct a TRE, as described by the MRP.

Notification requirements for chronic WET testing include a 72-hour verbal notification requirement and a 14-day written report requirement, if test results indicate toxicity. The 14-day written notification is established in the U.S. EPA WET Guidance documents cited in the MRP. The 72-hour verbal notification requirement is being added to provide the Regional Water Board with knowledge of the toxicity in advance of the written report. The 72-hour requirement is intended to give the Permittee sufficient time to make a telephone call to Regional Water Board staff and accounts for non-working days (e.g., weekends). Verbal notification of WET test exceedances may be left by voice mail if the Regional Water Board staff person is not immediately available by telephone.

This Order includes a requirement for the Permittee to conduct a screening test using at least one vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species. After the screening test is completed, monitoring can be reduced to the most sensitive species.

Chronic WET limitations will be established if future monitoring results demonstrate that discharges from the Facility are causing or contributing to chronic toxicity in the receiving water.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Anti-Backsliding Requirements

Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in Order No. R1-2013-0001, with the exception of effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane at Discharge Points 006A(2), 006B, 012A(2) and 012B.

Order No. R1-2013-0001 included effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane based on the CTR human health criteria. Chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane were not detected in the effluent based on three results each at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (representative of Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B) and four results each at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. Chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane were not detected in the receiving water based on two results each at Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-L and three results each at Monitoring Location RSW-012BU during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001. The concentration of chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane in the effluent and receiving water did not exceed the CTR human health criteria, and the data demonstrate that the discharge no longer demonstrates reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the water quality objectives at Discharge Points 006A(2), 006B, 012A(2), and 012B. The updated effluent data for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane constitutes new information, which permits the removal of effluent limitations consistent with CWA section 402(o)(2)(B). Therefore, this Order does not retain effluent limitations for

chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane at Discharge Points 006A(2), 006B, 012A(2), and 012B.

Reasonable potential for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane was found at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015. The calculation of the MDEL for both of these pollutants resulted in slightly higher effluent limitations than the previous permit. Establishment of these higher effluent limitations is allowed under the antibacksliding exception at CWQ section 402(0)(2)(B) which allows the use of new information in the calculation of new effluent limitations. In addition, the previous permit incorrectly established an effluent limitation of 0.401 ug/L for chlorodibromomethane that was carried over to the public review draft of this Order. The original publication of 40 CFR Part 131 Publication (5/18/00) included an incorrect objective of 0.401 µg/L for chlorodibromomethane, which was corrected to 0.41 µg/L in Federal Register Vol. 66, No. 30 (2/13/01). This Order has been revised to include the correct chlorodibromomethane effluent limitation of 0.41 ug/L as allowed by Clean Water Act section 402(o)(2)(B)(ii) which provides that “technical mistakes or mistaken interpretation of the law were used”.

2. Antidegradation Policies

State Water Board Resolution 68-16, the Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California (the Antidegradation Policy) requires that disposal of waste into waters of the state be regulated to achieve the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state. The quality of some waters is higher than established by adopted policies and that higher quality water shall be maintained to the maximum extent possible consistent with the Antidegradation Policy. The Antidegradation Policy requires that (1) higher quality water will be maintained until it has been demonstrated to the state that any change will be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of the water, and will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the policies; and (2) any activity that produces a waste or may produce waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and discharges to existing high quality water will be required to meet waste discharge requirements that will result in the best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) of the discharge necessary to assure pollution or nuisance will not occur, and the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.

This Order authorizes the Permittee to increase its production of recycled water from 21.34 mgd to 25.9 mgd. The increased volume of tertiary treated water will be beneficially reused at multiple Subregional System projects, including the Geysers Recharge Project and the Santa Rosa Urban Reuse Project, and will not result in an increase in discharge volume to surface water from the surface water outfall locations.

To maintain treatment at current levels, and thus avoiding any degradation that could occur if discharge levels increased over current performance, this Order includes a final effluent limitation for total nitrogen based on past treatment performance of the WWTP. Because the concentration parameter is a more accurate measure of treatment plant performance than a mass emission rate, which is dependent on flow rate which can vary greatly over time and is largely out of the control of the operator, Regional Water Board staff calculated treatment plant performance for total nitrogen using effluent concentration data for nitrate, nitrite, and total organic nitrogen obtained from the Permittee’s self-monitoring reports and translated the calculated value into a final concentration-based effluent limitation that is

protective of water quality and will prevent degradation. Details of the development of the concentration based WQBEL for total nitrogen are described in section IV.C.4.a of this Fact Sheet.

Discharges from the Facility are required to maintain protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving water and comply with applicable provisions of the Basin Plan.

This Order is consistent with applicable federal and state antidegradation policies, as it does not authorize the discharge of increased concentrations of pollutants or increased volumes of treated wastewater beyond that which was permitted to discharge in accordance with Order No. R1-2013-0001.

3. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD₅, TSS, and total coliform bacteria. Restrictions on these pollutants are discussed in section IV.B of this Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations for total nitrogen, total phosphorus, pH, copper, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane, and pentachlorophenol, and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, that are more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements but are necessary to meet water quality standards. These requirements are discussed in section IV.C.3 of the Fact Sheet.

WQBELs have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. Most beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA*" pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

The Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13263, including the provisions of Water Code section 13241, in establishing these requirements.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations

This Order does not establish interim effluent limitations.

F. Land Discharge Specifications and Requirements – Not Applicable.

G. Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements

Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements are contained in section IV.C of the Order. The Permittee and the City of Rohnert Park have obtained coverage separately under the Recycled Water General Order to distribute recycled water to authorized use sites; therefore, this Order does not include specifications or requirements for uses of recycled water. All of the water recycling specifications are based on the technical capabilities of the wastewater treatment system and levels required by the Basin Plan and title 22.

1. Scope and Authority

Section 13263 of the Water Code requires the Regional Water Board to prescribe requirements for proposed discharges, existing discharges, or material changes in an existing discharge based upon the conditions of the disposal area or receiving waters upon or into which the discharge is made or proposed. The prescribed requirements shall implement any relevant water quality control plans that have been adopted, and shall take into consideration the beneficial uses to be protected, the water quality objectives reasonably required for that purpose, other waste discharges, the need to prevent nuisance, and the provisions of Water Code section 13241. In prescribing requirements, the Regional Water Board is not obligated to authorize the full waste assimilation capacities of the receiving water.

Water Code section 13241 requires the Regional Water Board to establish water quality objectives in water quality control plans as in its judgment will ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses and prevention of nuisance, recognizing that it may be possible for the quality of water to be changed to some degree without unreasonably affecting beneficial uses. The Basin Plan establishes water quality objectives specific to the North Coast Region for the protection of past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water. Factors required for consideration during development of applicable water quality objectives, such as the characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, economic considerations, and other factors required in accordance with section 13241 were considered during the Basin Planning and adoption process.

Here, the Regional Water Board considered all of these factors when developing the waste discharge requirements for the recycled water discharge. Limitations for BOD₅, TSS, total coliform, and pH were derived based upon the treatment capability of the Facility in order to implement water quality objectives that protect the beneficial uses of both surface and groundwater. Both beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to state law, and then submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA. In addition, discharge prohibitions were included to prohibit the use of untreated or partially treated wastewater for recycling.

The Regional Water Board considered the factors set forth in Water Code section 13241, including the consideration of past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of the receiving water, which the Regional Water Board anticipates to be the same as set forth in the Basin Plan. The Regional Water Board considered the environmental characteristics, including water quality of the Santa Rosa Hydrologic Subarea of the Russian River Hydrologic Unit, the coordinated control of all factors that affect water quality in the area, and the need to develop and use recycled water, which this Order supports. The Permittee did not submit any evidence regarding whether the waste discharge requirements for recycled water discharges would interfere with the development of needed housing within the region or the costs of compliance, particularly anything to show that the costs of compliance with the Order would be unmanageable.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

- a. **Beneficial Uses.** Beneficial use designations for groundwater established in the Basin Plan include MUN, AGR, IND, and PRO.

- b. **Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives.** The Basin Plan contains narrative objectives for tastes and odors, bacteria, radioactivity, and chemical constituents (including those chemicals that adversely affect agricultural water supply) that apply to groundwater.

3. Determining the Need for Requirements for Water Recycling

Section IV.C of this Order contains Water Recycling Specifications and Requirements to ensure that the recycled water produced by this Facility meets minimum requirements for the protection of groundwater and surface water. The Water Recycling Specifications are established in this Order to conform to requirements contained in title 22, division 4, chapter 3 of the CCR for the recycling use of disinfected tertiary-2.2 recycled water. The Permittee is required to comply with applicable state and local requirements regarding the production and use of recycled wastewater, including requirements of Water Code sections 13500 – 13577 (Water Reuse) and DDW regulations at title 22, sections 60301 – 60357 of the CCR (Water Recycling Criteria). The Permittee and the City of Rohnert Park have also obtained coverage separately under State Water Board Order No. WQ 2016-0068-DDW, Water Reclamation Requirements for Recycled Water Use (Recycled Water General Order) to regulate recycled water distribution and use. As such, this Order does not include use area requirements, rather only contains requirements that apply to the production and storage of recycled water.

- a. **BOD₅ and TSS.** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order includes discharge specifications for BOD₅ and TSS that consist of a monthly average of 10 mg/L and a weekly average of 15 mg/L. These levels are technically achievable based on the capability of the tertiary treatment system. These specifications are included in the Order to ensure that discharges to the recycled water system receive proper treatment.
- b. **pH.** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order includes instantaneous minimum and maximum effluent limitations for pH of 6.0 and 9.0, respectively, based on the technology-based effluent limitations required by U.S. EPA pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 133. These pH limitations are included in the Order to ensure that pH levels are appropriate for the protection of groundwater when discharging to the recycled water system.
- c. **Coliform Bacteria.** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order includes recycled water specifications for total coliform bacteria that reflect standards for tertiary treated recycled water adopted by DDW in title 22 of the CCR and are included to ensure that recycled water quality is protective of human health. This Order changes the compliance determination method for coliform bacteria at the recommendation of DDW. Order No. R1-2013-0001 required that compliance be determined through calculation of the geometric mean of UV channel results. This Order requires compliance to be determined based on the maximum UV channel result. This Facility was designed to meet title 22 treatment and disinfection standards suitable for the broad range of recycled water uses identified in title 22, including irrigation of urban landscapes and crops produced for human consumption.

Due to the age of the UV disinfection system and the more stringent method for determining compliance with coliform bacteria standards under this Order, the Permittee is concerned that it may not be able to meet coliform bacteria effluent limitations at all times. In letters dated December 16, 2019 and April 16, 2020, the Permittee requested an in-permit compliance schedule to complete construction of a new UV disinfection system and interim total coliform limits to allow time to meet total

coliform limitations. The Order was revised after the public comment period to include a compliance schedule requiring the Permittee to complete its UV disinfection system upgrade within the term of this Order. The final compliance date set in the compliance schedule in section VI.C.7 of the Order by July 31, 2025. The Order was not revised to include interim limitations for total coliform. Regional Water Board staff consulted with DDW staff in this regard. DDW staff are concerned that allowing total coliform limits that are less stringent than the Title 22 limits that have been set for protection of public health would be inappropriate. In addition, Regional Water Board staff have observed that the Permittee has made vast improvements in the operation and maintenance of its UV disinfection system that have resulted in greatly improved levels of compliance with the total coliform limitations. These improvements must be continued in order to achieve a high level of compliance with total coliform effluent limitations until completion of the Permittee's UV disinfection upgrade.

- d. **Water Recycling Capacity.** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order requires that the Permittee maintain, at a minimum, a total water recycling capacity of 4,015 million gallons for Geysers recharge and maintain the capability to irrigate 2,590 million gallons per year. This provision is consistent with the Incremental Recycled Water Program (IRWP) developed by the Permittee as a means of planning for future flows to the Facility. The Master Plan for the IRWP has been designed to meet the Facility's capacity requirements and manages flows with a mixture of conservation and reuse.

This provision also implements the Regional Water Board's intent for continued application of the Interim Action Plan (1986-1990) for the Santa Rosa Area, which was included in the Basin Plan in 1987 through Regional Water Board Resolution No. 87-58.

- e. **Title 22 Engineering Report.** This Order requires the Permittee to implement a DDW-approved title 22 Engineering Report that demonstrates compliance with Statewide Water Recycling Criteria in title 22, division 4, chapter 3 of the CCR. The Permittee's most recent title 22 engineering report was accepted by DDW by letter dated February 12, 2020.

4. **Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy**

The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. This Order does not provide for an increase in the volume and mass of pollutants discharged. The discharge will not have significant impacts on the beneficial uses of groundwater because the Order does not authorize the discharge of treated wastewater to groundwater.

As further discussed in MRP section VIII.C and Fact Sheet section VII.E.2, the City of Santa Rosa's May 2013 Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) prepared to satisfy requirements of the State Water Board's Recycled Water Policy and the State Sustainable Groundwater Management Act recommends the development of a monitoring and reporting program to support the refinement of the SNMP in the future. This is necessary to ensure the preservation and maintenance of high-quality groundwater. Groundwater monitoring requirements have been included in MRP section VIII.C to implement these requirements.

H. **Other Requirements**

This Order contains additional specifications that apply to the Facility including:

- a. Filtration Rate.** Order R1-2013-0001 includes a provision requiring that wastewater be filtered at a rate that does not exceed 5 gallons per minute per square foot (gal/min/ft²) of filter surface area, based on the definition of filtered wastewater found in title 22, section 60301.320 of the CCR. The title 22 definition is used as a reasonable performance standard to demonstrate that advanced treated wastewater has been coagulated and adequately filtered for removal of pathogens and for conditioning of water prior to the disinfection process. On October 18, 2013 the California Department of Public Health approved and on February 20, 2014 the Regional Water Board Executive Officer approved the Permittee's October 2, 2012 *Filter Loading Evaluation for Water Reuse* study (FLEWR Study) and June 22, 2013 Standard Operating Procedure For Filter Operation Above 5 gpm/ft², which demonstrated no significant change in filtration effectiveness at a loading rate of 7.5 gal/min/ft². Therefore, this Order authorizes an increased filtration rate based on the FLEWR study and the Permittee's compliance with conditions of approval established by DDW.
 - b. Turbidity.** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order specifies that the turbidity of the filtered wastewater not exceed an average of 2 NTU during any 24-hour period; 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and 10 NTU at any time, and is based on the definition of filtered wastewater found in title 22 section 60301.320 of the CCR. The title 22 definition is used as a reasonable performance standard to ensure adequate removal of turbidity upstream of the disinfection facilities. Properly designed and operated effluent filters will meet this standard. The point of compliance for the turbidity requirements is a point following the effluent filters and before discharge to the disinfection system. The Permittee plans to use chemical addition to supplement microfiltration if limitations for turbidity are exceeded. In addition, this Order specifies more stringent turbidity specifications of 1.5 NTU during any 24-hour period, 2.5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and 5 NTU at any time based on the findings of the FLEWR Study and the October 18, 2013 CDPH acceptance letter and more recently the February 12, 2020 DDW title 22 report acceptance letter.
- 5. Disinfection Process Requirements for the UV Disinfection System.** The Order contains monitoring requirements for the UV disinfection system in section IV.D.2. These requirements are needed to determine compliance with requirements for recycled wastewater systems, established at CCR title 22, division 4, chapter 3 and to ensure that the disinfection process achieves effective pathogen reduction. The Order and MRP include UV disinfection requirements as recommended by the California Department of Health Services (CDPH, now State Water Board Division of Drinking Water (DDW)) in an August 29, 2012 letter (subject line: Laguna Water Reclamation Facility, UV Checkpoint Bioassay Results) and DDW in a February 12, 2020 letter (subject line: City of Santa Rosa Summary and Compilation of Title 22 Engineering Reports for Production, Distribution, and Use of Recycled Water (4990004-701)).

UV system operation requirements are necessary to ensure that adequate UV dosage is applied to the wastewater to inactivate pathogens (e.g., viruses, bacteria) in the wastewater. UV dosage is dependent on several factors such as UV transmittance, UV power setting, and wastewater flow through the UV system. Minimum dosage requirements are based on recommendations by DDW and guidelines established by the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research (AWWARF) "*Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse*" first published in

December 2000 revised as a Third Edition dated August 2012. Furthermore, a Memorandum dated November 1, 2004, issued by DDW to Regional Water Board Executive Officers recommended that provisions be included in permits for water recycling treatment plants employing UV disinfection requiring permittees to establish fixed cleaning frequency of quartz sleeves as well as include provisions that specify minimum delivered UV dose that must be maintained (as recommended by the NWRI/AWWARF UV Disinfection Guidelines). Minimum UV dosage requirements specified in section IV.D.2 of the Order ensures that adequate disinfection of wastewater will be achieved.

The Permittee submitted a UV disinfection system operation and maintenance plan (UV O&M Plan) in November 2012 and updates on April 26, 2018. This update included a supplement to the O&M plan and standard operating procedures for “Plant Effluent Off-Spec Condition Response.” Attachment A of the UV O&M Plan includes the Emergency Response Plan required by IV.D.2.n of the Order.

DDW reviewed the Permittee’s UV disinfection system during an inspection on July 31, 2018 to assess the Permittee’s compliance with permit requirements related to the UV disinfection system. DDW documented the findings of this inspection in a letter dated November 5, 2018. DDW found that the Permittee is properly operating and maintaining its UV disinfection system, but that UV disinfection has issues with excessive biofilm growth that leads to occasional permit excursions due to the age and design of the system. The system was designed with medium pressure lamps that emit broad spectrum output of UV and visible light at multiple wavelengths and the visible light emitted from UV lamps may promote algae growth in UV reactors and surrounding piping. DDW recommended that the Permittee revise the UV Operations and Maintenance Plan to reflect a written operations procedure for plant off spec automated diversion system operations and submit this document to DDW staff for review and acceptance and improve UV channel cleaning practices and other measures that will prevent biological growth in the UV channels. DDW further recommended that the Regional Water Board require monitoring of daily bacteriological sampling results as either an individual reported value for each operational channel or a maximum reported value of all operational channels and replacement of the UV disinfection system if biofilm issues and violations of total coliform effluent limitations continue to occur.

6. **Storage Ponds.** Storage pond requirements are included in section IV.D.3 of the Order to ensure that future recycled water storage ponds are constructed in a manner that protects groundwater and complies with requirements of the Water Code and title 27 of the CCR.

I. Compliance Determination for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations for Total Phosphorus (Compliance Determination Section VII.O)

Two alternative methods of complying with the No Net Loading effluent limitation for Total Phosphorus have been included in this Permit. The Nutrient Offset Program included in Order No. R1-2013-0001 has been removed. All unused credits previously approved under the NOP shall be transferred to the WQTF accounting system.

1. The first compliance option is to utilize the WQTF included in this Order as Attachment I. The WQTF was developed through a three-year collaborative stakeholder process led by Sonoma and Gold Ridge Resource Conservation Districts and funded by a Conservation Innovation Grant issued by the US Department of Agriculture. The WQTF is a revised and expanded version of the previous Nutrient Offset Program and was designed to replace it.

The WQTF is intended to provide a method for complying with the “no net loading” effluent limitation for total phosphorus and to maximize the environmental benefits derived from the expenditure of limited funding for water quality protection actions by promoting restoration actions that will improve the Laguna de Santa Rosa’s ability to assimilate pollutants of concern.

For the purpose of this Order, the WQTF as adopted by the Regional Water Board by Resolution No. R1-2018-0025 on July 11, 2018 has been modified as follows:

- a. To allow direct approval of projects without requiring a pre-qualified practice in order to reduce the time it takes for project approval (section 7.4 of the WQTF in Attachment I).
 - b. To extend the maximum allowable credit banking period. The WQTF adopted as part of this Order allows credits generated by a project to have a credit banking period that may be for the duration of the project life when that project has received a reduced retirement ratio (section 6.3 of the WQTF in Attachment I).
 - c. To clarify that the WQTF does not prescribe a maximum project life (section 6.2 of the WQTF in Attachment I).
 - d. To clarify that credits generated from a project using different practices may be assigned different banking periods which are dependent upon each practice (section 6.2 of the WQTF in Attachment I).
 - e. To clarify the required elements of a plan for remedy resulting from a material failure of a project to meet approved practice standards or other requirements of an approved Credit Project Plan (section 8.3 of the WQTF in Attachment I).
2. The second method of compliance is through the use of a new Alternative Total Phosphorus Compliance Option (ACO). The ACO is intended to be used for this single permit term to provide a means to support the WQTF through the implementation of a project that would provide uplift to the main stem Laguna de Santa Rosa. The ACO is a short-term solution to supporting the long-term goal of restoring the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The ACO requirements are designed with the intent that any restoration projects proposed and implemented through the ACO are above and beyond what the WQTF requires. This included a careful analysis of the total mass of phosphorus discharged from the Facility over the last five years and the application of a protective trading ratio and an additional margin of safety, as discussed further, below.

The ACO is equally protective of water quality as the WQTF Option identified in item 1, above, by ensuring that restoration project(s) occur on the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa and that two pre-qualified practices are developed consistent with the WQTF. Resolution R1-2018-0025 approving the WQTF states, “Staff notes that impairments in the Laguna de Santa Rosa are in part driven by ongoing external loads of nutrients, sediment, and oxygen-demanding material. However, there is also a significant role played by internal recycling of past inputs, including regeneration of nutrients from legacy sediment deposits and creation of biomass (and associated oxygen demand) by aquatic plant growth and decay. These conditions underlie the Laguna de Santa Rosa’s current lack of assimilative capacity for additional phosphorus loads, and the consequent need for both pollutant source controls and restoration actions in the watershed.”

The ACO requires the Permittee to develop two pre-qualified practices and to implement restoration project(s) that meet specified criteria, as described in section VII.O.2 of the Order, designed to address legacy impacts of phosphorus through the removal of nutrient-laden sediment and/or other restoration work in the mainstem Laguna de Santa Rosa. The restoration project(s) shall not only help to address legacy phosphorus impairments, but also provide ongoing benefits by adding assimilative capacity to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The restoration project(s) selected shall also provide auxiliary benefits such as wildlife habitat and increased riparian vegetation. In addition, the restoration project(s) shall be specifically designed to increase dissolved oxygen levels and reduce water temperature. The restoration project(s) are intended to support the long-term goal of restoring the Laguna de Santa Rosa. This approach is consistent with a BMP based approach to comply with the “No Net Loading” phosphorus limitation. As with the WQTF Option, the ACO is a stricter interpretation of the “No Net Loading” effluent limitation and requires the Permittee to meet specific performance criteria with a margin of safety included to ensure that the final limitation is met. Any restoration project(s) implemented under the ACO are required to result in removal of twice as much phosphorus as was discharged over the last permit term to ensure that the “No Net Loading” limitation is met.

The Order further requires that the selected restoration project(s) will meet all specified performance criteria, as described in section VII.O.2 of this Order and be designed to remove at least 44,876 pounds of phosphorus. This number is based on the 22,438 pounds of phosphorus discharged over the last permit term (as further described under the heading “Phosphorus Discharged, below) multiplied by the sum of two factors: (1) a factor of 1.5 to ensure the project itself generates environmental benefit, and (2) a margin of safety factor of 0.5 to ensure the environmental benefit is retained in the event of unusually large phosphorus discharges by the Permittee over the permit term.

This equation for calculating the mass of phosphorus required to be removed or reduced by the ACO is as follows:

$$PR = (TR + MOS) * PT = (1.5 + 0.5) * (22,438 \text{ lbs}) = 44,876 \text{ lbs}$$

Where:

PR = Mass of Phosphorus required to be removed or reduced by the ACO
Restoration Project = 44,876 lbs

TR = Trading Ratio = (Uncertainty Ratio + Retirement Ratio) = (1.5 + 0) = 1.5

MOS = Margin of Safety = 0.5

PT = Total mass of Phosphorus discharged by the Permittee over the previous
permit term = 22,438 lbs

Phosphorus Discharged. The number of pounds of phosphorus discharged during the last permit term is based on discharges that occurred during the discharge periods 2014-2015 through 2018-2019 as shown in the following table:

Table F-16: Total Mass of Phosphorus Discharged per Discharge Season

<u>Discharge Period</u>	<u>Discharge Volume (million gallons)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus¹ (mg/L)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus Discharged (pounds)</u>
2013-2014	0	2.7	0
2014-2015	0	3.6	0
2015-2016	4.9	2.8	114
2016-2017	1,228	1.5	15,438
2017-2018	0	2.3	0
2018-2019	561	1.5	6,886
Sum			22,438

Table Notes:

1. As measured in Delta Pond during discharge seasons 2013-2014 and 2017-2018 and in plant effluent in 2014-2015. Discharges in 2016-2017 and 2018-2019 occurred on multiple days from the Delta Pond and Meadowlane D Pond; 1.5 mg/L reflects the flow-weighted average concentration of phosphorus discharged.

Although Order No. R1-2013-0001 has been in effect for six years, the Regional Water is using the last five years of the permit term (discharge periods 2014-2015 through 2018-2019) to determine the amount of total phosphorus discharged. This approach is consistent with data set period used to conduct the Reasonable Potential Analysis described in section IV.C of the Fact Sheet. The data presented in Table F-16 demonstrates the variability of the Permittee’s discharges, driven primarily by the variability of weather patterns that have ranged from dry years to extremely wet years over the past five years.

Trading Ratio: A Trading Ratio of 1.5 is applied to the restoration project(s). This is based on the default trading ratio of 2.5 identified under the WQTF which is the sum of two factors, an Uncertainty Ratio of 2.0 and a Retirement Ratio of 0.5. Both of these factors are applied to increase the amount of Phosphorus that must be removed or reduced by the project to ensure the environmental benefit of the project itself. The uncertainty ratio is a ratio that accounts for scientific uncertainty, including potential inaccuracies in estimation methods and/or variability in project performance; and the retirement ratio is a ratio that sets aside a portion of the offset for net environmental benefit. The WQTF allows the retirement and/or uncertainty ratios to be adjusted downward by as much as 0.5 (each) under several circumstances, including (1) a reduced retirement ratio when a credit-generating project is explicitly designed to enhance environmental values (e.g., habitat or ecosystem restoration, recognized priority or multi-benefit actions); (2) a reduced retirement ratio when a credit-generating project occurs on permanently protected lands; and (3) a reduced uncertainty ratio when a credit-generating project includes direct measurement of pollutant reductions. In this case, the retirement ratio has been decreased by 0.5 because any restoration project proposed under the ACO must be designed to enhance environmental values, and the uncertainty ratio has also been decreased by 0.5

because it is required that the restoration project(s) include the direct measurement of pollutant reductions.

Margin of Safety: The Margin of Safety (MOS) is an additional uncertainty ratio of 0.5 applied to the restoration project(s). This is a separate added ratio to the Trading Ratio. The MOS is included in the calculation to account for unpredictable factors that impact the Permittee's need to discharge such as weather conditions, the timing of actual phosphorus removed by a selected restoration project(s), and the amount of phosphorus that could be discharged during the permit term.

The MOS is not a factor included in the WQTF. It is unique to the ACO to ensure that the restoration project(s) provide a net benefit to the Laguna de Santa Rosa through the removal of a substantial amount of sediment that is likely to exceed the amount of phosphorus that the Permittee may discharge during the permit term. As previously stated, the ACO requirements are designed with the intent that any restoration project(s) proposed and implemented through the ACO are above and beyond what the WQTF requires.

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

CWA section 303(a-c) requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria, where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Regional Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan.

The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional [Water] Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains Receiving Surface Water Limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for biostimulatory substances, chemical constituents, color, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, sediment, settleable material, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

The receiving water limitation for temperature in this Order includes a requirement that the 7-day average of daily maximum measurements of the receiving water not exceed 64.4° (or 18°C). This numeric limitation is not contained in the Basin Plan but is necessary to ensure that any alteration to the natural receiving water temperature caused by the discharge does not adversely affect beneficial uses. U.S. EPA Region 10 Guidance (EPA 910-B-03-002) sets a temperature standard for support of salmonids at a 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature of 18°C for non-core rearing habitat. This receiving water limitation in this Order is consistent with U.S. EPA guidance and fully protects beneficial uses.

The dissolved oxygen limitation in this Order reflects the new Basin Plan dissolved oxygen limitation that was adopted by the Regional Water Board on June 18, 2015, and effective beginning April 24, 2017, after receiving approval from U.S. EPA. The new Basin Plan dissolved oxygen limitation specifies limits for the WARM, COLD, and SPWN beneficial uses. The COLD and SPWN beneficial uses occur in the Laguna de Santa Rosa and its tributaries. This Order includes only the SPWN limitations because it is the most restrictive and protective limit and the SPWN beneficial use is present throughout the entire discharge season. The dissolved oxygen receiving water limitation provides for consideration of a modified limit for waterbodies for which the aquatic life-based dissolved oxygen requirements are unachievable due to natural conditions. The intent of this language is to provide a means to adjust the dissolved oxygen limit to a

concentration less than the 9.0 mg/L daily limit and 11.0 mg/L 7-day moving average limit established in section V.A of the Order and not to increase the limits.

The receiving water limitation for bacteria in section V.A.18 of the Order reflects the new bacteria water quality objectives applicable to the REC-1 beneficial use adopted by the State Water Board on February 4, 2019 in *Part 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy*.

B. Groundwater

Groundwater limitations in this Order have been retained from the previous Order with minor modifications to reflect revised sections of title 22. Groundwater limitations are included in the Order to protect the beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, and freshwater replenishment to surface waters. Discharges from the Facility shall not cause exceedance of applicable water quality objectives or create adverse impacts to beneficial uses of groundwater. Groundwater data must be evaluated using appropriate statistical tools to determine when groundwater degradation is occurring.

The Order includes a new groundwater toxicity limitation that was adopted by the Regional Water Board on June 18, 2015, and effective beginning July 18, 2016 after receiving approval from the California Office of Administrative Law. This new Basin Plan limitation requires that groundwaters shall not contain toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, or that adversely affects beneficial uses. This limitation applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the synergistic effect of multiple substances.

VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. Federal Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D to the Order. The Permittee must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 C.F.R. section 122.42. The rationale for the special conditions contained in the Order is provided in section VI.B, below.

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

2. Regional Water Board Standard Provisions

In addition to the Federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D), the Permittee shall comply with the Regional Water Board Standard Provisions provided in Standard Provisions VI.A.2 of the Order.

- a. Order Provision VI.A.2.a identifies the state's enforcement authority under the Water Code, which is more stringent than the enforcement authority specified in the federal regulations (e.g., 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2)).
- b. Order Provision VI.A.2.b requires the Permittee to notify Regional Water Board staff, orally and in writing, in the event that the Permittee does not comply or will be unable to comply with any Order requirement. This provision requires the Permittee to make direct contact with a Regional Water Board staff person.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

The Permittee shall comply with the MRP, included as Attachment E of this Order, and future revisions thereto.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Standard Revisions (Special Provision VI.C.1.a).** Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 C.F.R. section 122.62, which include the following:
 - i. When standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision. Therefore, if revisions of applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA or amendments thereto, the Regional Water Board will revise and modify this Order in accordance with such revised standards.
 - ii. When new information that was not available at the time of permit issuance would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. **Reasonable Potential (Special Provision VI.C.1.b).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to modify, or revoke and reissue, this Order if present or future investigations demonstrate that the Permittee governed by this Permit is causing or contributing to excursions above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective, or adversely impacting water quality and/or the beneficial uses of receiving waters.
- c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (Special Provision VI.C.1.c).** This Order requires the Permittee to investigate the causes of and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE.
- d. **303(d)-Listed Pollutants (Special Provision VI.C.1.d).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order to modify existing effluent limitations or add effluent limitations for pollutants that are the subject of any future TMDL action.

- e. Water Effects Ratios (WERs) and Metal Translators (Special Provision VI.C.1.e).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if future studies undertaken by the Permittee provide new information and justification for applying a WER or metal translator to a water quality objective for one or more priority pollutants.
- f. Nutrients (Special Provision VI.C.1.f).** This Order contains effluent limitations for nitrate, nitrite, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus and effluent monitoring for nutrients (ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, and total phosphorus). This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if future monitoring data indicates the need for new or revised effluent limitations for any of these parameters.
- g. Salt and Nutrient Management Plans (Special Provision VI.C.1.g).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if needed to incorporate provisions consistent with any Regional or sub-regional salt and nutrient management plan(s) adopted by the Regional Water Board or any amendments to the Recycled Water Policy that are applicable to the Permittee.
- h. Title 22 Engineering Report (Special Provision VI.C.1.h).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order to adequately implement title 22, if necessary, based on the Permittee's title 22 engineering report.
- i. Temperature Study (Special Provision VI.C.1.i).** The temperature receiving water limitations in this Order are based on EPA Region 10 Guidance (EPA 910-B-03-002) for support of salmonids in non-core rearing habitat. At times, these limitations constrain operation of the Permittee's recycled water storage facilities and limit the amount of recycled water available for reuse. This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if the Permittee demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), that study results indicate site-specific temperature limitations are applicable to the receiving waters.
- j. Mixing Zone Study (Special Provision VI.C.1.j).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if the Permittee demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer that it has evaluated all reasonable alternatives for compliance with human health-based effluent limitations, if imposed, and conducts a mixing zone study that provides a basis for determining that permit conditions (i.e., effluent limitations and receiving water monitoring locations) should be considered for modification.
- k. Pathogens (Special Provision VI.C.1.k).** This provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order if needed, to adequately implement the Regional Water Board's Russian River Pathogen TMDL.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. Pathogen Special Study (Special Provision VI.C.2.b).** The Regional Water Board adopted the Action Plan for the Russian River Watershed Pathogen TMDL (Pathogen TMDL) in August 2019, and TMDL-driven effluent limitations may be implemented in future permits. The Pathogen TMDL notes that tertiary recycled water, such as that produced by the Facility, is fully disinfected and is not considered a source of

pathogens of human origin; however, the TMDL expresses uncertainty about the potential for regrowth of pathogens of human origin, particularly after storage. This Order requires the Permittee to conduct a study to assess the Facility's ability to comply with the bacteria water quality objective in section V.A.18 of the Order and required actions outlined in Table 4 of the Pathogen TMDL and to submit a report that summarizes the results of the Permittee's ability to comply with the bacteria water quality objective and the Pathogen TMDL, and, if necessary, a plan and schedule for achieving compliance with the Pathogen TMDL. The plan of compliance should identify any other studies necessary to demonstrate compliance with the bacteria water quality objective and the Pathogen TMDL (i.e., study to determine whether the discharge includes pathogens of human origin). The Regional Water Board will use the results of the study to inform the implementation of TMDL-based effluent limitations, if necessary, during the next permit renewal.

- b. Engineering Evaluation of Discharge Outfalls. (Order Provision VI.C.2.c).** During the previous permit term, the Permittee had unauthorized discharges in relation to discharge valves that had become inoperable. The Permittee has not used other discharge points, specifically Discharge Points 012A(1) and 012A(2)) for approximately 15 years and is concerned that the infrastructure associated with these discharge points may be in an inoperable condition. In addition, the Permittee should be required to demonstrate that storage ponds are being maintained to ensure protection of surface water and groundwater. This Order requires the Permittee to submit a written work plan describing a plan to evaluate all storage ponds and discharge outfall infrastructure to assess the condition of each discharge outfall and its associated infrastructure. Upon completion of the evaluation the Permittee is required to submit a final report describing the condition of each storage pond, outfall and associated infrastructure, and identifying a plan to address deficiencies and to ensure proper on-going maintenance. In addition, Discharge Prohibition III.M prohibits the use of Discharge Points 012A(1) and 012A(2) until the Permittee demonstrates that these discharge points are operationally functional.
- c. Local Limits Evaluation (Special Provision VI.C.2.d).** As discussed further in section VI.C.5.b of this Fact Sheet, this Order requires the Permittee to implement a pretreatment program that conforms to federal regulations. Thus, as required by federal regulation and in order to prevent interference with the POTW or pass through of pollutants to the receiving water, this Order requires the Permittee to conduct a local limits evaluation once during the term of the Order and review and update, if necessary, its local limits and sewer use ordinances.
- d. Sewer Use Ordinance Evaluation (Special Provision VI.C.2.e).** This Order requires the Permittee to evaluate the effectiveness of sewer use ordinances and update requirements as necessary to ensure the ordinances are applicable and enforceable thereby preventing interference with the POTW or pass through of pollutants to the receiving water.
- e. Disaster Preparedness Assessment Report and Action Plan (Special Provision VI.C.2.f).** Natural disasters, extreme weather events, sea level rise, and shifting precipitation patterns, some of which are projected to intensify due to climate change, have significant implications for wastewater treatment and operations. Some natural disasters are expected to become more frequent and extreme according to the current

science on climate change. In order to ensure that Facility operations are not disrupted, compliance with conditions of this Order are achieved, and receiving waters are not adversely impacted by permitted and unpermitted discharges, this Order requires the Permittee to submit a Disaster Preparedness Assessment Report and Action Plan.

- f. **Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program (Special Provision VI.C.2.g).** The Order requires the Permittee to implement the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program developed under Order No. R1-2013-0001 and submitted to the Regional Water Board on September 30, 2014 (initial report) and July 10, 2015 (addendum report).

Section 4.1 of the addendum report recommends continuation of specific activities by City staff and collaboration with other entities in the Santa Rosa Plain to support the use of recycled water and protect the groundwater basin. Table F-17 identifies each activity identified by the City and how that activity is required to be implemented through this Order:

Table F-17. Summary of Activities to Support the Use of Recycled Water and Protection of Groundwater

Activity	Required Implementation	Order/MRP Section No.
BMPs to maintain storage pond integrity through daily and annual storage pond operations and maintenance activities currently employed by City staff.	Engineering Evaluation of Recycled Water Storage Ponds and Discharge Outfalls. Implementation of Discharge Management Plan	Order Section VI.C.2.c Order Section VI.C.6.a
Coordination with the Santa Rosa Subregional Water Reclamation System Effluent Monitoring Program.	Implement Effluent and Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements in MRP	MRP Sections IV.A, VII.A, VIII, and IX
Soil and groundwater monitoring related to use of recycled water for irrigation.	Implement Groundwater monitoring requirements in MRP	MRP Section VIII.C
New receiving water monitoring program as required in the Permit.	Implement Effluent and Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements in MRP	MRP Sections IV.A, VII.A, VIII, and IX
Automated monitoring of Delta Pond discharge, including flow, pH, temperature, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, and conductivity.	Implement Effluent and Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements in MRP	MRP Sections IV.C and VIII.C
Documentation of nutrient (total nitrogen and total phosphorus) discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and tributaries and activities related to nutrient reduction projects.	Implement Order requirements for compliance with total phosphorus effluent limitations Implement Effluent and Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements in MRP	Order Section VII.O and MRP section VI.C.6.b MRP Sections IV, VIII.A and IX.E

Activity	Required Implementation	Order/MRP Section No.
Future monitoring activities recommended in the Proposed Santa Rosa SNMP submitted by the City, including possible installation of additional shall monitoring wells.	Implement MRP requirement to implement the Storage Pond Integrity Leak Monitoring Program Implement Groundwater Monitoring Requirements in the MRP	Order section VI.C.2.g MRP Section VIII.C

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Pollutant Minimization Program (Special Provision VI.C.3.a).** This provision is included in this Order pursuant to section 2.4.5 of the SIP. The Regional Water Board includes standard provisions in all NPDES permits requiring development of a Pollutant Minimization Program when there is evidence that a toxic pollutant is present in the effluent at a concentration greater than an applicable effluent limitation.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Operation and Maintenance (Special Provisions VI.C.4.).** 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(e) requires proper operation and maintenance of permitted wastewater systems and related facilities to achieve compliance with permit conditions. An up-to-date operation and maintenance manual, as required by Provision VI.C.4.b of this Order, is an integral part of a well-operated and maintained facility. This Order also requires the Permittee to develop, maintain, and implement a standard operating procedure to manage the use of chlorine in the UV disinfection system to prevent the discharge of chlorine to surface waters.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

- a. **Wastewater Collection Systems (Special Provision VI.C.5.a)**
 - i. **Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems.** On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order). The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all SSOs, among other requirements and prohibitions.

On February 20, 2008, the State Water Board adopted Order No. WQ 2008-0002-EXEC Adopting Amended Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, to ensure adequate and timely notifications are made to the Regional Water Board and appropriate local, state, and federal authorities in case of sewage spills. On August 6, 2013, the State Water Board adopted Order No. WQ 2013-0058-EXEC Amending Monitoring and Reporting Program for Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems. Order No. WQ 2013-0058-EXEC addressed compliance and enforceability of the Monitoring and

Reporting Program and superseded the amendments in Order No. WQ-2008-0002-EXEC. Notification and reporting of SSOs is conducted in accordance with the requirements of Order Nos. 2006-0003-DWQ and WQ 2013-0058-EXEC, and any revisions thereto for operation of its wastewater collection system.

- b. Pretreatment of Industrial Waste (Special Provision VI.C.5.b).** Section 402(b)(8) of the CWA requires that POTWs receiving pollutants from significant industrial sources subject to section 307(b) standards establish an industrial pretreatment program to ensure compliance with these standards. The implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(a) state, “*any POTW (or combination of POTWs operated by the same authority) with a total design flow greater than 5 million gallons per day (mgd) and receiving from industrial users pollutants which pass through or interfere with operation of the POTW or are otherwise subject to pretreatment standards will be required to establish a POTW pretreatment program unless the NPDES State exercises its option to assume local responsibilities as provided in 403.10(e).*” The Facility is subject to pretreatment standards as described in section 307(b) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(a).
- c. Sludge Disposal and Handling Requirements (Special Provision VI.C.5.c).** The disposal or reuse of wastewater treatment screenings, sludges, or other solids removed from the liquid waste stream is regulated by 40 C.F.R. parts 257, 258, 501, and 503, and the State Water Board promulgated provisions of title 27 of the CCR. The Permittee has indicated that all screenings, sludges, and solids removed from the liquid waste stream are currently disposed of off-site at a municipal solid waste landfill in accordance with all applicable regulations.
- d. Biosolids Management (Special Provision VI.C.5.d).** This provision requires the Permittee to comply with the State’s regulations relating to the discharge of biosolids to the land. The discharge of biosolids through land application is not regulated under this Order. The Permittee has obtained coverage under the State Water Board Order No. 2004-0012-DWQ, General Waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land as a Soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural, Horticultural, and Land Reclamation Activities (General Order). Coverage under the General Order, as opposed to coverage under this NPDES permit or individual WDRs, implements a consistent statewide approach to regulating this waste discharge.
- e. Operator Certification (Special Provision VI.C.5.e).** This provision requires the Facility to be operated by supervisors and operators who are certified as required by title 23, section 3680 of the CCR.
- f. Adequate Capacity (Special Provision VI.C.5.f).** The goal of this provision is to ensure appropriate and timely planning by the Permittee to ensure adequate capacity for the protection of public health and water quality.
- g. Septage Handling Requirements (Special Provision VI.C.5.g).** The Permittee currently accepts and treats septage at the Facility. Domestic septage is defined as the liquid or solid material removed from a septic tank, cesspool, portable toilet, type III marine sanitation device, recreational vehicle’s sanitation tank, or similar storage or treatment works that receives only domestic septage. Septage is characterized by high organic strength, high solids content, high odor potential, high vector attraction potential, and high potential to pollute groundwater. Septage may be 6 to 80 times more concentrated than typical municipal wastewater and may also contain heavy

metals and illicitly dumped hazardous materials. Septage has the potential to upset treatment plant operations or process performance or both if the plant is not designed to handle septage. Some of the impacts of septage addition to WWTFS include potential toxic shock to biological processes; increased odor emissions; increased volume of grit, scum, screenings, and sludge; increased organic loading to biological processes; and increased housekeeping requirements. This Order requires the Permittee to manage septage accepted at the Facility in a manner that ensures that pollutants associated with domestic septage do not pass through or interfere with the operation or performance of the Facility.

- h. Resource Recovery from Anaerobically Digestible Material (Special Provision VI.C.5.h).** Some POTWs choose to accept organic material such as food waste, fats, oils, and grease into their anaerobic digesters for co-digestion to increase production of methane and other biogases for energy production and to prevent such materials from being discharged into the collection system, which could cause sanitary sewer overflows. The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery has proposed an exemption from requiring Process Facility/Transfer Station permits where this activity is regulated under waste discharge requirements or NPDES permits. The proposed exemption is restricted to anaerobically digestible material that has been prescreened, slurried, and processed/conveyed in a closed system to be co-digested with regular POTW sludge. The proposed exemption requires that a POTW develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the proper handling, processing, tracking, and management of the anaerobically digestible material before it is received by the POTW.

SOPs are required for POTWs that accept hauled food waste, fats, oil, and grease for injection into anaerobic digesters. The development and implementation of SOPs for management of these materials is intended to allow the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to exempt this activity from separate and redundant permitting programs. If the POTW does not accept food waste, fats, oil, or grease for resource recovery purposes, it is not required to develop and implement SOPs.

The Permittee currently accepts hauled-in anaerobically digestible material for direct injection into its anaerobic digester for co-digestion and submitted SOPs on November 15, 2018. This Order requires the Permittee to update the SOP's as necessary.

6. Other Special Provisions

- a. Recycled Water Operation and Discharge Management (Special Provision VI.C.6.a).** Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order requires that the Permittee operate its recycled water storage and discharges in accordance with the Permittee's most current approved *Regional Water Reuse System Discharge Management Plan*. This most current approved Discharge Management Plan was submitted by the Permittee and approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer in May 2011. The Permittee submitted a revised Discharge Management Plan on November 15, 2018 (with revised ROWD). Regional Water Board staff provided comments to the Permittee on February 26, 2020. Upon approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer this will become the current plan. This Order allows the Discharge Management Plan to be amended and subsequently approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

This requirement has been moved from the water recycling provisions (section IV.C) in the 2013 Order to the Special Provision for Municipal Facilities section (section VI.C.6). This language was relocated to recognize that the Discharge Management Plan applies more broadly than water recycling and that it is a critical component to ensuring that the Permittee operates the Facility to maximize reclamation and minimize discharges to surface waters. The Order allows the Permittee to elect an alternate compliance path for meeting total phosphorus effluent limitations during this permit term and discharge management is an essential component to ensure that the Permittee continues to manage discharges to minimize the discharge of total phosphorus and meet the no net loading effluent limitation for total phosphorus.

This provision also implements the Regional Water Board's continued application of the Interim Action Plan (1986-1990) for the Santa Rosa Area, which was included in the Basin Plan in 1987 through Regional Water Board Resolution No. 87-58 and conditionally prohibited discharges to surface waters and required documentation from the Permittee to support the elimination and/or minimization of discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River..

- a. **Capacity Increase Engineering Report (Special Provision VI.C.6.b).** The Permittee is required to submit an engineering report documenting that treatment and/or total water recycling capacity has been added. This report shall document that the Permittee exceeds the total water recycling capacity of 4,015 million gallons for Geysers recharge and maintains the capability to irrigate at least 2,590 million gallons per year at 21.34 mgd average dry weather flow. The Regional Water Board Executive Officer will inform the Permittee within 90 days after receipt of the report that the additional capacity is recognized by the Regional Water Board. This provision is retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001, even though the Permittee does not anticipate an increase in discharge volume during the term of the permit.
- b. **Storm Water (Special Provision VI.C.6.b).** This provision acknowledges the Permittee's coverage under the Industrial Storm Water General Permit (or subsequent renewed versions of the NPDES General Permit CAS000001).

7. **Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable**

This Order does not establish interim effluent limitations or schedules of compliance for final effluent limitations.

VII. **RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Section 122.48 of 40 C.F.R. requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code section 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The MRP, Attachment E, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this Facility.

A. **Influent Monitoring**

Influent monitoring requirements for flow, BOD₅, and TSS are retained from the previous permit, WDR Order No. R1-2013-0001 and are necessary to determine compliance with this Order's 85 percent removal requirement for these parameters. Influent monitoring for CTR priority pollutants is established in this Order to assess and track the effectiveness of the Pretreatment Program implementation (section VI.C.5 of the Order) and to assess the need for establishing or

updating local limits. Other monitoring requirements for the industrial pretreatment program are described in section X.D.3 of the MRP.

B. Effluent Monitoring

Effluent monitoring requirements are necessary to determine compliance with prohibitions and/or effluent limitations established by the Order. Monitoring at Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-002, EFF-006A(1), EFF-006A(2), EFF-006B, EFF-012A(1), EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, and EFF-015, is necessary to demonstrate compliance with effluent limitations and demonstrate whether or not the discharge poses reasonable potential for a pollutant to exceed any numeric or narrative water quality objectives.

1. Monitoring Location EFF-001 (prior to discharge to Meadow Lane or Delta Ponds) (Table E-3)

- a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, BOD₅, total coliform, and radioactivity at Monitoring Location EFF-001 have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- b. Monitoring data collected over the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 showed no exceedances of effluent limitations for TSS and pH at Monitoring Location EFF-001. Therefore, this Order reduces monitoring requirements for TSS and pH at Monitoring Location EFF-001 from daily to twice per week.
- c. Monitoring requirements for pH have been revised to clarify that compliance with technology-based effluent limitations (6 – 9) for pH is required for discharges to storage and to the recycled water system, while compliance with water quality-based effluent limitations (6.5 to 8.5) is required for all discharges to surface waters.

2. Monitoring Location EFF-001 (prior to discharge to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Point 012A(1), or the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015) (Table E-4)

- a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, BOD₅, coliform, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, specific conductance, temperature, total dissolved solids, turbidity, and radioactivity at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(1) and 015) have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- b. Effluent monitoring for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate have been removed as monitoring data collected during the term of the permit demonstrated no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the water quality objective for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate. Quarterly monitoring for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate will continue to occur as part of the required quarterly CTR priority pollutant monitoring.
- c. Effluent monitoring data collected over the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 showed no exceedances of effluent limitations for TSS and pH at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 012A(1) and 015), therefore, this Order reduces monitoring requirements for TSS and pH at Monitoring Location EFF-001 from daily to twice per week.
- d. Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an

exceedance of water quality objectives for copper, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, pentachlorophenol, nitrate, and nitrite, at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (representative of discharges from Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1) and 015). Therefore, this Order maintains weekly monitoring requirements for nitrate and nitrite, as well as monthly monitoring requirements for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane at Monitoring Location EFF-001. Additionally, this Order establishes monthly monitoring requirements for copper (when discharging at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015), and for pentachlorophenol at Monitoring Location EFF-001.

- e. This Order retains a monitoring frequency of weekly for mercury to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential against the Tribal Subsistence Fishing Objective of 1 ng/L after the Basin Plan has been updated to include the T-SUB beneficial use. See discussion in Fact Sheet section IV.C.3.c.
- f. This Order includes a prohibition of discharges that exceed five percent of the flow of the Russian River as measured at the Hacienda bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000. Therefore, this Order requires the Permittee to calculate and report the discharge dilution rate to determine compliance with the prohibition.
- g. This Order requires effluent monitoring for CTR priority pollutants and chronic toxicity at least two times per year between the months of December and April at Monitoring Location EFF-001. The monitoring is required during periods of discharge if discharges occur. The monitoring is required even if there is no discharge in order to generate adequate data to perform an RPA with sufficient data.

3. Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B (Prior to Discharge from Meadow Lane Ponds to the Laguna de Santa Rosa at Discharge Point 006A(2) or to the confluence of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and Colgan Creek at Discharge Point 006B) (Table E-5)

- a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, specific conductance, temperature, total dissolved solids, turbidity, and radioactivity at Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) (renamed) and EFF-006B have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- b. Weekly effluent monitoring for *E. coli* bacteria has been established in this Order to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to an exceedance of new water quality objectives for *E. coli* bacteria and ensure compliance with the Pathogen TMDL during periods of discharge from storage to receiving waters.
- c. Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, or bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at Monitoring Location EFF-006B (representative of discharges from Monitoring Locations EFF-006A(2) and EFF-006B). Therefore, this Order discontinues weekly monitoring requirements for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and monthly monitoring requirements for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane at Monitoring Locations EFF-

006A(2) and EFF-006B. Quarterly monitoring for these pollutants will continue to occur as part of the required quarterly CTR priority pollutant monitoring.

- d. Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for mercury. This Order retains a monitoring frequency of weekly for mercury to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential against the Tribal Subsistence Fishing Objective of 1 ng/L after the Basin Plan has been updated to include the T-SUB beneficial use. See discussion in Fact Sheet section IV.C.3.c.
- e. This Order includes a prohibition of discharges that exceed five percent of the flow of the Russian River as measured at the Hacienda bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000. Therefore, this Order requires the Permittee to calculate and report the discharge dilution rate to determine compliance with the prohibition.
- f. This Order requires effluent monitoring for CTR priority pollutants twice per year between the months of December and April at Monitoring Locations EFF-006A and EFF-006B only during periods of discharge. See VII.2.g above for monitoring requirements that ensure that adequate data is available to perform an RPA.
- g. Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-001, this Order contains an effluent limitation for total nitrogen at Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B. In order to assess compliance with the total nitrogen effluent limitation, this Order establishes a monthly monitoring requirement to calculate and report total nitrogen.

4. Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B (Prior to Discharge from Delta Pond to Santa Rosa Creek at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B) (Table E-6)

- a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, specific conductance, temperature, total dissolved solids, turbidity, and radioactivity at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- b. Weekly effluent monitoring for *E. coli* bacteria has been established in this Order to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to an exceedance of new water quality objectives for *E. coli* bacteria and ensure compliance with the Pathogen TMDL during periods of discharge from storage to receiving waters.
- c. Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for mercury, chlorodibromomethane, or dichlorobromomethane at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B). Therefore, this Order discontinues weekly monitoring requirements for monthly monitoring requirements for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B. This Order retains a monitoring frequency of weekly for mercury to ensure that adequate monitoring data is available to assess reasonable potential against the Tribal Subsistence Fishing Objective of 1 ng/L after the Basin Plan has been updated to include the T-SUB beneficial use. See discussion in Fact Sheet section IV.C.3.c.

- d. Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at Monitoring Location EFF-012B (representative of discharges from Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B) based on an ambient background receiving water result that exceeded the most stringent water quality objective of 1.8 µg/L. Therefore, this Order retains monitoring requirements for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B but the monitoring frequency has been reduced from weekly to monthly.
- e. This Order includes a prohibition of discharges that exceed five percent of the flow of the Russian River as measured at the Hacienda bridge at USGS Gauge No. 11467000. Therefore, this Order requires the Permittee to calculate and report the discharge dilution rate to determine compliance with the prohibition.
- f. This Order requires effluent monitoring for CTR priority pollutants twice per year between the months of December and April at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(2) and EFF-012B. See VII.2.g above for monitoring requirements that ensure that adequate data is available to perform an RPA.
- g. Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-001, this Order contains an effluent limitation for total nitrogen at Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B. In order to assess compliance with the total nitrogen effluent limitation, this Order establishes a monthly monitoring requirement to calculate and report total nitrogen.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

WET monitoring requirements are retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001 and are included in this Order to protect the receiving water quality from the aggregate 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 time period and may measure mortality, reproduction, and/or growth. This Order retains annual monitoring requirements for acute toxicity and quarterly monitoring requirements for chronic toxicity, changes the sample type for chronic toxicity from grab to 24-hour composite in accordance with section V.B.3 of the MRP.

In addition to routine toxicity monitoring, this Order requires the Permittee to maintain and update their TRE Work Plan, in accordance with appropriate U.S. EPA guidance, to ensure that the Permittee has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The TRE is initiated by evidence of a pattern of toxicity demonstrated through the additional effluent monitoring provided as a result of an accelerated monitoring program.

D. Recycled Water Monitoring Requirements (EFF-001)

This Order requires the Permittee to comply with applicable state and local requirements regarding the production of recycled water. When distributing recycled water to the recycled water system, the Permittee must monitor its treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 for flow, BOD₅, TSS, pH, and total coliform bacteria to demonstrate compliance with water recycling specifications in section IV.C.1 of the Order. Recycled water monitoring requirements for ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, organic nitrogen, total dissolved solids, chloride, boron, sodium, and title 22 drinking water constituents are included in the monitoring and reporting program issued

as part of the Permittee's and City of Rohnert Park's respective enrollments under the Recycled Water General Order.

E. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water

a. Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, AND RSW-012BU

- i.** Receiving water monitoring is required to demonstrate compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. Monitoring requirements at Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and RSW-012BU for flow, pH, ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, organic nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, hardness, specific conductance, temperature, and turbidity have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- ii.** Monitoring Location RSW-006BU-C has been changed in this Order from a point in Colgan Creek, upstream of the confluence with the Laguna de Santa Rosa to Colgan Creek at Llano Road (38°22'25" N, 122°46'07.5" W).
- iii.** A new receiving water location, RSW-LSP has been established in this Order (see Table E-1). Formerly, each discharge point to the Laguna de Santa Rosa (006A, 006B, and 015) had a unique receiving water location (RSW-006AU, RSW-006BU-L, and RSW-015U) immediately upstream of each discharge point, but these discharge points were not safely or easily accessible during periods of high flow and flooding. The Permittee has requested that all upstream receiving water for discharges to the Laguna de Santa Rosa be conducted at the newly established RSW-LSP monitoring location. Table E-1 in the MRP has been revised to reflect include this new receiving water monitoring location and has retained the historic Monitoring Locations RSW-006AU, 006BU-L, and 015U for historical reference and because data from these receiving water monitoring locations is used for the reasonable potential analyses conducted in this Order.
- iv.** Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2013-0001 indicates that the discharge exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for copper at Monitoring Location EFF-001 when discharging at Discharge Points 006A(1), 012A(1), and 015. Therefore, this Order establishes effluent limitations and monthly monitoring requirements for copper when discharging at Discharge Point 006A(1), 012A(1), and/or 015. Accordingly, hardness monitoring in the receiving water at Monitoring Location RSW-LSP has been increased from quarterly to monthly, to be conducted concurrently with effluent monitoring for copper, a hardness-based metal, when discharging at Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015. When discharging at all other Discharge Points, quarterly receiving water monitoring for hardness has been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.
- v.** Effluent monitoring data collected during the term of Order No. R1-2103-001 indicates that the discharge exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for nitrite at Monitoring Locations EFF-012A(1) and EFF-015. Therefore this Order establishes effluent limitations for nitrite when discharging at Discharge Points 012A(1) and 015. Accordingly, this Order establishes monthly monitoring requirements for nitrite at Monitoring

Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and RSW-012BU in order to monitor compliance with the effluent limitations.

- vi. Consistent with Order No. R1-2013-0001, this Order contains an effluent limitation for total nitrogen. In order to evaluate total nitrogen concentration in the receiving water, this Order establishes a monthly monitoring requirement to calculate and report total nitrogen monitored in the receiving water at Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, and, RSW-012BU.
- vii. This Order requires receiving water monitoring for CTR priority pollutants twice per year between the months of December and April at Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, AND RSW-012BU.

b. Monitoring Locations RSW-012BD-S

- i. Receiving water monitoring is required to demonstrate compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. Monitoring requirements at Monitoring Location RSW-012BD-S for pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, temperature and specific conductance have been retained from Order No. R1-2013-0001.

2. Groundwater

- a. The North Coast Region has 58 groundwater basins as defined by the Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118. The Santa Rosa Plain is one of 16 priority groundwater basins/sub-basins within the North Coast Region. Groundwater basins within the North Coast Region are prioritized by combining the methodologies developed by DWR for the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA, 2014) and by the State Water Board Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program for California (2003).
- b. The Recycled Water Policy requires the development of salt and nutrient management plans (SNMP) for groundwater basins to determine salt and nutrient management contamination risk to groundwater quality can be caused by naturally-occurring sources of salinity, discharges of agricultural, domestic, industrial, and municipal wastewater; fertilizers; and residual solids (including on-site wastewater treatment systems). In addition, irrigation using imported water, diverted water, surface water, groundwater, or recycled water, and indirect potable reuse for groundwater recharge (groundwater recharge) can contribute to increased salt and nutrient loading. The State Water Board recognizes that regulation of recycled water alone will not fully address these conditions and encourages collaborative work among salt and nutrient management planning groups, the agricultural community, regional water boards, Integrated Regional Management Planning groups and groundwater sustainability agencies formed under SGMA to achieve the goals of groundwater sustainability, recycled water use, and water quality protection.
- c. The City of Santa Rosa led a salt and nutrient management planning group to develop an SNMP for the Santa Rosa Plain. The SNMP submitted by the City recognizes the increasing trend in salts and nutrients in the Santa Rosa Plain groundwater basin. The City's primary recommendation in the final SNMP, dated May 2013, is the development of a monitoring and reporting program to support the refinement of the SNMP in the future. The conceptual monitoring framework described in the SNMP proposes the collection of data from existing wells, as well as from new groundwater monitoring wells to be installed for this purpose. The objective is to develop a basin-wide

groundwater monitoring plan that will allow for a comprehensive assessment of water quality in relation to beneficial uses supported within the basin and applicable water quality objectives.

- d. On September 1, 2015, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer sent a letter to the City approving the proposed conceptual monitoring framework presented in the final SNMP and directing the City to develop a basin-specific MRP and schedule of implementation. Attachment A of the September 1, 2015 Regional Water Board letter included recommendations titled “Necessary Components of a Basin-Specific Monitoring and Reporting Program” for a basin-specific MRP designed to evaluate changes in groundwater basin water quality over time.
- e. This Order includes new groundwater monitoring requirements to implement the Permittee’s July 10, 2015 Storage Pond Integrity Program Work Plan and Regional Water Board recommendations for a basin-specific MRP designed to evaluate changes in groundwater basin water quality over time as stated in the September 1, 2015 Regional Water Board letter, included as Attachment J to this Order.

F. Other Monitoring Requirements

- 1. **Filtration Process Monitoring (MRP Section IX.A).** Monitoring of the surface loading rate at Monitoring Location INT-001A is necessary to demonstrate compliance with technology requirements set forth in DDW’s Alternative Treatment Technology Report for Recycled Water (September 2014 or subsequent) and conditions established for this Permittee in DDW’s February 12, 2020 title 22 Report acceptance letter. Monitoring of effluent turbidity of the tertiary filters at Monitoring Location INT-001B is required to demonstrate compliance with section 60301.320 of title 22 CCR filtration requirements for disinfected tertiary recycled water that apply when the tertiary filters are operated at a filtration rate of 5 gallons per minute per square foot of surface area (gpm/ft²). On October 18, 2013, CDPH provided an acceptance letter in response to submittal of the Permittee’s April 27, 2012 *Filter Loading Evaluation for Water Reuse (FLEWR) Study Report* which documents a study conducted by the Permittee to demonstrate that its tertiary filters can be operated at loading rates up to 7.5 gpm/ft². CDPH’s approval of this higher filter loading rate was authorized through a February 20, 2014 letter from the Regional Water Board Executive Officer which establishes conditions that the Permittee was comply with. These conditions are included in Order section IV.D. The training requirements specified in Order section IV.D.2.b were developed by the Permittee’s Chief Plant Operator with assistance from the Filter Loading Evaluation for Water Reuse (FLEWR) Project Investigation Team, as required by CDPH at the time of approval.
- 2. **Disinfection Process Monitoring for UV Disinfection System (Monitoring Location INT-002) (MRP Section IX.B).** UV disinfection system monitoring requirements at Monitoring Location INT-002 are included to assess compliance of the UV disinfection system with title 22 and guidelines established by the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation (AWWARF) Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse (3rd or subsequent editions).
- 3. **Visual Monitoring (MRP Section IX.C).** Visual monitoring requirements for the effluent (Monitoring Locations EFF-001, EFF-006A, EFF-006B, EFF-012A(1) EFF-012A(2), EFF-012B, EFF-015) and the receiving water (Monitoring Locations RSW-LSP, RSW-006BU-C, ,

and RSW-012BD-S) have been added to ensure compliance with receiving water limitations in section V of the Order.

4. **Sludge Monitoring (MRP Section IX.D).** Sludge monitoring requirements at Monitoring Location BIO-001 serve as a basis for the Permittee to develop the Sludge Handling and Disposal report that is required as part of the Annual Report pursuant to section X.D.2.f of the MRP.
5. **Discharge Monitoring Report Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program (MRP Section I.F).** Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires major and select minor permittees under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Permittee can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S. EPA to the State Water Board, the Permittee can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from its own laboratories or its contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Permittee shall ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.
6. **Accelerated Monitoring Requirements.** Tables E-3, E-4, E-5, and E-6 of the MRP include accelerated monitoring requirements for parameters that are required to be monitored daily, twice per week, weekly, and monthly.
7. **Flow Monitoring.** Section I.D of the MRP requires proper installation, calibration, operation, and maintenance of flow metering devices.
8. **Spill Notification (MRP section X.E).** The MRP that is part of this Order establishes requirements for reporting spills and unauthorized discharges, with the exception of SSOs, which must be reported in accordance with the requirements of State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ and WQ-2013-0058-EXEC and any future revisions.
9. **Volumetric Reporting.** Section X.D.5 of the MRP requires reporting of influent volumes, discharge volumes and reuse volumes from the Facility as part of an annual report submitted to GeoTracker. These reporting requirements are in accordance with Order No. WQ 2019-0037-EXEC and any future revisions. Volumetric reporting requirements have been limited to discharge locations and uses that the Permittee currently utilizes. If additional discharge locations or use types are added in the future, the volumetric reporting language should be updated accordingly.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (Regional Water Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the City of Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Regional Water Reuse System, Laguna Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the

Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Water Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Water Board notified the Permittee and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the following posting on the Regional Water Board’s Internet site at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/public_notices/public_hearings/npdes_permits_and_wdrs.shtml

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs as provided through the notification process. Comments were due to the Regional Water Board Executive Office electronically via e-mail to NorthCoast@waterboards.ca.gov or on disk (CD or DCD) in Portable Document Format (PDF) file in lieu of paper-sourced documents. The guidelines for electronic submittal of documents can be found on the Regional Water Board website at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast>.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, the written comments were initially due at the Regional Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **March 30, 2020**. The public comment period was extended to April 29, 2020 due to the COVID-19 emergency.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: **August 20, 2020**
Time: 8:30 a.m. or as announced in the Regional Water Board’s agenda
Location: Regional Water Board Hearing Room or by Video or Teleconference
5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

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

Please be aware that dates and venues may change. Our Web address is <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast> 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 Board to review the decision of the Regional Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Regional Water Board’s action:

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

For instruction on how to file a petition for review see
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml

E. Information and Copying

The ROWD, related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at the address identified in section VIII.C, above, at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Water Board by calling (707) 576-2220.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference this Facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Cathleen Goodwin at Cathleen.Goodwin@waterboards.ca.gov or (707) 576-2687.

Attachment F-1 – City of Santa Rosa RPA Summary

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Antimony	µg/L	DNQ	0.30	DNQ	0.15	6.0	--	--	14	--	6.0	No
Arsenic	µg/L	=	2	=	2.7	10	340	150	--	--	10	No
Beryllium	µg/L	<	0.10	<	0.10	4.0	--	--	--	--	4.0	No
Cadmium	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	2.3	4.11	2.3	--	--	5.0	No
Chromium (III)	µg/L	=	1	=	0.85	190	1,600	190	--	--	--	No
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	=	0.96	=	3.6	11	16	11	--	--	50	No
Copper	µg/L	<	2.6	=	4.6	8.7	13	8.7	1,300	--	--	No
Lead	µg/L	DNQ	0.17	=	0.75	2.9	73	2.9	--	--	--	No
Mercury	ng/L	<	2.88 ¹	=	18.1 ¹	4 ²	--	--	50	--	2,000	No
Nickel	µg/L	=	5.8	=	6.8	49	440	49	610	--	100	No
Selenium	µg/L	DNQ	0.33	DNQ	0.32	5.0	--	5.0	--	--	50	No
Silver	µg/L	<	0.031	<	0.031	3.5	3.5	--	--	--	--	No
Thallium	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	1.7	--	--	1.7	--	2.0	No
Zinc	µg/L	=	14.8	=	10.4	110	110	110	--	--	--	No
Cyanide	µg/L	<	1	<	1	5.2	22	5.2	700	--	150	No
Asbestos	MFL	--	--	--	--	7.0	--	--	7.0	--	7.0	Ud
2,3,7,8 TCDD	µg/L	<	1.08E-06	<	1.08E-06	1.3E-08	--	--	1.3E-08	--	3.0E-05	No
Acrolein	µg/L	<	0.95	<	0.95	320	--	--	320	780	--	No
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.059	--	--	0.059	--	--	No
Benzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	1.0	--	--	1.2	--	1.0	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	4.3	--	--	4.3	--	--	No
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.25	--	--	0.25	--	0.50	No
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	70	--	--	680	--	70	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.41	--	--	0.41	--	--	No
Chloroethane	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No-- Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	No-- Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chloroform	µg/L	=	1.48	<	0.07	No-- Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	DNQ	0.33	<	0.08	0.56	--	--	0.56	--	--	No
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.38	--	--	0.38	--	0.50	No
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.057	--	--	0.057	--	6.0	No
1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.52	--	--	0.52	--	5.0	No

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.50	--	--	10	--	0.50	No
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	300	--	--	3,100	--	300	No
Methyl Bromide	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	48	--	--	48	--	--	No
Methyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Methylene Chloride	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	4.7	--	--	4.7	--	5.0	No
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.17	--	--	0.17	--	1.0	No
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.80	--	--	0.80	--	5.0	No
Toluene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	150	--	--	6,800	--	150	No
1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.1	<	0.1	10	--	--	700	--	10	No
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	200	--	--	--	--	200	No
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	0.60	--	--	0.60	--	5.0	No
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	2.7	--	--	2.7	--	5.0	No
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	0.50	--	--	2.0	--	0.50	No
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.18	<	0.18	120	--	--	120	--	--	No
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	93	--	--	93	--	--	No
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	540	--	--	540	--	--	No
2-Methyl- 4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.74	<	0.74	13	--	--	13	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.72	<	0.72	70	--	--	70	--	--	No
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	1.0	<	1.0	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
3-Methyl 4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	<	1.1	<	1.1	0.28	8.7	6.7	0.28	--	1.0	No
Phenol	µg/L	<	0.18	<	0.18	21,000	--	--	21,000	--	--	No
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	2.1	--	--	2.1	--	--	No
Acenaphthene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	1,200	--	--	1,200	--	--	No
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	9,600	--	--	9,600	--	--	No
Benzidine	µg/L	<	1	<	1	0.00012	--	--	0.00012	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.38	<	0.38	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	0.20	No
Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Benzo(ghi)Perylene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.031	--	--	0.031	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,400	--	--	1,400	--	--	No
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.95 ³	DNQ	1.7	1.8	--	--	1.8	--	4.0	No
4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.54	<	0.54	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	No
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	1,700	--	--	1,700	--	--	No
4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chrysene	µg/L	<	0.19	<	0.19	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	600	--	--	2700	--	600	No
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	400	--	--	400	--	--	No
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	5.0	--	--	400	--	5.0	No
3,3 Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	<	0.31	<	0.31	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.33	<	0.33	23,000	--	--	23,000	--	--	No
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	310,000	--	--	310,000	--	--	No
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.42	<	0.42	2,700	--	--	2,700	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.28	<	0.28	0.11	--	--	0.11	--	--	No
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.52	<	0.52	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	300	--	--	300	--	--	No
Fluorene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,300	--	--	1,300	--	--	No
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.00075	--	--	0.00075	--	1.0	No
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	0.44	--	--	0.44	--	--	No
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	50	--	--	240	--	50	No
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	1.9	--	--	1.9	--	--	No
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Isophorone	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	8.4	--	--	8.4	--	--	No

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Naphthalene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	17	--	--	17	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	0.00069	--	--	0.00069	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.0050	--	--	0.0050	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	5.0	--	--	5.0	--	--	No
Phenanthrene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	960	--	--	960	--	--	No
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Aldrin	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.00013	3.0	--	0.00013	--	--	No
alpha-BHC	µg/L	<	0.006	<	0.006	0.0039	--	--	0.0039	--	--	No
beta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.004	<	0.004	0.014	--	--	0.014	--	--	No
gamma-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.019	0.95	--	0.019	--	0.20	No
delta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chlordane	µg/L	<	0.0023	<	0.0023	0.00057	2.4	0.0043	0.00057	--	0.10	No
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	<	0.0046	<	0.0046	0.00059	1.1	0.0010	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	<	0.0025	<	0.0025	0.00059	--	--	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00083	--	--	0.00083	--	--	No
Dieldrin	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00014	0.24	0.056	0.00014	--	--	No
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0041	<	0.0041	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
Endosulfan Sulfate	µg/L	<	0.0028	<	0.0028	110	--	--	110	--	--	No
Endrin	µg/L	<	0.0021	<	0.0021	0.036	0.086	0.036	0.76	--	2.0	No
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	<	0.0019	<	0.0019	0.76	--	--	0.76	--	--	No
Heptachlor	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.00021	0.52	0.0038	0.00021	--	0.010	No
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	<	0.0026	<	0.0026	0.00010	0.52	0.0038	0.00010	--	0.010	No
PCBs sum ⁴	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	0.00017	--	0.014	0.00017	--	0.50	No
Toxaphene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	0.00020	0.73	0.00020	0.00073	--	3.0	No
Ammonia (mussels present)	mg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	2.6	13	2.6	--	--	--	No
Ammonia (mussels absent)	mg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	5.7	13	5.7	--	--	--	No
Gross Alpha	pCi/L	<	2.8	--	--	15	--	--	--	--	15	No
Radium-226 + Radium-228	pCi/L	<	0.14	--	--	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Strontium-90	pCi/L	DNQ	0.3	--	--	8.0	--	--	--	--	8.0	No
Tritium	pCi/L	<	287	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	--	20,000	No
Uranium	pCi/L	<	0.67	--	--	20	--	--	--	--	20	No

Discharge Points 006A(2) and 006B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	6.0	--	--	--	--	6.0	No
Methyl Tert-butyl Ether (MTBE)	mg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	13	--	--	--	--	13	No
Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	8.2	=	1.7	10	--	--	--	--	10	No
Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	0.19	--	--	1.0	--	--	--	--	1.0	No
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	=	360	--	--	500	--	--	--	--	500	No
Xylenes	µg/L	<	0.12	<	0.12	1,800	--	--	--	--	1,800	No

Table Notes:

- In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives), this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
- Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, a slow-moving waterbody, established in the Statewide Mercury Objectives.
- The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.
- PCBs sum refers to sum of PCB 1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, and 1260.

Discharge Point 012A(1)												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Antimony	µg/L	=	1	DNQ	0.088 (DNQ)	6.0	--	--	14	--	6.0	No
Arsenic	µg/L	DNQ	1.8	DNQ	1.3	10	340	150	--	--	10	No
Beryllium	µg/L	<	0.055	<	0.12	4.0	--	--	--	--	4.0	No
Cadmium	µg/L	<	0.034	<	0.13	2.9	5.8	2.9	--	--	5.0	No
Chromium (III)	µg/L	=	0.72	=	2.7	247	2,100	250	--	--	--	No
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	--	--	--	--	11	16	11	--	--	50	Ud
Copper	µg/L	=	7.5	=	2.0	11	17	11	1,300	--	--	No
Lead	µg/L	=	1.9	DNQ	0.44	4.2	110	4.2	--	--	--	No
Mercury	ng/L	=	2.3 ¹	=	4.6 ¹	4 ²	--	--	50	--	2,000	No
Nickel	µg/L	=	5.1	=	4.7	63	560	63	610	--	100	No
Selenium	µg/L	DNQ	0.47	<	0.32	5.0	--	5.0	--	--	50	No
Silver	µg/L	<	0.031	DNQ	0.079	5.9	5.9	--	--	--	--	No
Thallium	µg/L	<	0.19	<	0.32	1.7	--	--	1.7	--	2.0	No
Zinc	µg/L	=	50.2	DNQ	5.4	144	140	140	--	--	--	No

Discharge Point 012A(1)												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Cyanide	µg/L	DNQ	2.5	=	1.3 (DNQ)	5.2	22	5.2	700	--	150	No
Asbestos	MFL			--	--	7.0	--	--	7.0	--	7.0	Ud
2,3,7,8 TCDD	µg/L	<	4.54E-07	<	8.96E-07	1.3E-08	--	--	1.3E-08	--	3.0E-05	No
Acrolein	µg/L	<	0.95	<	0.95	320	--	--	320	780	--	No
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.059	--	--	0.059	--	--	No
Benzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	1.0	--	--	1.2	--	1.0	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	4.3	--	--	4.3	--	--	No
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.25	--	--	0.25	--	0.50	No
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	70	--	--	680	--	70	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	=	1.24	<	0.05	0.41	--	--	0.41	--	--	Yes
Chloroethane	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chloroform	µg/L	=	21.2	<	0.07	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	=	7.12	<	0.08	0.56	--	--	0.56	--	--	Yes
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.38	--	--	0.38	--	0.50	No
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.057	--	--	0.057	--	6.0	No
1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.52	--	--	0.52	--	5.0	No
1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	0.50	--	--	10	--	0.50	No
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	300	--	--	3,100	--	300	No
Methyl Bromide	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	48	--	--	48	--	--	No
Methyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Methylene Chloride	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	4.7	--	--	4.7	--	5.0	No
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.17	--	--	0.17	--	1.0	No
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.80	--	--	0.80	--	5.0	No
Toluene	µg/L	DNQ	0.32	DNQ	0.14	150	--	--	6,800	--	150	No
1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.1	<	0.1	10	--	--	700	--	10	No
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	200	--	--	--	--	200	No
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	0.60	--	--	0.60	--	5.0	No
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	2.7	--	--	2.7	--	5.0	No
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	0.50	--	--	2.0	--	0.50	No
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.18	<	0.18	120	--	--	120	--	--	No
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	93	--	--	93	--	--	No

Discharge Point 012A(1)												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	540	--	--	540	--	--	No
2-Methyl- 4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.74	<	0.74	13	--	--	13	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	DNQ	1.2	<	0.72	70	--	--	70	--	--	No
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	1.0	<	1.0	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
3-Methyl 4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	DNQ	3.7	<	1.1	0.28	7.1	5.5	0.28	--	1.0	Yes
Phenol	µg/L	DNQ	0.55	<	0.18	21,000	--	--	21,000	--	--	No
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	2.1	--	--	2.1	--	--	No
Acenaphthene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	1,200	--	--	1,200	--	--	No
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	9,600	--	--	9,600	--	--	No
Benzidine	µg/L	<	1	<	1	0.00012	--	--	0.00012	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.38	<	0.38	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	0.20	No
Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(ghi)Perylene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.031	--	--	0.031	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,400	--	--	1,400	--	--	No
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	1.8 ³	=	13.3	1.8	--	--	1.8	--	4.0	Yes
4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.89	<	0.54	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	No
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	1,700	--	--	1,700	--	--	No
4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chrysene	µg/L	<	0.19	<	0.19	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	600	--	--	2700	--	600	No

Discharge Point 012A(1)												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	400	--	--	400	--	--	No
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	5.0	--	--	400	--	5.0	No
3,3 Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	<	0.31	<	0.31	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.33	DNQ	0.57	23,000	--	--	23,000	--	--	No
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	310,000	--	--	310,000	--	--	No
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	1.1	<	0.42	2,700	--	--	2,700	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.28	<	0.28	0.11	--	--	0.11	--	--	No
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.88	=	1.8	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	300	--	--	300	--	--	No
Fluorene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,300	--	--	1,300	--	--	No
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.00075	--	--	0.00075	--	1.0	No
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	0.44	--	--	0.44	--	--	No
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	50	--	--	240	--	50	No
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	1.9	--	--	1.9	--	--	No
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Isophorone	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	8.4	--	--	8.4	--	--	No
Naphthalene	µg/L	DNQ	0.2	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	17	--	--	17	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	0.00069	--	--	0.00069	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.0050	--	--	0.0050	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	5.0	--	--	5.0	--	--	No
Phenanthrene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	960	--	--	960	--	--	No
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Aldrin	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.00013	3.0	--	0.00013	--	--	No
alpha-BHC	µg/L	<	0.006	<	0.006	0.0039	--	--	0.0039	--	--	No
beta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0040	<	0.0040	0.014	--	--	0.014	--	--	No
gamma-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.019	0.95	--	0.019	--	0.20	No
delta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chlordane	µg/L	<	0.0023	<	0.0023	0.00057	2.4	0.0043	0.00057	--	0.10	No

Discharge Point 012A(1)												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	<	0.0046	<	0.0046	0.00059	1.1	0.0010	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	<	0.0025	<	0.0025	0.00059	--	--	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00083	--	--	0.00083	--	--	No
Dieldrin	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00014	0.24	0.056	0.00014	--	--	No
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0041	<	0.0041	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
Endosulfan Sulfate	µg/L	<	0.0028	<	0.0028	110	--	--	110	--	--	No
Endrin	µg/L	<	0.0021	<	0.0021	0.036	0.086	0.036	0.76	--	2.0	No
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	<	0.0019	<	0.0019	0.76	--	--	0.76	--	--	No
Heptachlor	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.00021	0.52	0.0038	0.00021	--	0.010	No
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	<	0.0026	<	0.0026	0.00010	0.52	0.0038	0.00010	--	0.010	No
PCBs sum ⁴	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	0.00017	--	0.014	0.00017	--	0.50	No
Toxaphene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	0.00020	0.73	0.00020	0.00073	--	3.0	No
Ammonia (mussels present)	mg/L	=	4.2	<	0.2	2.6	13	2.6	--	--	--	No
Ammonia (mussels absent)	mg/L	=	4.2	<	0.2	5.7	13	5.7	--	--	--	No
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	6.0	--	--	--	--	6.0	No
Methyl Tert-butyl Ether (MTBE)	mg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	13	--	--	--	--	13	No
Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	28.6	=	0.91	10	--	--	--	--	10	Yes
Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	3.2	--	--	1.0	--	--	--	--	1.0	Yes
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	=	580	--	--	500	--	--	--	--	500	No
Xylenes	µg/L	<	0.12	<	0.12	1,800	--	--	--	--	1,800	No

Table Notes:

1. In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives), this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
2. Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to Santa Rosa Creek, a tributary of the Laguna de Santa Rosa which is a slow-moving waterbody, established in the Statewide Mercury Objectives.
3. The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.
4. PCBs sum refers to sum of PCB 1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, and 1260.

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Antimony	µg/L	DNQ	0.29	DNQ	0.088	6.0	--	--	14	--	6.0	No
Arsenic	µg/L	=	2.5	DNQ	1.3	10	340	150	--	--	10	No
Beryllium	µg/L	<	0.1	<	0.1	4.0	--	--	--	--	4.0	No
Cadmium	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	2.9	5.8	2.9	--	--	5.0	No
Chromium (III)	µg/L	=	2.5	=	3.1	247	2,100	250	--	--	--	No
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	--	--	--	--	11	16	11	--	--	50	Ud
Copper	µg/L	=	3.1	=	2.0	11	17	11	1,300	--	--	No
Lead	µg/L	DNQ	0.17	=	0.44	4.2	110	4.2	--	--	--	No
Mercury	µg/L	=	1.9 ¹	=	4.6 ¹	12 ²	--	--	50	--	2,000	No
Nickel	µg/L	=	9.1	=	4.7	63	560	63	610	--	100	No
Selenium	µg/L	DNQ	0.32	<	0.32	5.0	--	5.0	--	--	50	No
Silver	µg/L	DNQ	0.031	DNQ	0.079	5.9	5.9	--	--	--	--	No
Thallium	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	1.7	--	--	1.7	--	2.0	No
Zinc	µg/L	=	15	=	5.4	140	140	140	--	--	--	No
Cyanide	µg/L	<	1	<	1	5.2	22	5.2	700	--	150	No
Asbestos	MFL	--	--	--	--	7.0	--	--	7.0	--	7.0	Ud
2,3,7,8 TCDD	µg/L	<	8.59E-07	<	8.96E-07	1.3E-08	--	--	1.3E-08	--	3.0E-05	No
Acrolein	µg/L	<	0.95	<	0.95	320	--	--	320	780	--	No
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.059	--	--	0.059	--	--	No
Benzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	1.0	--	--	1.2	--	1.0	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	4.3	--	--	4.3	--	--	No
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.25	--	--	0.25	--	0.50	No
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	70	--	--	680	--	70	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.41	--	--	0.41	--	--	No
Chloroethane	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chloroform	µg/L	=	0.99	<	0.07	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	DNQ	0.2	<	0.08	0.56	--	--	0.56	--	--	No
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.38	--	--	0.38	--	0.50	No
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.057	--	--	0.057	--	6.0	No
1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	0.52	--	--	0.52	--	5.0	No
1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	0.50	--	--	10	--	0.50	No
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	300	--	--	3,100	--	300	No

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Methyl Bromide	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	48	--	--	48	--	--	No
Methyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Methylene Chloride	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	4.7	--	--	4.7	--	5.0	No
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	0.17	--	--	0.17	--	1.0	No
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.07	<	0.07	0.80	--	--	0.80	--	5.0	No
Toluene	µg/L	<	0.06	DNQ	0.14	150	--	--	6,800	--	150	No
1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.1	<	0.1	10	--	--	700	--	10	No
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	<	0.08	200	--	--	--	--	200	No
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	0.60	--	--	0.60	--	5.0	No
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	2.7	--	--	2.7	--	5.0	No
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	<	0.09	0.50	--	--	2.0	--	0.50	No
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.18	<	0.18	120	--	--	120	--	--	No
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	93	--	--	93	--	--	No
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	540	--	--	540	--	--	No
2-Methyl- 4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.74	<	0.74	13	--	--	13	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.72	<	0.72	70	--	--	70	--	--	No
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	1.0	<	1.0	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
3-Methyl 4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	<	1.1	<	1.1	0.28	7.1	5.5	0.28	--	1.0	No
Phenol	µg/L	<	0.18	<	0.18	21,000	--	--	21,000	--	--	No
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	<	0.13	2.1	--	--	2.1	--	--	No
Acenaphthene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	1,200	--	--	1,200	--	--	No
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	9,600	--	--	9,600	--	--	No
Benzidine	µg/L	<	1	<	1	0.00012	--	--	0.00012	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.38	<	0.38	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	0.20	No
Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(ghi)Perylene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.031	--	--	0.031	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,400	--	--	1,400	--	--	No
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.1 ³	=	13.3	1.8	--	--	1.8	--	4.0	Yes
4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.54	<	0.54	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	No
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	1,700	--	--	1,700	--	--	No
4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chrysene	µg/L	<	0.19	<	0.19	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	600	--	--	2700	--	600	No
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.05	<	0.05	400	--	--	400	--	--	No
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	5.0	--	--	400	--	5.0	No
3,3 Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	<	0.31	<	0.31	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.33	DNQ	0.57	23,000	--	--	23,000	--	--	No
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	310,000	--	--	310,000	--	--	No
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.42	<	0.42	2,700	--	--	2,700	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.28	<	0.28	0.11	--	--	0.11	--	--	No
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.32	<	0.32	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.52	DNQ	1.8	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	300	--	--	300	--	--	No
Fluorene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	1,300	--	--	1,300	--	--	No
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.27	<	0.27	0.00075	--	--	0.00075	--	1.0	No
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	<	0.11	<	0.11	0.44	--	--	0.44	--	--	No
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	50	--	--	240	--	50	No
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	1.9	--	--	1.9	--	--	No
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.29	<	0.29	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Isophorone	µg/L	<	0.26	<	0.26	8.4	--	--	8.4	--	--	No
Naphthalene	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	17	--	--	17	--	--	No

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	<	0.23	<	0.23	0.00069	--	--	0.00069	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	<	0.22	<	0.22	0.0050	--	--	0.0050	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	<	0.24	<	0.24	5.0	--	--	5.0	--	--	No
Phenanthrene	µg/L	<	0.16	<	0.16	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.25	<	0.25	960	--	--	960	--	--	No
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.14	<	0.14	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Aldrin	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.00013	3.0	--	0.00013	--	--	No
alpha-BHC	µg/L	<	0.006	<	0.006	0.0039	--	--	0.0039	--	--	No
beta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.004	<	0.004	0.014	--	--	0.014	--	--	No
gamma-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.019	0.95	--	0.019	--	0.20	No
delta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chlordane	µg/L	<	0.0023	<	0.0023	0.00057	2.4	0.0043	0.00057	--	0.10	No
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	<	0.0046	<	0.0046	0.00059	1.1	0.0010	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	<	0.0025	<	0.0025	0.00059	--	--	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00083	--	--	0.00083	--	--	No
Dieldrin	µg/L	<	0.0022	<	0.0022	0.00014	0.24	0.056	0.00014	--	--	No
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0027	<	0.0027	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0041	<	0.0041	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
Endosulfan Sulfate	µg/L	<	0.0028	<	0.0028	110	--	--	110	--	--	No
Endrin	µg/L	<	0.0021	<	0.0021	0.036	0.086	0.036	0.76	--	2.0	No
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	<	0.0019	<	0.0019	0.76	--	--	0.76	--	--	No
Heptachlor	µg/L	<	0.0024	<	0.0024	0.00021	0.52	0.0038	0.00021	--	0.010	No
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	<	0.0026	<	0.0026	0.00010	0.52	0.0038	0.00010	--	0.010	No
PCBs sum ⁴	µg/L	<	0.17	<	0.17	0.00017	--	0.014	0.00017	--	0.50	No
Toxaphene	µg/L	<	0.21	<	0.21	0.00020	0.73	0.00020	0.00073	--	3.0	No
Ammonia (mussels present)	mg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	2.6	13	2.6	--	--	--	No
Ammonia (mussels absent)	mg/L	<	0.2	<	0.2	5.7	13	5.7	--	--	--	No
Gross Alpha	pCi/L	<	3	--	--	15	--	--	--	--	15	No
Radium-226 + Radium-228	pCi/L	<	1	--	--	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Strontium-90	pCi/L	<	1	--	--	8.0	--	--	--	--	8.0	No
Tritium	pCi/L	<	1000	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	--	20,000	No
Uranium	pCi/L	<	0.67	--	--	20	--	--	--	--	20	No
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	<	0.06	6.0	--	--	--	--	6.0	No

Discharge Points 012A(2) and 012B												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Methyl Tert-butyl Ether (MTBE)	mg/L	<	0.04	<	0.04	13	--	--	--	--	13	No
Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	9.1	=	0.91	10	--	--	--	--	10	No
Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	0.13	--	--	1.0	--	--	--	--	1.0	No
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	=	410	--	--	500	--	--	--	--	500	No
Xylenes	µg/L	<	0.12	<	0.12	1,800	--	--	--	--	1,800	No

Table Notes:

- In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives), this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
- Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to Santa Rosa Creek, a tributary of the Laguna de Santa Rosa which is a slow-moving waterbody, established in the Statewide Mercury Objectives.
- The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.
- PCBs sum refers to sum of PCB 1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, and 1260.

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Antimony	µg/L	=	1	--	--	6.0	--	--	14	--	6.0	No
Arsenic	µg/L	DNQ	1.8	--	--	10	340	150	--	--	10	No
Beryllium	µg/L	<	0.055	--	--	4.0	--	--	--	--	4.0	No
Cadmium	µg/L	<	0.034	--	--	1.8	1.8	2.9	--	--	5.0	No
Chromium (III)	µg/L	=	0.72	--	--	150	150	250	--	--	--	No
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	--	--	--	--	11	11	11	--	--	50	Ud
Copper	µg/L	=	7.5	--	--	6.7	6.7	11	1,300	--	--	No
Lead	µg/L	=	1.9	--	--	1.9	1.9	4.2	--	--	--	No
Mercury	µg/L	=	2.3 ¹	--	--	4 ²	--	--	50	--	2,000	No
Nickel	µg/L	=	5.1	--	--	37	37	63	610	--	100	No
Selenium	µg/L	DNQ	0.47	--	--	5.0	5.0	5.0	--	--	50	No
Silver	µg/L	<	0.031	--	--	2.1	--	--	--	--	--	No
Thallium	µg/L	<	0.19	--	--	1.7	--	--	1.7	--	2.0	No
Zinc	µg/L	=	50.2	--	--	86	86	140	--	--	--	No
Cyanide	µg/L	DNQ	2.5	--	--	5.2	22	5.2	700	--	150	No
Asbestos	MFL	--	--	--	--	7.0	--	--	7.0	--	7.0	Ud

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
2,3,7,8 TCDD	µg/L	<	4.57E-07	--	--	1.3E-08	--	--	1.3E-08	--	3.0E-05	No
Acrolein	µg/L	<	0.95	--	--	320	--	--	320	780	--	No
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	<	0.22	--	--	0.059	--	--	0.059	--	--	No
Benzene	µg/L	<	0.07	--	--	1.0	--	--	1.2	--	1.0	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<	0.14	--	--	4.3	--	--	4.3	--	--	No
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	<	0.05	--	--	0.25	--	--	0.25	--	0.50	No
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.07	--	--	70	--	--	680	--	70	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	=	1.24	--	--	0.41	--	--	0.41	--	--	Yes
Chloroethane	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	µg/L	<	0.24	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chloroform	µg/L	=	21.2	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	=	7.12	--	--	0.56	--	--	0.56	--	--	Yes
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.07	--	--	0.38	--	--	0.38	--	0.50	No
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.08	--	--	0.057	--	--	0.057	--	6.0	No
1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	<	0.05	--	--	0.52	--	--	0.52	--	5.0	No
1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	0.50	--	--	10	--	0.50	No
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	300	--	--	3,100	--	300	No
Methyl Bromide	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	48	--	--	48	--	--	No
Methyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Methylene Chloride	µg/L	<	0.11	--	--	4.7	--	--	4.7	--	5.0	No
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	--	--	0.17	--	--	0.17	--	1.0	No
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.07	--	--	0.80	--	--	0.80	--	5.0	No
Toluene	µg/L	DNQ	0.32	--	--	150	--	--	6,800	--	150	No
1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.1	--	--	10	--	--	700	--	10	No
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.08	--	--	200	--	--	--	--	200	No
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<	0.04	--	--	0.60	--	--	0.60	--	5.0	No
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	2.7	--	--	2.7	--	5.0	No
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	<	0.09	--	--	0.50	--	--	2.0	--	0.50	No
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.18	--	--	120	--	--	120	--	--	No
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	93	--	--	93	--	--	No
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	<	0.23	--	--	540	--	--	540	--	--	No
2-Methyl- 4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.74	--	--	13	--	--	13	--	--	No

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	DNQ	1.2	--	--	70	--	--	70	--	--	No
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<	1.0	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
3-Methyl 4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	DNQ	3.7	--	--	0.28	8.7	6.7	0.28	--	1.0	Yes
Phenol	µg/L	DNQ	0.55	--	--	21,000	--	--	21,000	--	--	No
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	<	0.13	--	--	2.1	--	--	2.1	--	--	No
Acenaphthene	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	1,200	--	--	1,200	--	--	No
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<	0.27	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.23	--	--	9,600	--	--	9,600	--	--	No
Benzidine	µg/L	<	1	--	--	0.00012	--	--	0.00012	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.32	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(a)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.38	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	0.20	No
Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.27	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Benzo(ghi)Perylene	µg/L	<	0.25	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.25	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	<	0.2	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	0.031	--	--	0.031	--	--	No
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	1,400	--	--	1,400	--	--	No
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	1.8 ³	--	--	1.8	--	--	1.8	--	4.0	No
4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.23	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.89	--	--	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	No
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	<	0.14	--	--	1,700	--	--	1,700	--	--	No
4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chrysene	µg/L	<	0.19	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	600	--	--	2700	--	600	No
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.05	--	--	400	--	--	400	--	--	No
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	5.0	--	--	400	--	5.0	No

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
3,3 Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	<	0.31	--	--	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.33	--	--	23,000	--	--	23,000	--	--	No
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	<	0.29	--	--	310,000	--	--	310,000	--	--	No
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	1.1	--	--	2,700	--	--	2,700	--	--	No
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.28	--	--	0.11	--	--	0.11	--	--	No
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<	0.32	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	µg/L	DNQ	0.88	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	<	0.25	--	--	0.040	--	--	0.040	--	--	No
Fluoranthene	µg/L	<	0.26	--	--	300	--	--	300	--	--	No
Fluorene	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	1,300	--	--	1,300	--	--	No
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.27	--	--	0.00075	--	--	0.00075	--	1.0	No
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	<	0.11	--	--	0.44	--	--	0.44	--	--	No
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	<	0.21	--	--	50	--	--	240	--	50	No
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	<	0.24	--	--	1.9	--	--	1.9	--	--	No
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.29	--	--	0.0044	--	--	0.0044	--	--	No
Isophorone	µg/L	<	0.26	--	--	8.4	--	--	8.4	--	--	No
Naphthalene	µg/L	DNQ	0.2	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	<	0.21	--	--	17	--	--	17	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	<	0.23	--	--	0.00069	--	--	0.00069	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	<	0.22	--	--	0.0050	--	--	0.0050	--	--	No
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	<	0.24	--	--	5.0	--	--	5.0	--	--	No
Phenanthrene	µg/L	<	0.16	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Pyrene	µg/L	<	0.25	--	--	960	--	--	960	--	--	No
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	<	0.14	--	--	5.0	--	--	--	--	5.0	No
Aldrin	µg/L	<	0.0027	--	--	0.00013	3.0	--	0.00013	--	--	No
alpha-BHC	µg/L	<	0.006	--	--	0.0039	--	--	0.0039	--	--	No
beta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0040	--	--	0.014	--	--	0.014	--	--	No
gamma-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	--	--	0.019	0.95	--	0.019	--	0.20	No
delta-BHC	µg/L	<	0.0024	--	--	No Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	Uo
Chlordane	µg/L	<	0.0023	--	--	0.00057	2.4	0.0043	0.00057	--	0.10	No
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	<	0.0046	--	--	0.00059	1.1	0.0010	0.00059	--	--	No
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	<	0.0025	--	--	0.00059	--	--	0.00059	--	--	No

Discharge Points 006A(1) and 015												
Constituent	Units	Qualifier	MEC	Qualifier	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	MCL	Reasonable Potential
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	<	0.0022	--	--	0.00083	--	--	0.00083	--	--	No
Dieldrin	µg/L	<	0.0022	--	--	0.00014	0.24	0.056	0.00014	--	--	No
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0027	--	--	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	<	0.0041	--	--	0.056	0.22	0.056	110	--	--	No
Endosulfan Sulfate	µg/L	<	0.0028	--	--	110	--	--	110	--	--	No
Endrin	µg/L	<	0.0021	--	--	0.036	0.086	0.036	0.76	--	2.0	No
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	<	0.0019	--	--	0.76	--	--	0.76	--	--	No
Heptachlor	µg/L	<	0.0024	--	--	0.00021	0.52	0.0038	0.00021	--	0.010	No
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	<	0.0026	--	--	0.00010	0.52	0.0038	0.00010	--	0.010	No
PCBs sum ⁴	µg/L	<	0.17	--	--	0.00017	--	0.014	0.00017	--	0.50	No
Toxaphene	µg/L	<	0.21	--	--	0.00020	0.73	0.00020	0.00073	--	3.0	No
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	<	0.06	--	--	6.0	--	--	--	--	6.0	No
Methyl Tert-butyl Ether (MTBE)	mg/L	<	0.04	--	--	13	--	--	--	--	13	No
Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	28.6	--	--	10	--	--	--	--	10	Yes
Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	=	3.2	--	--	1.0	--	--	--	--	1.0	Yes
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	=	5805	--	--	500	--	--	--	--	500	No
Xylenes	µg/L	<	0.12	--	--	1,800	--	--	--	--	1,800	No

Table Notes:

1. In accordance with the implementation procedures specified in section IV.D.2.c of the State Water Board's *Final Part 2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Tribal and Subsistence Fishing Beneficial Uses and Mercury Provisions* (Statewide Mercury Objectives), this value represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the water column concentration.
2. Represents the water column concentration for translation of the fish tissue WQO for protection of the COMM, WILD, and RARE beneficial uses applicable to the Laguna de Santa Rosa, a slow-moving waterbody, established in the Statewide Mercury Objectives.
3. The MEC for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was determined by subtracting the method blank result from each corresponding effluent result as allowed by the analytical method (EPA Method 625.1). This allowance is given in Method 625.1 because of the difficulty of reducing /eliminating the signal for bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in samples due to the ubiquitous nature of this compound.
4. PCBs sum refers to sum of PCB 1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, and 1260.
5. TDS concentrations were all less than 500 mg/L during periods of discharge.

**ATTACHMENT G – AMEL AND MDEL COPPER STANDARDS BASED ON CTR WATER QUALITY
 CRITERIA FOR FRESHWATER**

Receiving Water Hardness as CaCO ₃ (mg/L)	Freshwater CTR Water Quality Criteria (µg/L)		Effluent Limitations ¹ (µg/L)	
	CMC 1-Hour Average	CCC 4-Day Average	Average Monthly	Maximum Daily
5	0.83	0.72	0.45	0.83
10	1.6	1.3	0.87	1.6
15	2.3	1.8	1.3	2.3
20	3.1	2.4	1.7	3.1
25	3.8	2.9	2.1	3.8
30	4.5	3.3	2.5	4.5
35	5.2	3.8	2.8	5.2
40	5.9	4.3	3.2	5.9
45	6.6	4.7	3.6	6.6
50	7.3	5.2	4.0	7.3
55	8.0	5.6	4.4	8.0
60	8.7	6.0	4.7	8.7
65	9.3	6.5	5.1	9.3
70	10	6.9	5.5	10
75	11	7.3	5.8	11
80	11	7.7	6.2	11
85	12	8.1	6.6	12
90	13	8.5	6.9	13
95	13	8.9	7.3	13
100	14	9.3	7.6	14
105	15	9.7	8.0	15
110	15	10	8.4	15
115	16	11	8.7	16
120	17	11	9.1	17
125	17	11	9.4	17
130	18	12	10	18
135	19	12	10	19
140	19	12	10	19
145	20	13	11	20
150	21	13	11	20
155	21	14	12	21
160	22	14	12	22
165	22	14	12	22
170	23	15	12	23
175	24	15	13	23
180	24	15	13	24
185	25	16	13	25
190	26	16	14	25
195	26	17	14	26

Receiving Water Hardness as CaCO ₃ (mg/L)	Freshwater CTR Water Quality Criteria (µg/L)		Effluent Limitations ¹ (µg/L)	
	CMC 1-Hour Average	CCC 4-Day Average	Average Monthly	Maximum Daily
200	27	17	14	26
205	28	17	15	27
210	28	18	15	27
215	29	18	15	28
220	29	18	16	28
225	30	19	16	29
230	31	19	16	30
235	31	19	16	30
240	32	20	17	31
245	33	20	17	31
250	33	20	17	32
255	34	21	18	32
260	34	21	18	33
265	35	22	18	33
270	36	22	18	34
275	36	22	19	34
280	37	23	19	35
285	38	23	19	35
290	38	23	20	36
295	39	24	20	37
300	39	24	20	37
310	41	25	21	38
320	42	25	21	39
340	44	27	23	41
350	46	27	23	42
360	47	28	24	43
370	48	29	24	44
380	49	29	25	45
390	51	30	25	46
400	52	31	26	47

Table Notes:

1. Hardness-dependent effluent limitations for copper were developed in accordance with the procedures detailed in section IV.C.4 of the Fact Sheet.

Order No. R1-2020-0012
City of Santa Rosa
NPDES No. CA0022764

ATTACHMENT I- WATER QUALITY TRADING FRAMEWORK

ATTACHMENT ~~1K~~
to
~~RESOLUTION R1-2018-0025~~ NPDES PERMIT NO. R1-2020-0012

Water Quality Trading Framework for the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed

~~Approved by the Regional Water Board:
July 11, 2018~~

Table of Contents

- Introduction 4
 - Foundational References 4
 - Guiding Principles 4
- 1. Policy & Regulatory Instruments to Support Trading 5
 - 1.1 Authority for Water Quality Trading in California 5
 - 1.2 Regulatory Instruments to Support Trading..... 5
 - 1.3 Public Involvement 5
 - 1.4 Regional Water Board Authority to Audit 6
- 2. Trading Basics..... 6
 - 2.1 Types of Trades..... 6
 - 2.2 Trading Parties..... 6
 - 2.3 Trading Area 6
 - 2.4 Types of Credits to be Traded 6
 - 2.5 Approved / Pre-qualified Practices..... 7
- 3. Trading Eligibility Criteria 10
 - 3.1 Eligibility for Trading Parties..... 10
 - 3.2 Eligibility Criteria for Credit-Generating Projects 10
- 4. Quantifying Pollutant Reductions for Water Quality Credits 12
- 5. Trading Ratios 13
- 6. Credit Characteristics & Accounting Conventions 14
 - 6.1 Credit Life 14
 - 6.2 Project Life..... 14
 - 6.3 Banking Credits for Later Use 15
 - 6.4 Project Expiration and Renewal 15
- 7. Project Planning, Pre-Screening, & Approval..... 16
 - 7.1 Credit Project Plans 16
 - 7.2 Credit Project Plan Approval Process 17
 - 7.3 Credit Project Pre-Screening Process (Optional)..... 18
 - 7.4 Combined Qualified Practice and Credit Project Plans 19
- 8. Project Implementation & Verification..... 20
 - 8.1 Documenting Pre- and Post-Project Site Conditions..... 20
 - 8.2 Initial Project Verification 20
 - 8.3 Ongoing Project Verification 21
- 9. Credit Certification, Registration & Tracking 22
 - 9.1 Credit Certification 22
 - 9.2 Serialization of Certified Credits..... 22

9.3	Changes in Credit Status.....	23
9.4	Changes in Credit Ownership	23
9.5	Credit Tracking & Registry Administration	24
10.	Compliance and Enforcement.....	24
11.	Framework Improvements and Monitoring	24
11.1	Improving Framework Specifications, Protocols, and Processes	24
11.2	Monitoring / Evaluating Framework Effectiveness	25

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide a framework for the implementation of water quality trading (WQT) activities in the Laguna de Santa Rosa (Laguna) watershed (hereinafter “this Framework” or “this WQT Framework”), where such activities are explicitly allowed under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits adopted by order of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board).

This Framework seeks to provide NPDES permittees with cost-effective and environmentally beneficial options for complying with effluent limitations for specifically named pollutant discharges to surface waters. Environmentally beneficial compliance options allowed under this Framework include restoration projects that support and/or enhance instream conditions, habitat quality, and ecological functions. ~~This Framework is available to the City of Santa Rosa and the Town of Windsor.~~

Foundational References

This WQT Framework draws heavily from the following foundational reference materials:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency *Water Quality Trading Policy*, dated January 13, 2003. (a.k.a. 2003 USEPA Trading Policy)
- *Building a Water Quality Trading Program: Options and Considerations*; a product of the National Network on Water Quality Trading, dated June 2015. (a.k.a. National Network’s *Options and Considerations* document)
- *Water Quality Trading Framework for the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed*; technical report prepared for Sonoma Resource Conservation District by Kieser & Associates, LLC, dated September 2015. (a.k.a. Local Stakeholder Recommendations)
- *The Water Quality Trading Toolkit*; created by the Association of Clean Water Administrators and Willamette Partnership, dated August 2016. (a.k.a. ACWA Trading Framework Template)

Guiding Principles

While this Framework details the basic processes and requirements for facilitating WQT within the Laguna watershed, individual trades may introduce unique circumstances and challenges. Should questions arise about the intent of this Framework’s provisions, its users should defer to these guiding principles, as well as those provided in the Local Stakeholder Recommendations:

- Activities conducted pursuant to this WQT Framework must be supported by sound science and effectively accomplish regulatory and environmental goals.
- WQT activities must provide sufficient accountability, transparency, accessibility, and opportunities for public involvement to ensure that promised water quality improvements are delivered.
- The benefits of WQT must be realized without allowing adverse water quality impacts associated with credit-generating actions to occur in place, in kind, or in time.

- WQT activities must adhere to all applicable laws, including the federal Clean Water Act, the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and local laws.

1. Policy & Regulatory Instruments to Support Trading

1.1 Authority for Water Quality Trading in California

The Regional Water Board's authority to utilize WQT as a means of controlling pollution in California is derived from federal and state laws and policies. Those laws and policies are enumerated in the Regional Water Board resolution and the administrative record that supports the ~~use~~^{approval} of this WQT Framework (Resolution No. R1-2018-0025).

1.2 Regulatory Instruments to Support Trading

This WQT Framework may be utilized by dischargers whose NPDES permits explicitly allow the use of nutrient offsets or pollutant credit trading as a means for complying with specific effluent limitations.⁴

1.3 Public Involvement

In order to ensure public accountability, transparency, and accessibility during the implementation of this Framework, the following opportunities for public involvement are provided:

- Minimum 30-day public review, opportunity to comment, written response, and public hearing prior to the Regional Water Board's adoption of NPDES permits authorizing the use of nutrient offsets or pollutant credit trading as a compliance option; ~~Minimum. This 30-day public review shall also serve as the minimum~~ 30-day public review, opportunity to comment, written response, and public hearing prior to the Regional Water Board's approval or subsequent renewal of this WQT Framework within NPDES permits;
- Minimum 30-day public review and opportunity to comment prior to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer's approval of supporting documentation for: 1) practices to be pre-qualified under this Framework (Section 2.5.2); and 2) projects proposed without a prequalified practice (Section 7.4);
- Public notification and release (online) of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer's approval of Credit Project Plans and relevant project information within one week of approval (Section 7.2 or Section 7.4);
- Public notification and release (online) of key documents and reports related to project implementation and verification within one week (Section 8); and
- Public notification and release (online) of key documents and notices related to credit certification and credit tracking within one week (Section 9).

⁴ ~~For purposes of this Framework, allowances for the use of nutrient offsets in Regional Water Board approved NPDES permits for the City of Santa Rosa (Order No. R1-2013-0001) and the Town of Windsor (Order No. R1-2013-0042) currently constitute allowances for water quality trading.~~

Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter in any way the statutory requirements of the Regional Water Board to provide opportunities for public review and comment on official permitting, enforcement, and/or other regulatory actions.

1.4 Regional Water Board Authority to Audit

Because this WQT Framework represents an option for complying with effluent limitations in NPDES permits issued by the Regional Water Board, and because the Regional Water Board has the authority to determine compliance with permits it issues, all activities conducted (and records generated) under the terms of this Framework shall be subject to audit and inspection by Regional Water Board staff. Additional information about the Regional Water Board's permit compliance and enforcement authorities is provided in Section 10 below.

2. Trading Basics

2.1 Types of Trades

This Framework allows trading of pollutant credits (hereinafter "water quality credits").

2.2 Trading Parties

This Framework generally supports trading of water quality credits between NPDES permittees (i.e., point source dischargers or credit buyers) and unregulated nonpoint sources (i.e., credit generators or sellers). However, nothing prohibits point source dischargers from trading water quality credits amongst themselves (e.g., the City of Santa Rosa selling credits to the Town of Windsor), or an entity from generating water quality credits for its own use (e.g., the City's municipal parks department generating credits to be used by the City's NPDES permitted wastewater treatment facility), provided all other eligibility criteria and Framework requirements are met. Trading eligibility criteria are described in Section 3 below.

2.3 Trading Area

The trading area for this Framework (where water quality credits may be generated, bought, sold, and used) is the Laguna de Santa Rosa watershed in Sonoma County, CA. The 254 square-mile watershed consists of all areas drained by the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Creek, and Mark West Creek, which collectively drain into the Russian River. A map of the trading area is presented in Figure 2.3 below.

2.4 Types of Credits to be Traded

This Framework supports trading of water quality credits for one pollutant only, total phosphorus, on a mass basis. Credits are generated through approved phosphorus reduction or removal actions. One credit is equal to one pound of total phosphorus. Additional information about credit characteristics is provided in Section 6 below.




Figure 2.3. Trading Area for the Laguna de Santa Rosa WQT Framework²

2.5 Approved / Pre-qualified Practices

Supporting Except for practices and projects described in Section 7.4, supporting documentation for all practices used to generate water quality credits under this Framework must first be subject to public review and be approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. Once approved, the practices (and associated credit quantification methods) shall be considered pre-qualified for future use on a project-scale, as will be described in Credit Project Plans (Section 7.1). To ensure transparency, the Regional Water Board will maintain a current and publicly-accessible list of pre-qualified practices as well as the approved supporting documentation for those practices on its website.

2.5.1 Supporting Documentation for Pre-qualified Practices

As mentioned above, in order to be considered pre-qualified for use on a project-scale, each practice proposed as the basis for water quality credit generation must be characterized by supporting documentation. The supporting documentation should establish the standards of quality, predictability,

² Map copied from *Water Quality Trading Framework for the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed*; technical report prepared for Sonoma Resource Conservation District by Kieser & Associates, LLC, dated 2015. (a.k.a. Local Stakeholder Recommendations)

effectiveness, and transparency that will guide site-specific implementation of the practice in question and quantification of the water quality credits to be generated. Supporting documentation for each practice may vary based on the nature of the practice, but should generally include the following:

Practice Standards

- Description of the practice and its purpose;
- Description of where the practice should be applied (i.e. appropriate site conditions);
- Guidelines and performance standards for design, installation, and maintenance;
- Potential side effects, interactions, and additional benefits of the practice;
- Practice-specific baseline requirements (Section 3.2.2), maximum project life (Section 6.2), and applicable trading ratio (Section 5); and
- Monitoring requirements as needed to support practice implementation (Section 11.2).

Credit Quantification Methods

- Description of predicted practice effectiveness, as supported by site-specific analysis or literature;
- Technical summary of the method by which water quality credits will be calculated (i.e., credit quantification method), and a description of the method's accuracy, sensitivity, and uncertainty;
- Monitoring required to support the accurate use of the credit quantification method;
- Procedures for applying the credit quantification method and documentation requirements; and
- Date or version number of the credit quantification method, and identifying information for the method's developer.

Project Review / Verification Procedures

- Recommended procedures for pre- and post-project site condition assessments, monitoring, and project verification activities;
- Recommended documentation and reporting for pre- and post-project site condition assessments, monitoring, and project verification activities; and
- Recommended conditions / schedule for credit release (if applicable).

Where professional certification or special expertise is necessary for the design, installation, maintenance, credit quantification, or verification of a particular practice, the supporting documentation for that practice should describe such requirements.

Additional information about credit quantification methods is provided in Section 4 below. Additional information about documenting pre- and post-project site conditions is provided in Section 8.1. Additional information about initial and ongoing project verification requirements is provided in Sections 8.2 and 8.3, respectively.

2.5.2 Process for Approving Pre-qualified Practices

The process for approving (or pre-qualifying) a practice for use under this WQT Framework is as follows.

Step 1: Preparation and Submittal of Supporting Documentation

New and/or updated practices may be proposed by any entity at any time for pre-qualification under this WQT Framework. Supporting documentation for each practice (described in Section 2.5.1 above) must be prepared and submitted to Regional Water Board staff, along with a request to initiate the approval process described herein.

Step 2: Initial Screening / Completeness Review

Regional Water Board staff will perform an initial screening of the request for approval and supporting documentation for the proposed practice to verify completeness, and will solicit technical input and/or additional information from the proposal submitter (and others) as needed.

Step 3: Staff Review and Recommendation

Once the request for approval and supporting documentation have been determined to be complete, Regional Water Board staff will review the package in a timely manner, and will prepare a recommendation for approval or denial of the proposal. A recommendation for approval may be accompanied by conditions of approval. A recommendation for denial shall be accompanied by reasons for the denial.

Step 4: Staff Concurrence, Public Notice and Comment

If Regional Water Board staff recommends approval of the proposed practice, it will make available to the general public the request for approval, supporting documentation, and staff's recommendation (including any conditions of approval) for a minimum 30-day review and comment period. Regional Water Board staff will consider all comments received during the 30-day period, and may revise its recommendation (or conditions of approval) based on those comments. If Regional Water Board staff recommends denial of the proposed practice, it will forward its recommendation (including reasons for denial) directly to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

Step 5: Final Decision / Addition to Pre-qualified Practice List

Regional Water Board staff will provide its final recommendation to the Executive Officer for his/her consideration and final decision. If the proposal is approved, the Executive Officer's notice of approval will be made available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website and the practice will be placed on the pre-qualified practice list, along with the approved supporting documentation. If the proposal is denied, the notice of denial (including reasons for denial) will be made available on the website.

As suggested above, significant updates or revisions to supporting documentation for practices that have already been approved (i.e., practices that are already on the pre-qualified practice list) will follow the same process as for adding a new practice. Practice revisions may be triggered by a variety of events, including local lessons learned or the release of new information such as monitoring results, standards updates, or new findings in scientific literature. For purposes of this provision, the Regional

Water Board Executive Officer has the discretion to determine what constitutes a significant update or revision.

3. Trading Eligibility Criteria

3.1 Eligibility for Trading Parties

The following subsections outline the basic eligibility criteria that credit buyers and sellers must meet in order to participate in WQT under this Framework.

3.1.1 Credit Buyers

As stated in Section 1.2 above, this WQT Framework may be utilized by dischargers whose NPDES permits explicitly allow the use of nutrient offsets or pollutant credit trading as a means for complying with specific effluent limitations. For purposes of this Framework, such dischargers shall be referred to as “credit buyers” and shall be considered eligible to buy and/or use water quality credits to meet their compliance obligations, provided that all other permit and Framework requirements are met.

3.1.2 Credit Sellers

Any entity, public or private, landowner or operator, regulated or unregulated, may generate water quality credits to be sold and/or used under this WQT Framework, provided that all applicable Framework requirements and other obligations are met. For purposes of this Framework, such an entity shall be referred to as a “credit seller.” Other obligations may include, but not be limited to: applicable permit requirements, federal anti-backsliding provisions, federal and state anti-degradation policies, and any other affirmative statutory, regulatory, or contractual obligations.

3.2 Eligibility Criteria for Credit-Generating Projects

Under this Framework, a pollutant reduction or removal action is eligible to generate water quality credits as long as it is not otherwise required. That is, any action already required by law, regulation, permit, enforcement action, or any other legally binding agreement is not eligible to generate credits.³ On the contrary, actions taken voluntarily are eligible. The following subsections describe additional considerations relative to the eligibility of actions to be undertaken in credit-generating projects.

3.2.1 Avoiding Localized Impacts

Consistent with the guiding principles listed in the Introduction section above, actions taken to generate credits under this Framework must provide water quality benefits that are equal to or greater than the pollutant discharges they are meant to offset in place, in kind, and in time. Furthermore, there can be no significant, adverse localized impacts as a result of a credit trade. Each Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1) shall be reviewed by Regional Water Board staff for adherence to these general criteria, to state and federal endangered species protection laws, and to state and federal environmental review laws (i.e., California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)).

³ This provision includes, but is not limited to any requirement imposed by the Regional Water Board or by another regulatory agency.

3.2.2 Baseline Requirements for Credit-Generating Projects

For purposes of this WQT Framework, baseline shall be defined as the minimum level of effort or level of implementation that must be achieved before a project is eligible to generate credits. Depending on the nature of the credit-generating project, practice-specific baseline requirements may apply to the credit buyer, the credit seller, the project itself, the project site, or a combination thereof. Baseline requirements for every project, ~~as originally established in pre-qualified practice standards (Section 2.5.1),~~ must be specified in the approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1).

Consistent with the guiding principles listed in the Introduction section above, baseline requirements for projects conducted under this Framework shall at least correspond to the minimum requirements of any applicable laws, regulatory requirements, or other affirmative obligations such as those established in permits, easements, deed restrictions, and/or other binding contracts. Where no such requirements exist, baseline shall at least be equivalent to current conditions or practices at the project site, based on the prior three-year history of the property or operation.

Where approved credit-generating projects take place on lands subject to regulatory requirements, those requirements will be added to the defined baseline for the practices used. Thus, only voluntary actions that are above and beyond what is minimally required, or that take place prior to the adoption of a regulatory mechanism that requires those actions, shall be eligible to generate credits. For projects implementing practices that later become baseline requirements due to the effects of new or expanding regulatory programs, credits generated by those practices shall be honored for the approved project life (Section 6.2), but may not subsequently be renewed (Section 6.4).

3.2.3 Applied Timing of Baseline Requirements

All applicable baseline requirements must be met before any approved project is allowed to generate credits under this WQT Framework. This provision shall not prevent credit buyers or sellers from simultaneously implementing baseline requirements and credit-generating project components.

3.2.4 Applied Location of Baseline Requirements

Baseline requirements shall apply to the individual project site where an approved credit-generating project is being undertaken. However, the implementation of a credit-generating project at one location on a property shall not be allowed to result in the degradation of environmental conditions at another location on the property.

3.2.5 Timing of Framework Applicability

Immediately following the approval of this Framework by the Regional Water Board, projects are eligible to generate credits pursuant to its terms. Projects previously approved under the Santa Rosa Nutrient Offset Program (Regional Water Board Order No. R1- 2008-0061) shall be considered eligible under this Framework to continue generating credits according to terms under which those projects were originally approved and for their approved project lives.

3.2.6 Use of Public Conservation Funds

Under this WQT Framework, the use of public conservation funds⁴ to implement credit-generating projects is not prohibited, provided the funding entity's requirements are met and provided proportional accounting is used to allocate the credits generated by the project to each funding source. Proportional accounting shall apply to costs associated with the following phases of a credit-generating project: Credit Project Plan development, project implementation, maintenance, verification, monitoring and reporting.

The use of proportional accounting may affect the number of credits a credit seller may sell or a credit buyer may use. For example, if half the cost of a credit-generating project is paid for using public conservation funds, then only half the credits generated by that project shall be available to sell to the credit buyer.

Alternatively, if a credit seller uses public conservation funds to meet baseline requirements for a particular credit-generating project, and the seller uses private funds to implement all other aspects of the project that exceed baseline requirements, then all of the credits generated by that project shall be available to sell to the credit buyer.

In any case involving the use of public conservation or any other externally-derived funds to generate credits under this WQT Framework, it is the obligation of the trading parties to know and adhere to the funding entity's requirements.

3.2.7 Credit Stacking

Credit stacking refers to the generation of credits for multiple environmental markets (e.g. compensatory wetland mitigation, carbon sequestration and/or phosphorus credits) from a single project. Under this WQT Framework, credit stacking is allowed with proportional accounting. That is, a project is allowed to generate multiple types of credits, but those credits must be accounted for and sold (or used) proportionately. For example, if a project generates both wetland and phosphorus credits, and the credit seller sells 60% of the project's wetland credits, only 40% of the phosphorus credits from that project can also be sold. Details of any credit stacking proposal must be specified in the approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1) and subsequently verified pursuant to the provisions of Sections 8.2 and 8.3 below.

4. Quantifying Pollutant Reductions for Water Quality Credits

As described in Section 2.5 above, credit quantification methods for pre-qualified practices must be included in the supporting documentation for those practices and will be approved on a case-by-case basis. Once approved, credit quantification methods for those practices shall be considered pre-qualified for future use.

⁴ Public conservation funds include those targeted to support voluntary natural resource protection, enhancement and/or restoration, with a primary purpose of creating, restoring, enhancing or preserving water quality, healthy soils, habitats or ecological functions. Public loans intended to be used for capital improvements of public water or wastewater systems (e.g., Clean Water State Revolving Funds and USDA Rural Development funds) and utility storm water and surface water management fees are not considered public funds dedicated to conservation.

Appropriate methods for quantifying water quality credits may include the use of models (mechanistic or empirical), pre-established pollution reduction rates (from experimentation or scientific literature), direct monitoring, or a combination of the above. Models and pre-established rates, if used, should be calibrated or otherwise tuned to local conditions. In general, for this WQT Framework, methods used to quantify water quality credits to be derived from a pre-qualified practice should rely on best available science, and should demonstrate accuracy, repeatability, sensitivity, transparency, and practicality, although some trade-offs amongst these qualities are inevitable.

5. Trading Ratios

The default trading ratio for this WQT Framework is 2.5:1. That is, in any given discharge season, if a discharger wishes to use water quality credit trading to comply with the “no net loading” effluent limitation for total phosphorus in its NPDES permit, it must generate or purchase water quality credits equivalent to 2.5 times the amount of total phosphorus that it discharges. The trading ratio is the sum of two factors, both of which are applied to increase the amount of credits needed by the discharger:

- *Uncertainty ratio*: A ratio that accounts for scientific uncertainty, including potential inaccuracies in estimation methods and/or variability in project performance.
- *Retirement ratio*: A ratio that sets aside a portion of credits generated for net environmental benefit.

Table 5.1 summarizes the ratio(s) that will be applied to all trades under this WQT Framework.

Table 5.1. Applicable Trading Ratios

Ratio Type	Multiplier	Description
Uncertainty	2.0	A factor of 2.0 accounts for all potential sources of variability and uncertainty, including the following factors that may affect credit estimation: [†] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Average site conditions - Meteorological phenomena - Practice efficiency rates - Practice maturation rates - Pollutant equivalencies - Pollutant transport, delivery, and attenuation characteristics
Retirement	0.5	A factor of 0.5 is recommended to ensure that all trades generate a net water quality benefit.
TOTAL	2.5 : 1	

† Note: Uncertainty associated with pollutant discharge estimates is not explicitly accounted for in this ratio because discharges from wastewater treatment facilities are assumed to be reasonably accurate.

The Regional Water Board Executive Officer may allow the retirement and/or uncertainty ratios specified above to be adjusted downward by as much as 0.5 (each) for a particular trade under the following circumstances:

- a. A reduced retirement ratio may be applied when a credit-generating project is explicitly designed to enhance environmental values (e.g., habitat or ecosystem restoration, recognized priority or multi-benefit actions).
- b. A reduced retirement ratio may be applied when a credit-generating project occurs on permanently protected lands.
- c. A reduced uncertainty ratio may be applied when a credit-generating project includes direct measurement of pollutant reductions.

6. Credit Characteristics & Accounting Conventions

The following credit characteristics and accounting conventions shall apply to all credits generated under this WQT Framework.

6.1 Credit Life

“Credit life” is defined as the period of time during which a water quality credit may be used to offset a pollutant discharge, typically beginning with the credit’s “effective date” and ending with its “retirement date.”

The life of all credits generated under this WQT Framework shall be one year, beginning October 1 (i.e., the beginning of the NPDES discharge season) and ending September 30.

6.2 Project Life

“Project life” is defined as the period of time over which a project is anticipated to generate usable water quality credits. The life of a credit-generating project often spans several years (i.e., several consecutive credit lives). The credits generated by that project shall be distributed uniformly over those years, or as otherwise specified in the credit release schedule included in the approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1). Projects may implement multiple practices in which case each practice shall have its own project life.

For purposes of this Framework, project life shall be allowed to vary based on the specific nature of the project, the project site, the ~~pre-qualified~~ practice(s) used, and on the expressed preferences of the credit buyer and seller. In general, relatively short project lives (i.e., 5 years or less) are appropriate for less permanent practices, or for those expected soon to become subject to new regulatory requirements, such as land management practices associated with agricultural operations. Longer project lives ~~(i.e., up to 10 or 20 years)~~ are appropriate for more permanent, longer-lasting practices, such as riparian restoration or upgrades to roads, fences,

and drainage facilities. Project life shall be specified in each approved Credit Project Plan and will be evaluated on a case by case basis. This Framework does not prescribe a maximum project life.

6.3 Banking Credits for Later Use

“Banking” is the generation of a water quality credit in one time period with the intention that it be used to offset a discharge in another (future) time period. Under this WQT Framework, the “banking period” is the timeframe over which a credit shall be allowed to be banked. The minimum banking period for any credit generated under this WQT Framework is three years⁵.

~~Under this WQT Framework, banking of~~ If credits shall be allowed for up to five years (i.e., five discharge seasons) for credits are derived from projects that are explicitly designed to enhance environmental values receive a reduced retirement ratio under Section 5 (e.g., habitat or ecosystem restoration, recognized priority or multi-benefit actions), and up to, project occurs on permanently protected lands), then the banking period may be for the duration of the project life, i.e. up to the date of project expiration (Section 6.4). Credits generated from a project using different practices may be assigned different banking periods which are dependent upon the practice.

~~For example, if the banking period were three years (i.e., three discharge seasons) for credits derived from all other projects (e.g., erosion control or nutrient management actions). For instance, in the latter case, a water quality credit generated during the summer preceding the 2017/18~~ 2020/21 discharge season may be used to offset a discharge in the 2017/18, 2018/19, 2020/21, 2021/22, or 2019/20, 2022/23 discharge season. In another example, credits generated during the summer preceding the 2020/21 discharge season from a project with a reduced retirement ratio and with a life of 10 years may be used to offset a discharge during any discharge season through 2029/30.

Any credits that remain unused after the allowable banking period shall be retired for environmental benefit. For purposes of this provision, credit-generating actions must take place before the discharges they are used to offset occur.

6.4 Project Expiration and Renewal

Under this WQT Framework, once a credit-generating project reaches the end of its specified project life, it shall be considered expired and no longer able to generate credits. However, where such a project continues to function, is properly maintained, and meets all eligibility criteria and Framework requirements that are in effect at the time, it may be renewed and allowed to generate additional credits. The process for renewing an expired project shall be the same as the process for approving a new project (Section 7.2 or Section 7.4).

⁵ For the purposes of credit banking, years and discharge seasons are synonymous.

7. Project Planning, Pre-Screening, & Approval

7.1 Credit Project Plans

All the documentation necessary to approve a credit-generating project under this WQT Framework must be submitted in a Credit Project Plan, which contains relevant project design, implementation, maintenance, monitoring, and credit information as detailed below. Except for practices and projects described in Section 7.4, oOnly practices that have been pre-qualified under the terms of Section 2.5 of this Framework may be proposed for credit generation. Credit Project Plans must be prepared by qualified individuals⁶ who can properly select ~~pre-qualified~~ practice(s) for use at a particular site, and incorporate them into a project design. Consistent with the guiding principles listed in the Introduction section above, all Credit Project Plans should be designed with the primary goal of improving water quality, and should be sufficiently detailed to allow plan reviewers to understand the nature of the proposed project, its conformance with applicable Framework provisions, and the anticipated water quality credits to be generated. Approval of a credit-generating project is contingent upon the Credit Project Plan being complete and sufficiently detailed. Credit Project Plans should contain the following elements:

Basic Information

- Project name
- Date of submittal
- Project location
- Estimated size of the project area (e.g. number of acres or linear feet)
- Name of the project developer with organization and contact information
- Name of the initial owner of the water quality credits to be generated with organization and contact information

Project Design and Credit Information

- Project goals and/or objectives
- Description of the project site (e.g., ownership, land use history, current site conditions)
- Identification of ~~pre-qualified~~ practices to be used
- Description of anticipated project benefits beyond pollutant reductions (if any)
- Declaration of project eligibility with supporting documentation or discussion
- Description of applicable baseline requirements and a discussion of how those requirements have been or will be satisfied
- Designs and specifications
- Project implementation plan and/or construction schedule
- Site assessment procedures and reporting requirements (Section 8.1)

⁶ Qualified individuals may include, but not be limited to the following: a Natural Resources Conservation Service certified planner, a local Resource Conservation District employee, a certified crop advisor, a certified erosion control specialist, a California licensed civil engineer or professional geologist, or other professional consultant. Supporting documentation for ~~pre-qualified~~ practices (Section 2.5.1) may specify when certified professionals or other experts are required for the design, installation, or maintenance of a particular practice.

- Identification of parties responsible for project implementation and site assessment
- Description of construction contracts or agreements
- Evidence or description of required permits and/or CEQA documentation
- Preliminary water quality credit calculations and proposed trading ratio, with justification if less than the default 2.5:1
- Disclosure of funding sources and proportional accounting estimates (if public conservation funds are used)
- Credit stacking proposal and proportional accounting estimates (if stacking is proposed)
- Proposed project life and credit release schedule
- Project design consultants (if any) with organization and contact information

Project Maintenance Plan

- Description of maintenance requirements
- Project maintenance activities and schedule
- Description of adaptive project management procedures
- Identification of parties responsible for project maintenance
- Description of maintenance contracts and legal project protection agreements⁷

Project Monitoring, Verification and Reporting Plan

- Description of monitoring, project verification, and reporting requirements (Sections 8.2, 8.3, and 11.2)
- Monitoring, project verification, and reporting schedule
- Identification of parties responsible for monitoring, project verification, and reporting
- Description of project verification contracts or agreements

7.2 Credit Project Plan Approval Process

Except for practices and projects described in Section 7.4, Credit Project Plans to be implemented under this WQT Framework must first be reviewed and approved according to the following process:

Step 1: Preparation and Submittal of Proposed Credit Project Plan

A proposed Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1) must be prepared and submitted by a credit seller or its agent to Regional Water Board staff, along with a request to initiate the approval process described herein. The Credit Project Plan and request must be submitted at least 90 days prior to the proposed start of project construction.

⁷ Under this WQT Framework, legal project protection agreements must be established for all credit-generating projects that provide necessary access to and legal protection of the project area against other dissonant land uses for, at a minimum, the proposed project life. It is ultimately the credit buyer/user's responsibility to ensure (by contract or otherwise) that the projects upon which it relies for water quality credits are sufficiently maintained to generate those credits over their project lives.

Step 2: Initial Screening / Completeness Review

Regional Water Board staff will perform an initial screening of the proposed Credit Project Plan (and any supporting documentation) to verify completeness, and will solicit technical input and/or additional information from the credit seller, its agent, and others as needed.

Step 3: Staff Review and Recommendation

Upon determining the proposed Credit Project Plan is complete, Regional Water Board staff will review the Plan in a timely manner, and will prepare a recommendation for approval or denial of the Plan. A recommendation for approval may be accompanied by conditions of approval. A recommendation for denial shall be accompanied by reasons for the denial.

Step 4: Final Decision / Public Notice

Regional Water Board staff will provide its recommendation to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer for his/her consideration and final decision. The Executive Officer's final decision shall be made no later than 60 days following staff's determination that the proposed Credit Project Plan is complete. If the proposed Credit Project Plan is approved, the Executive Officer's notice of approval and relevant project information⁸ will be made available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website. If the proposed Credit Project Plan is denied, the notice of denial (including reasons for the denial) will be made available on the website.

7.3 Credit Project Pre-Screening Process (Optional)

Prior to incurring the expense of developing a complete Credit Project Plan and initiating the plan approval process described in Section 7.2 ~~above~~ or Section 7.4, a credit seller or its agent may wish to have certain plan elements pre-screened by Regional Water Board staff for conformance with the provisions of this WQT Framework. Pre-screening is not required, but is encouraged for all projects, especially to confirm project eligibility and applicable baseline requirements. Other worthwhile topics for pre-screening may include: proposed project life, applicable trading ratio, preliminary credit estimates, and/or special conditions or circumstances associated with a particular project or site.

The optional process for project pre-screening may be more or less formal, depending on the preferences of the credit seller or its agent, and depending on the nature and extent of the information being pre-screened. Steps of the process may be carried out in writing or verbally. In general, the credit seller or its agent shall submit a request for pre-screening to Regional Water Board staff, along with any draft plan elements or other relevant documentation. Staff will review the materials submitted for conformance with the provisions of this WQT Framework, and consult with the credit seller or its agent (and others) as needed to formulate a preliminary determination and/or response to the request.

⁸ The Regional Water Board recognizes that some Credit Project Plans may contain confidential information. Public disclosure of portions of a Credit Project Plan that contains confidential information or trade secrets may be limited in accordance with applicable laws that provide for protection of the disclosure of such information. The credit seller or its agent must identify information that it asserts is exempt from public disclosure. When doing so, the seller or its agent must provide the Regional Water Board a copy of the complete Credit Project Plan and a copy with the portions it asserts are protected in redacted form.

7.4 Combined Qualified Practice and Credit Project Plans

In some circumstances it may be desirable to submit a project proposal for work not identified under an approved pre-qualified practice. For example, some credit generating projects may not be conducive to the use of pre-qualified practices or may be sufficiently unique that the practices underlying them would be extremely unlikely to be used again. Additionally, there may be a desire to focus all available resources towards the project itself.

Credit Project Plans submitted for approval without the use of pre-qualified practices must contain all the information required for a pre-qualified practice (Section 2.5.1) and a Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1). Credit Project Plans submitted for approval without the use of pre-qualified practices will be reviewed and approved according to the following process:

Step 1: Preparation and Submittal of Proposed Credit Project Plan

A proposed Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1) must be prepared and submitted by a credit seller or its agent to Regional Water Board staff, along with a request to initiate the approval process described herein. The Credit Project Plan and request must be submitted at least 120 days prior to the proposed start of project construction.

Step 2: Initial Screening / Completeness Review

Regional Water Board staff will perform an initial screening of the proposed Credit Project Plan (and any supporting documentation) to verify completeness and will solicit technical input and/or additional information from the credit seller, its agent, and others as needed.

Step 3: Staff Review and Recommendation

Upon determining the proposed Credit Project Plan is complete, Regional Water Board staff will review the Plan in a timely manner and will prepare a recommendation for approval or denial of the Plan. A recommendation for approval may be accompanied by conditions of approval. A recommendation for denial shall be accompanied by reasons for the denial.

Step 4: Staff Concurrence, Public Notice and Comment

If Regional Water Board staff recommends approval of the proposed Credit Project Plan, it will make available to the general public the request for approval, supporting documentation, and staff's recommendation (including any conditions of approval) for a minimum 30-day review and comment period. Regional Water Board staff will consider all comments received during the 30-day period and may revise its recommendation (or conditions of approval) based on those comments. If Regional Water Board staff recommends denial of the proposed practice, it will forward its recommendation (including reasons for denial) directly to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

Step 5: Final Decision / Public Notice

Regional Water Board staff will provide its recommendation to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer for consideration and final decision. If the proposed Credit Project Plan is

approved, the Executive Officer's notice of approval and relevant project information⁹ will be made available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website. If the proposed Credit Project Plan is denied, the notice of denial (including reasons for the denial) will be made available on the website.

8. Project Implementation & Verification

Once a proposed Credit Project Plan has been approved via the process described in Section 7.2 ~~above~~ Section 7.4, the subject project must be successfully implemented and its performance independently verified before any resulting water quality credits may be certified and sold (or used). The following subsections describe requirements for project implementation and project verification under this WQT Framework.

8.1 Documenting Pre- and Post-Project Site Conditions

Site conditions for all credit-generating projects approved under this WQT Framework must be assessed and documented by the credit seller or its agent before and after project implementation. Project-specific site assessment procedures and reporting requirements will be included in each approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1).

8.2 Initial Project Verification

Initial project verification is the process of reviewing and confirming whether a credit-generating project has been implemented in accordance with its approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1). Initial verification pertains to the project "as-built", which may differ somewhat from the Credit Project Plan as originally approved.

8.2.1 Required Elements of Initial Verification

Initial verification for each credit-generating project must be conducted by an independent and qualified third-party verifier.¹⁰ Although project-specific requirements for initial verification may vary based on the approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1), required elements of initial verification shall always include the following:

⁹ The Regional Water Board recognizes that some Credit Project Plans may contain confidential information. Public disclosure of portions of a Credit Project Plan that contains confidential information or trade secrets may be limited in accordance with applicable laws that provide for protection of the disclosure of such information. The credit seller or its agent must identify information that it asserts is exempt from public disclosure. When doing so, the seller or its agent must provide the Regional Water Board a copy of the complete Credit Project Plan and a copy with the portions it asserts are protected in redacted form.

¹⁰ Qualifications for third-party verifiers will vary based on practice and project type. In general, third party verifiers must: (1) have relevant knowledge and experience related to the practices being used to generate credits, (2) be familiar with the terms of this WQT Framework, with the supporting documentation for ~~pre-qualified~~ practices they are being asked to verify, and with the credit quantification methods used for that practice, (3) be capable of working in an independent and unbiased manner, and (4) have no conflicts of interest. Examples of possible third-party verifiers include, but are not limited to qualified individuals, as previously described in footnote ~~65~~ (Section 7.1).

- *Administrative Review:* Confirmation of project eligibility under the terms of this Framework based on available documentation and as-built conditions, and confirmation that contracts and agreements are in place to ensure legal project protection and maintenance for the approved project life.
- *Technical Review:* Confirmation that water quality credits were quantified accurately in the approved Credit Project Plan and that all required documentation (e.g., data files, sampling results, model parameters) and as-built adjustments to the preliminary credit calculations are complete and correct.
- *Implementation Review:* Confirmation (via site visit or other reasonable means) that the project was installed consistent with the approved Credit Project Plan, and that all baseline requirements have been met. Any discrepancies between the approved Credit Project Plan and as-built conditions must be noted and brought to the attention of the credit seller for correction.

8.2.2 Required As-Built Documentation and Initial Verification Report

Upon completion of project implementation, the credit seller or its agent shall submit to Regional Water Board staff and the project verifier the completed site assessment documentation (Section 8.1) and any revisions or updates to the approved Credit Project Plan that are necessary to reflect as-built conditions. Subsequent to the receipt of this information, the project verifier shall separately submit an initial verification report, featuring a summary of initial verification activities, results and opinions, recommendations for adaptive project management, and any outstanding findings, notes or concerns. Regional Water Board staff will make these documents available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website.

8.3 Ongoing Project Verification

Ongoing project verification is the process of periodically reviewing and confirming whether a credit-generating project continues to be maintained in conformance with its approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1), that it continues to meet all relevant Framework criteria, and that credits generated by the project have been (and continue to be) accurately estimated using appropriate quantification methods and procedures.

Ongoing verification for each credit-generating project must be conducted by an independent and qualified third-party verifier – preferably the same party that conducted the initial verification of the project. Verification frequency, required elements of ongoing project review, and reporting requirements will vary depending on the individual project. Requirements for all ongoing verification activities will be specified in the approved Credit Project Plan.

Copies of all verification reports for credit-generating projects implemented under this WQT Framework shall be provided to Regional Water Board staff by the independent third-party verifier. Upon determining that a verification report is accurate and complete, Regional Water Board staff will make the report available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website. In the event that a verification report identifies a material failure to meet approved practice standards or other

requirements of an approved Credit Project Plan, the credit seller (or the party responsible for project implementation, as identified in the Credit Project Plan) shall notify Regional Water Board staff immediately.

Upon such notification, the seller (or responsible party) will have 60 days to submit to Regional Water Board staff a plan for remedy, including recommended performance benchmarks, the conditions under which Regional Water Board staff should consider suspending or cancelling any credits that have already been certified (Section 9.1), and recommendations for adaptive project management. The plan for remedy will also describe how any deficit resulting from credits that have already been used but are subsequently suspended or cancelled will be addressed by either: 1) correcting the material failure to meet approved practice standards or other requirements of an approved Credit Project Plan; or 2) implementing a new credit generating project to address the deficit. Regional Water Board staff will make such plans available to the general public on the Regional Water Board's website. In all cases, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer has the authority to determine whether a verification report accurately reflects the credits generated, and may certify, suspend or cancel credits as described in Section 9 below, or request additional information as necessary to verify that a project is implemented in accordance with its approved Credit Project Plan.

Regardless of project verification results, NPDES permittees (i.e., credit buyers or users) are ultimately responsible for complying with their effluent limitations, and any NPDES-related compliance matters or enforcement actions based on the results of project verification activities shall be taken up with the permittee.

9. Credit Certification, Registration & Tracking

9.1 Credit Certification

Upon receiving a verification report confirming that water quality credits have been generated by an approved project (Sections 8.2 and 8.3), Regional Water Board staff will review the report for accuracy and completeness, and will solicit technical input and/or additional information from the report submitter (and others) as needed. Upon determining the verification report is accurate and complete, Regional Water Board staff will certify the credits generated by issuing an official Credit Certificate to the credit seller, or whomever the approved Credit Project Plan identifies as the initial owner of the credits. Once a credit is certified, it is officially available for purchase, sale, or use by an NPDES permittee. Immediately upon their issuance, copies of Credit Certificates issued by Regional Water Board staff shall be provided to the administrator of the credit registry, as described in Section 9.5 below.

9.2 Serialization of Certified Credits

To ensure accountability, transparency, and ease of tracking, each credit certified under this WQT Framework shall be assigned a unique serial number, accompanied by the date of certification. Serial information will be included in the Credit Certificate issued by Regional Water Board staff.

9.3 Changes in Credit Status

Once certified, the status of a credit may change over time. In order to ensure that credits generated under this WQT Framework remain valid, are used only once, and/or are retired on time, changes in credit status must be reliably tracked and accounted for. For purposes of credit tracking, the status of credits shall be defined and documented as follows:

Active

Upon certification, all credits shall be considered active. The status of active credits shall be documented in Credit Certificates issued by Regional Water Board staff, as described in Section 9.1 above.

Used

Credits shall be considered used once they have been applied by an NPDES permittee to meet an effluent limitation. The status of used credits shall be documented in annual compliance reports submitted to Regional Water Board staff as required in the user's NPDES permit.

Retired

Credits shall be considered retired if they remain unused beyond the final year allowed under this Framework's credit banking provisions (Section 6.3). The status of retired credits shall be documented in Credit Retirement Notices issued by Regional Water Board staff to the credit owner.

Suspended or Cancelled

Credits shall be considered suspended or cancelled if/when a project verification report identifies a failure to meet approved practice standards or other requirements of an approved Credit Project Plan, as described in Section 8.3 above. The status of suspended or cancelled credits shall be documented in Credit Suspension or Credit Cancellation Notices issued by Regional Water Board staff to the credit owner.

Immediately upon their issuance, copies of annual NPDES compliance reports, Credit Retirement Notices, Credit Suspension Notices, and Credit Cancellation Notices shall be provided by the issuers to the administrator of the credit registry described in Section 9.5 below.

9.4 Changes in Credit Ownership

Once certified, the ownership of a credit may change over time. In order to ensure that credits generated under this WQT Framework are owned by only one entity at a time, changes in credit ownership (i.e., credit trades via transfer or sale) must be reliably tracked and accounted for. For purposes of credit tracking, initial ownership of credits shall be documented in Credit Certificates issued by Regional Water Board staff, as described in Section 9.1 above.

Changes in credit ownership shall be documented in Credit Trade Notices submitted by the trading parties to Regional Water Board staff. At a minimum, Credit Trade Notices must include the quantity of

credits traded, the serial number of each credit traded, the purchase price, and identifying information and signatures of the buyer (i.e., the new owner) and seller (i.e., the previous owner).

Immediately upon their issuance, copies of Credit Trade Notices shall be provided by the issuers to the administrator of the credit registry described in Section 9.5 below.

9.5 Credit Tracking & Registry Administration

As described in Sections 9.3 and 9.4 above, the status and ownership of water quality credits certified under this Framework is subject to change over time. In order to track these changes, and to ensure the accountability, transparency, and accessibility of WQT activities conducted in the Laguna watershed, a designated administrator shall maintain an official and publicly-accessible credit registry. The role of administrator shall be performed by Regional Water Board staff or by a trusted and qualified third-party designee.

As soon as a credit is certified as described in Section 9.1 above, the administrator shall add it to the credit registry and track it through its eventual use, cancellation, or retirement. Attributes to be tracked for each credit in the registry include, but shall not be limited to: serial number, date of certification, owner, status, expiration date, site location, project from which the credit was derived, and links to publicly-available project documents.

The administrator of the credit registry shall keep all credit information current and shall update the registry immediately upon receipt of the various certificates, reports, and notices identified in Sections 9.3 and 9.4 above.

10. Compliance and Enforcement

This WQT Framework provides authorized dischargers with an optional means for complying with certain effluent limitations in their NPDES permits. Compliance with effluent limitations in NPDES permits is ultimately based on the contents of annual reports required by those permits. If a permittee opts to utilize this Framework as means of compliance, its reports must include sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the water quality credits it used were appropriately certified under this Framework, and were sufficient to meet its effluent limitations.

The Regional Water Board has the authority to enforce the provisions of NPDES and other permits it issues, and to take enforcement actions as warranted and authorized under the California Water Code. Records generated during the implementation of this WQT Framework may be used as evidence in enforcement proceedings.

11. Framework Improvements and Monitoring

11.1 Improving Framework Specifications, Protocols, and Processes

This WQT Framework shall be implemented to maintain adherence to the guiding principles listed in the Introduction section above, and managed in such a way as to capitalize on lessons learned. Changes and improvements to the provisions of this Framework are expected over time, and may necessitate a

formal revision. Such a revision would be subject to standard requirements for public noticing, review, and Regional Water Board approval.

11.2 Monitoring / Evaluating Framework Effectiveness

Some form of monitoring shall be required for every credit-generating project approved under this WQT Framework. In general, monitoring is needed to support applications of approved credit quantification methods (Section 4), and to verify the generation of credits (Section 8). However, the type, location, and frequency of monitoring activities will necessarily vary by ~~pre-qualified~~ practice type (Section 2.5.1), with specific details to be determined at the project scale and incorporated into an approved Credit Project Plan (Section 7.1).

Depending on the nature and location of an approved credit-generating project, examples of monitoring may include:

- Sampling of surface sediment nutrient concentrations at a project site to quantify credits generated;
- Topographical and vegetation surveys to complete site condition assessments;
- Repeated photo point monitoring to document as-built conditions and to verify continued project maintenance; and
- Instream sampling of turbidity, dissolved oxygen, and nutrient concentrations to verify project performance and effectiveness.

The overall effectiveness of WQT activities conducted under this Framework must be evaluated within the larger context of other beneficial use recovery actions being undertaken in the Laguna watershed. As a general rule, ambient water quality monitoring (i.e., surface water status and trends monitoring) is not specifically required under this Framework, but may be appropriate (and thus required) for some projects. Otherwise, ambient water quality monitoring is anticipated to be conducted under the auspices of the Russian River Regional Monitoring Program, or a similar, regionally-coordinated program. Nothing in this Framework prohibits any entity from lawfully conducting ambient water quality monitoring in the Laguna watershed.

Order No. R1-2020-0012
City of Santa Rosa
NPDES No. CA0022764

**ATTACHMENT J- SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 REGIONAL WATER BOARD LETTER TO THE CITY OF SANTA
ROSA REGARDING GROUNDWATER MONITORING**

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

September 1, 2015

Mr. David Guhin, Director of Utilities
Utilities Department
City of Santa Rosa
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Dear Mr. Guhin:

Subject: Santa Rosa Plain Salt and Nutrient Management Plan

File: Salt and Nutrient Management Plan for the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Subbasin

Staff of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) thank you and your staff for the significant efforts made in gathering a diverse group of stakeholders, compiling technical information and preparing a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) for the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Basin. The City's primary recommendation in the final SNMP, dated May 2013, is the development of a monitoring and reporting program (MRP) to support the refinement of the SNMP in the future. The conceptual monitoring framework described in the SNMP proposes the collection of data from existing wells, as well as from new groundwater monitoring wells to be installed for this purpose. This letter is to inform you that we approve the proposed conceptual monitoring framework presented in the final SNMP.

Please review the attached recommendations for a basin-specific MRP designed to evaluate changes in groundwater basin water quality over time. The primary objective of the MRP is to collect sufficient data to: ensure protection of beneficial uses when making decisions regarding the use of recycled water; evaluate the effectiveness of best management practices for dairies, vineyards and wineries; evaluate the implementation of new septic system regulations; promote groundwater recharge; and to assess other discharges of waste to land throughout the Santa Rosa Plain groundwater basin. This will include establishing the baseline conditions and identifying changes and trends in groundwater quality and elevation over time. We look forward to working with you on the development of a basin-specific MRP and schedule for implementation.

Necessary Components of a Basin-Specific Monitoring and Reporting Program

1. Goals and Objectives

The objective is to develop a basin-wide groundwater monitoring plan that will allow for a comprehensive assessment of water quality in relation to beneficial uses supported within the basin and applicable water quality objectives. Several localized and project-specific monitoring programs exist throughout the Santa Rosa Plain basin. These include monitoring of ground and surface waters by various agencies to comply with regulatory requirements, as well as voluntary monitoring efforts by agencies and environmental groups. In keeping with the Recycled Water Policy's (Policy) preferred approach, it is recommended that there be an inventory of all water quality monitoring and data collection within each groundwater basin as a starting point in developing a basin-wide groundwater monitoring plan. Compilation and review of existing programs and groundwater quality reports will reduce the potential for redundancy, and also assist in identifying data gaps that need to be addressed.

Regulatory agencies that are involved in statewide monitoring of groundwater quality for the purpose of assessing and protecting groundwater resources include the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board- Division of Water Quality, Division of Drinking Water, Office of Research and Planning), Department of Water Resources, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Department of Pesticide Regulation, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). State Water Board's online groundwater information system, GeoTracker/ Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) provides access to groundwater quality monitoring data from these agencies as well as other Regional Water Boards and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. This information is available on the GAMA program website.

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/gama/geotracker_gama.shtml

Results from these monitoring efforts may be used in conjunction with those generated by water purveyors, managers and private entities in determining the scope of the monitoring plan. Stakeholders are also encouraged to use the 2003 USGS report titled "Framework for a Ground Water Quality and Assessment Program for California" as a resource when developing the monitoring plan. This document is available at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/gama/docs/usgs_rpt_72903_wri034166.pdf

2. Basin/Watershed Characterization and Baseline

The purpose of a baseline is to assess data over time and analyze possible trends in groundwater data. Regional Water Board staff recommends that the baseline characterization of the groundwater basin reflect the information in the USGS

Scientific Investigation Report 2013-5118 (*Hydrological and Geochemical Characterization of the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed, Sonoma County, California*).

3. **Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan**

Prior to installing new groundwater monitoring wells for the purpose of basin monitoring and assessment a well installation work plan shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board for review and concurrence. Well installation work plans should include:

- i. A scope of work;
- ii. Well location determinations and pre-field work activities;
- iii. Soil sample collection and analysis;
- iv. Monitoring well development;
- v. Field procedures;
- vi. Well location figures (general and specific); and
- vii. Proposed well construction diagrams.

4. **Sampling Design Plan**

A basin-wide sampling design plan that is intended to gather representative data will need to include the following:

- a) Representative monitoring locations in:
 - i. Each of the five major sub-basins of the Santa Rosa Plain (Wilson Grove, Cotati, Windsor, Rincon Valley, and Mayacamas Mountain Upland);
 - ii. Each of the four major geologic formations underlying the Santa Rosa Plain (Glen Ellen Formation, Wilson Grove Formation, Sonoma Volcanics and Petaluma Formation);
 - iii. Deep (>150' bgs) and shallow (<150' bgs) groundwater bearing units; and
 - iv. Each of the major land use types identified in the SNMP;
- b) Methodologies for:
 - i. Eliminating redundant data;
 - ii. Data weighting to address sample representativeness and statistical significance;
- c) A well location map with depth dependent data;
- d) Given the importance of the shallow groundwater resource in the Santa Rosa Plain groundwater basin, siting criteria for any well locations should emphasize shallow groundwater assessment and data gaps in major land uses;
- e) Wells should be identified based on purpose (e.g., DW for drinking water supply, E for evaluation, CD for contaminant detection, and CA for corrective action.);
- f) Basin-wide water level/ water balance monitoring;
- g) The *Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems* (OWTS Policy) was

adopted by the State Water Board on June 19, 2012. The OWTS Policy includes some monitoring requirements, which should be considered in conjunction with Sonoma County as they develop a Local Agency Management Plan (LAMP) to maximize the efficiency and coordination of sampling activities in areas affected by both Recycled Water and OWTS policies.

- h) Individual Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR)-related monitoring programs can and should be modified to facilitate consistent, scientifically defensible, and cost-effective regional groundwater monitoring programs while also maintaining a sufficient level of individual discharger monitoring to document compliance with applicable WDRs. Allowable modifications will generally be restricted to the following:
 - i. Development of basin/sub-basin consistent compliance monitoring requirements (i.e., monitoring parameters/constituents and frequencies for water supply, influent, effluent, and receiving water including both groundwater and surface water for participating stakeholders subject to WDRs for similar types of discharges that are consistent with the regional groundwater monitoring program.

5. Primary Constituents of Concern

Consider an expansion of the primary constituents of concern to include

- a) Electrical conductivity (EC)
- b) pH
- c) Nitrate,
- d) Total Dissolved Solids (TDS),
- e) Arsenic,
- f) Sodium,
- g) Chloride,
- h) Sulfate, and
- i) Boron

Additionally, to further evaluate baseline conditions consider monitoring of constituents of emerging concern per the Recycled Water Policy as amended by State Water Board Resolution No. 2013-0003. The amended Recycled Water Policy can be found at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/docs/rwp_revtoc.pdf

6. Sampling Frequency

An appropriate sampling frequency plan commensurate with hydrogeological response times within groundwater while also sufficient enough to provide timely and ongoing compliance evaluations for applicable water quality objectives (e.g., reduction of sampling frequencies for deeper wells to annually or once every several years versus semiannual wet and dry season monitoring for shallow wells). The

USGS basin characterization identified that shallow groundwater can be decades old while deeper water-bearing units can be centuries to millennia old; therefore, anthropogenic effects on water quality will be detected in shallower formations first. Additionally, any monitoring for constituents of emerging concern should be done at a reduced frequency as compared to the primary constituents of concern. Individual constituent monitoring for any compound(s) may be adjusted as data and trends become available and as funding are prioritized.

7. Quality Assurance Project Plan

Quality assurance (QA) is an integrated system of management activities (i.e., planning, implementation, assessment, reporting, and quality improvement) that focuses on providing confidence in the data or product by ensuring that it is of the type and quality needed and expected by the client. Quality systems include elements such as responsibilities of management and staff as well as quality control and sample handling guidelines for both laboratory and field activities. Additional information can be found at the following State Water Board website.

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/tools.shtml#qa

8. Reporting

Consistent with an August 28, 2009, State Water Board Executive memorandum, Regional Water Board approval of SNMPs as implementation plans will be contingent in part on the electronic submittal of regional monitoring program data into the State Water Board's GAMA Program GeoTracker information system via Electronic Deliverable Format (EDF). EDF should be uploaded subsequent to the sampling events. This reporting arrangement is intended to streamline efforts and resources by reducing the need for submitting frequent technical reports congruent with sampling efforts. Pursuant to the Recycled Water Policy, technical reporting including trend analysis can be done triennially.

Necessary Components of a Basin-Specific Monitoring and Reporting Program

1. Goals and Objectives

The objective is to develop a basin-wide groundwater monitoring plan that will allow for a comprehensive assessment of water quality in relation to beneficial uses supported within the basin and applicable water quality objectives. Several localized and project-specific monitoring programs exist throughout the Santa Rosa Plain basin. These include monitoring of ground and surface waters by various agencies to comply with regulatory requirements, as well as voluntary monitoring efforts by agencies and environmental groups. In keeping with the Recycled Water Policy's (Policy) preferred approach, it is recommended that there be an inventory of all water quality monitoring and data collection within each groundwater basin as a starting point in developing a basin-wide groundwater monitoring plan. Compilation and review of existing programs and groundwater quality reports will reduce the potential for redundancy, and also assist in identifying data gaps that need to be addressed.

Regulatory agencies that are involved in statewide monitoring of groundwater quality for the purpose of assessing and protecting groundwater resources include the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board- Division of Water Quality, Division of Drinking Water, Office of Research and Planning), Department of Water Resources, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Department of Pesticide Regulation, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). State Water Board's online groundwater information system, GeoTracker/ Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) provides access to groundwater quality monitoring data from these agencies as well as other Regional Water Boards and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. This information is available on the GAMA program website.

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/gama/geotracker_gama.shtml

Results from these monitoring efforts may be used in conjunction with those generated by water purveyors, managers and private entities in determining the scope of the monitoring plan. Stakeholders are also encouraged to use the 2003 USGS report titled "Framework for a Ground Water Quality and Assessment Program for California" as a resource when developing the monitoring plan. This document is available at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/gama/docs/usgs_rpt_72903_wri034166.pdf

2. Basin/Watershed Characterization and Baseline

The purpose of a baseline is to assess data over time and analyze possible trends in groundwater data. Regional Water Board staff recommends that the baseline characterization of the groundwater basin reflect the information in the USGS

Scientific Investigation Report 2013-5118 (*Hydrological and Geochemical Characterization of the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed, Sonoma County, California*).

3. **Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan**

Prior to installing new groundwater monitoring wells for the purpose of basin monitoring and assessment a well installation work plan shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board for review and concurrence. Well installation work plans should include:

- i. A scope of work;
- ii. Well location determinations and pre-field work activities;
- iii. Soil sample collection and analysis;
- iv. Monitoring well development;
- v. Field procedures;
- vi. Well location figures (general and specific); and
- vii. Proposed well construction diagrams.

4. **Sampling Design Plan**

A basin-wide sampling design plan that is intended to gather representative data will need to include the following:

- a) Representative monitoring locations in:
 - i. Each of the five major sub-basins of the Santa Rosa Plain (Wilson Grove, Cotati, Windsor, Rincon Valley, and Mayacamas Mountain Upland);
 - ii. Each of the four major geologic formations underlying the Santa Rosa Plain (Glen Ellen Formation, Wilson Grove Formation, Sonoma Volcanics and Petaluma Formation);
 - iii. Deep (>150' bgs) and shallow (<150' bgs) groundwater bearing units; and
 - iv. Each of the major land use types identified in the SNMP;
- b) Methodologies for:
 - i. Eliminating redundant data;
 - ii. Data weighting to address sample representativeness and statistical significance;
- c) A well location map with depth dependent data;
- d) Given the importance of the shallow groundwater resource in the Santa Rosa Plain groundwater basin, siting criteria for any well locations should emphasize shallow groundwater assessment and data gaps in major land uses;
- e) Wells should be identified based on purpose (e.g., DW for drinking water supply, E for evaluation, CD for contaminant detection, and CA for corrective action.);
- f) Basin-wide water level/ water balance monitoring;
- g) The *Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems* (OWTS Policy) was

adopted by the State Water Board on June 19, 2012. The OWTS Policy includes some monitoring requirements, which should be considered in conjunction with Sonoma County as they develop a Local Agency Management Plan (LAMP) to maximize the efficiency and coordination of sampling activities in areas affected by both Recycled Water and OWTS policies.

- h) Individual Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR)-related monitoring programs can and should be modified to facilitate consistent, scientifically defensible, and cost-effective regional groundwater monitoring programs while also maintaining a sufficient level of individual discharger monitoring to document compliance with applicable WDRs. Allowable modifications will generally be restricted to the following:
 - i. Development of basin/sub-basin consistent compliance monitoring requirements (i.e., monitoring parameters/constituents and frequencies for water supply, influent, effluent, and receiving water including both groundwater and surface water for participating stakeholders subject to WDRs for similar types of discharges that are consistent with the regional groundwater monitoring program.

5. Primary Constituents of Concern

Consider an expansion of the primary constituents of concern to include

- a) Electrical conductivity (EC)
- b) pH
- c) Nitrate,
- d) Total Dissolved Solids (TDS),
- e) Arsenic,
- f) Sodium,
- g) Chloride,
- h) Sulfate, and
- i) Boron

Additionally, to further evaluate baseline conditions consider monitoring of constituents of emerging concern per the Recycled Water Policy as amended by State Water Board Resolution No. 2013-0003. The amended Recycled Water Policy can be found at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/docs/rwp_revtoc.pdf

6. Sampling Frequency

An appropriate sampling frequency plan commensurate with hydrogeological response times within groundwater while also sufficient enough to provide timely and ongoing compliance evaluations for applicable water quality objectives (e.g., reduction of sampling frequencies for deeper wells to annually or once every several years versus semiannual wet and dry season monitoring for shallow wells). The

USGS basin characterization identified that shallow groundwater can be decades old while deeper water-bearing units can be centuries to millennia old; therefore, anthropogenic effects on water quality will be detected in shallower formations first. Additionally, any monitoring for constituents of emerging concern should be done at a reduced frequency as compared to the primary constituents of concern. Individual constituent monitoring for any compound(s) may be adjusted as data and trends become available and as funding are prioritized.

7. Quality Assurance Project Plan

Quality assurance (QA) is an integrated system of management activities (i.e., planning, implementation, assessment, reporting, and quality improvement) that focuses on providing confidence in the data or product by ensuring that it is of the type and quality needed and expected by the client. Quality systems include elements such as responsibilities of management and staff as well as quality control and sample handling guidelines for both laboratory and field activities. Additional information can be found at the following State Water Board website.

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/tools.shtml#qa

8. Reporting

Consistent with an August 28, 2009, State Water Board Executive memorandum, Regional Water Board approval of SNMPs as implementation plans will be contingent in part on the electronic submittal of regional monitoring program data into the State Water Board's GAMA Program GeoTracker information system via Electronic Deliverable Format (EDF). EDF should be uploaded subsequent to the sampling events. This reporting arrangement is intended to streamline efforts and resources by reducing the need for submitting frequent technical reports congruent with sampling efforts. Pursuant to the Recycled Water Policy, technical reporting including trend analysis can be done triennially.