

CHAPTER 4 IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION	1
CONTROL OF POINT SOURCE POLLUTANTS	2
<i>DEFINITION OF POINT SOURCE</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>POINT SOURCE CONTROL CATEGORIES</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>REGIONAL BOARD PERMITTING PROGRAMS</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT WAIVER POLICY</i>	<i>109</i>
<i>WATER RECLAMATION REQUIREMENTS</i>	<i>1110</i>
<i>WASTE DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS</i>	<i>2018</i>
<i>WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION (SECTION 401)</i>	<i>2220</i>
<i>SELF MONITORING, COMPLIANCE MONITORING, AND INSPECTIONS</i>	<i>2220</i>
ENFORCEMENT	2321
LEVEL A ENFORCEMENT ACTION	23 21
LEVEL B ENFORCEMENT ACTION	23 21
LEVEL C ENFORCEMENT ACTION	23 21
LEVEL D ENFORCEMENT ACTION	24 22
SELECTION OF APPROPRIATE ENFORCEMENT ACTION	24 22
<i>STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD PLANS AND POLICIES</i>	<i>2523</i>
HAZARDOUS WASTE SOURCE REDUCTION	<i>2523</i>
<i>MUNICIPAL AND DOMESTIC WASTEWATER</i>	<i>2523</i>
CLEAN WATER GRANTS AND LOANS	<i>2624</i>
INDIVIDUAL DOMESTIC SUBSURFACE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS	<i>2724</i>
GUIDELINES FOR NEW COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL SEWERAGE FACILITIES	<i>2926</i>
WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	<i>3430</i>
WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION	<i>3834</i>
REGIONAL BOARD ACTION PLAN ON WATER RECLAMATION	<i>3834</i>
<i>FACTORING WATER SUPPLY CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE REGIONAL BOARD REGULATION OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS</i>	<i>4238</i>
<i>RECLAIMED WATER CONFORMANCE WITH WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES</i>	<i>4339</i>
DISCHARGES TO COASTAL LAGOONS FROM PILOT WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS	<i>4339</i>
DISCHARGES TO INLAND SURFACE WATERS	<i>4440</i>
WATER RECLAMATION UNDER RESOLUTION NO. 81-16	<i>4743</i>
WATER RECLAMATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO OCEAN DISPOSAL	<i>4743</i>
RECLAIMED WATER STORAGE REQUIREMENTS	<i>4843</i>
INDUSTRIAL WASTE	4844
<i>PRETREATMENT PROGRAM FOR INDUSTRIES</i>	<i>4844</i>
<i>STEAM ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS</i>	<i>4945</i>

<i>SUBSURFACE DISPOSAL FROM CAMPGROUNDS AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARKS</i>	5046
<i>VESSELS (RECREATIONAL, COMMERCIAL, AND NAVAL) AND MARINAS</i>	5146
VESSELS AND MARINAS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION	5247
NAVY VESSELS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION	5247
VESSEL WASTES	5247
MARINAS.....	5348
CZARA(G) GUIDANCE FOR MARINAS	5549
REGULATION OF VESSELS AND MARINAS.....	5549
NO DISCHARGE ZONE	5549
<i>SHIPYARDS</i>	5751
SHIPYARD THREAT TO WATER QUALITY	5751
PRIMARY ACTIVITIES AS SHIPYARDS	5751
SHIPYARD FACILITIES	5751
SHIPYARD INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES	5751
MATERIALS USED AT SHIPYARDS.....	5852
WASTES GENERATED AT SHIPYARDS.....	5953
SHIPYARD WASTE DISCHARGES TO RECEIVING WATERS.....	6053
SHIPYARD COMPLEXITY	6054
LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF SHIPYARD DISCHARGES ON WATER QUALITY AND BENEFICIAL USES	
.....	6154
SAN DIEGO BAY SHIPYARDS	6155
SHIPYARDS – GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	6255
BOATYARDS	6256
GROUND WATER DEWATERING	6256
DREDGING AND DISPOSAL OF DREDGE SPOIL	6357
<i>REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL</i>	6357
FEDERAL STATUTES AND REGULATION	6357
STATE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS	6558
<i>HISTORY OF DREDGE AND FILL PROJECTS</i>	6760
SAN DIEGO BAY	6760
OTHER AREAS.....	6761
<i>DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL</i>	6761
<i>PROBLEMS POSED BY DREDGING SEDIMENT/CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT</i>	7163
ENVIRONMENTAL THREAT ASSOCIATED WITH CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS.....	7164
DISPOSAL OF CONTAMINATED MATERIAL DREDGE SPOIL RETURN WATER.....	7164
DISCHARGES OF WASTE TO LAND	7164
<i>CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 23, CHAPTER 15</i>	7365
<i>RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1976</i>	7871
<i>SOLID WASTE ASSESSMENT TEST (SWAT)</i>	7871
<i>SLUDGE USE AND DISPOSAL</i>	7871
<i>AUTO SHREDDER WASTE</i>	8073
<i>SHREDDER WASTE POLICY (RESOLUTION NO. 85-92)</i>	8073
CONTROL OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION	8073
<i>CHRONOLOGY OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION CONTROL MEASURES</i>	8073
<i>THE NEED FOR NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION CONTROL</i>	8174

<i>DEFINITION OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION</i>	<u>8174</u>
CATEGORIES OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION	<u>8174</u>
<i>OVERLAPS BETWEEN NONPOINT & POINT SOURCES</i>	<u>8174</u>
<i>SEVERITY OF NONPOINT SOURCE PROBLEM</i>	<u>8174</u>
<i>NONPOINT SOURCE FUNDING</i>	<u>8275</u>
<i>SECTION 319 NONPOINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</i>	<u>8275</u>
<i>ALL NONPOINT SOURCE DISCHARGES ARE CURRENTLY REGULATED</i>	<u>8577</u>
<i>NPDES STORM</i>	<u>8577</u>
<i>WATER PROGRAM</i>	<u>8577</u>
SECTION 402(p) CLEAN WATER ACT.....	<u>8577</u>
DEFINITION OF STORM WATER.....	<u>8577</u>
THE PROBLEM.....	<u>8577</u>
<i>STATUTORY AUTHORITY</i>	<u>8678</u>
<i>MUNICIPAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND CONSTRUCTION PERMITS -- COMMON CHARACTERISTICS</i>	<u>8678</u>
AREAWIDE MUNICIPAL STORM WATER PERMITS	<u>8779</u>
GENERAL INDUSTRIAL STORM WATER PERMIT	<u>9182</u>
GENERAL CONSTRUCTION STORM WATER PERMIT	<u>9283</u>
HIGHWAY RUNOFF CONTROL PROGRAM	<u>9283</u>
COASTAL NONPOINT POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM	<u>9485</u>
<i>COASTAL ZONE ACT REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS</i>	<u>9485</u>
<i>AGRICULTURE</i>	<u>9485</u>
EROSION CONTROL	<u>9586</u>
AGRICULTURAL IRRIGATION RETURN WATER	<u>9586</u>
SALT LOADING	<u>9686</u>
APPLIED CHEMICALS	<u>9686</u>
IRRIGATION WATER.....	<u>9787</u>
DAIRIES – CONFINED ANIMAL FACILITIES.....	<u>9787</u>
EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL	<u>9989</u>
<i>EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PROGRAM (RESOLUTION NO. 87-91)</i>	<u>10090</u>
GOAL OF PROGRAM	<u>10090</u>
MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES	<u>10090</u>
REGIONAL BOARD IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES.....	<u>10090</u>
<i>THE ELSINORE-MURRIETA-ANZA RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT SEDIMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE (RESOLUTION NO. 79-25) AND THE RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL POLICY (RESOLUTION NO. 92-21)</i>	<u>10194</u>
<i>RESOURCE EXTRACTION</i>	<u>10292</u>
SAND, GRAVEL AND RELATED OPERATIONS.....	<u>10292</u>
<i>FLOOD CONTROL</i>	<u>10393</u>
IMPACTS OF CHANNELIZATION	<u>10393</u>
CONCLUSION.....	<u>10494</u>
<i>FUTURE DIRECTION: WATERSHED - BASED WATER QUALITY CONTROL</i>	<u>10595</u>
REMEDIATION OF POLLUTION	<u>10595</u>
<i>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS</i>	<u>10796</u>
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK CLEANUP FUND.....	<u>10897</u>

<i>SPILLS, LEAKS, INVESTIGATION AND CLEANUP</i>	<u>10897</u>
<i>ABOVEGROUND PETROLEUM STORAGE TANKS</i>	<u>10998</u>
<i>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES</i>	<u>10998</u>
CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT POLICY	<u>11199</u>
CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT	<u>116105</u>
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPAIRED WATERBODIES	<u>117106</u>
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD FOR DIAZINON, CHOLLAS CREEK WATERSHED, SAN DIEGO COUNTY	<u>120108</u>
NECESSITY STANDARD [GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 11353(b)]	<u>120108</u>
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d)	<u>120108</u>
BENEFICIAL USE IMPAIRMENTS	<u>120108</u>
WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	<u>120108</u>
WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVE VIOLATIONS	<u>120108</u>
SOURCES OF DIAZINON	<u>120108</u>
CONCENTRATION-BASED TMDL	<u>121108</u>
NUMERIC TARGETS	<u>121109</u>
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD	<u>121109</u>
LINKAGE ANALYSIS	<u>121109</u>
WASTE LOAD AND LOAD ALLOCATIONS	<u>121109</u>
DIAZINON LOAD REDUCTIONS NEEDED.....	<u>121109</u>
SEASONAL VARIATIONS AND CRITICAL CONDITIONS	<u>121109</u>
RESPONSIBLE PARTIE(S)	<u>123111</u>
TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	<u>123111</u>
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD FOR DISSOLVED COPPER, SHELTER ISLAND YACHT BASIN, SAN DIEGO BAY	<u>127115</u>
PROBLEM STATEMENT	<u>127115</u>
NUMERIC TARGET	<u>127115</u>
SOURCE ANALYSIS.....	<u>127115</u>
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD	<u>128116</u>
MARGIN OF SAFETY	<u>128116</u>
ALLOCATIONS AND REDUCTIONS	<u>128116</u>
RECALCULATIONS IF WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES CHANGE.....	<u>129117</u>
TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	<u>129117</u>
COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE.....	<u>129117</u>
OTHER PROGRAMS	<u>130118</u>
<i>SAN DIEGO BAY TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD WORKSHEETS</i>	<i><u>130118</u></i>
<i>GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT</i>	<i><u>131119</u></i>
SAN PASQUAL VALLEY	<i><u>131119</u></i>
LOWER SAN LUIS REY VALLEY.....	<i><u>132120</u></i>
LOWER SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY	<i><u>132120</u></i>
SANTEE	<i><u>132120</u></i>
LOWER SWEETWATER RIVER BASIN	<i><u>134121</u></i>
LOWER TIJUANA RIVER BASIN.....	<i><u>134121</u></i>
UPPER SANTA MARGARITA RIVER BASIN.....	<i><u>134121</u></i>
SAN JUAN CREEK	<i><u>134121</u></i>
<i>SALT BALANCE</i>	<i><u>135122</u></i>
<i>SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER PROGRAM</i>	<i><u>135122</u></i>

REFERENCES	136-123
INDEX – CHAPTER 4	138-125

FIGURES

Figure 4-1. Required Recharge Rates to Maintain 10 MG/L N Nitrate Standard	27
Figure 4-2. Waste Classification Process.....	70

TABLES

Table 4-1. NPDES and WDR Permitted Facilities in the San Diego Region	4
Table 4-2. Examples of Industrial and Municipal Point Source Discharges to Surface and Ground Waters .	5
Table 4-3. “Threat to Water Quality” and “Complexity” Definition.....	6
Table 4-4. Types of Discharges Identified for Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements..	11-16
Table 4-5. Permitted Uses and California Title 22 Health Requirements for Reclaimed Water	32, 33
Table 4-6. Water Reclamation Projects as of March 1993	35-37
Table 4-7. Landfill Classifications	68,69
Table 4-8. Receiving Waters Impacted by Pollution from Stormwater and Urban Runoff	81
Table 4-9. Highway Runoff Constituents and their Primary Sources	84
Table 4-10. TMDL Numeric Targets	115
Table 4-11. Summary of Dissolved Copper Sources to SIYB.....	116
Table 4-12. TMDL and Allocation Summary	116
Table 4-13. Interim Loading Targets for Attainment of the TMDL.....	117

PHOTOS

<u>Elegant tern. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>State Water Resources Control Board logo. Retrieved 10 August 2004 from</u> <u>http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/index.html</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>San Diego Bay sailboat. Photo by Pete Michael.....</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Oceanside Harbor. Photo by Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman. Retrieved 13 August 2004 from</u> <u>http://www.californiacoastline.org. Copyright © 2002-2004 Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman,</u> <u>California Coastal Records Project www.californiacoastline.org.....</u>	<u>48</u>
<u>California tree frog. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>57</u>
<u>San Diego Bay bridge. Photo by Pete Michael.....</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Mission Bay and San Diego River. Photo by Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman. Retrieved 13 August 2004</u> <u>from http://www.californiacoastline.org. Copyright © 2002-2004 Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman,</u> <u>California Coastal Records Project www.californiacoastline.org.....</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>Waste. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Storm water logo. Graphic by State Water Resources Control Board; Retrieved 10 August 2004</u> <u>from http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/index.html</u>	<u>77</u>
<u>Best Management Practices. Photo by David Gibson</u>	<u>78</u>

<u>Highway. Photo by Division of Water Rights, State Water Resources Control Board</u>	<u>83</u>
<u>Imperial Beach. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>85</u>
<u>Dairy. Photo by Division of Water Rights, State Water Resources Control Board</u>	<u>87</u>
<u>Santa Margarita River. Photo by David Gibson</u>	<u>89</u>
<u>Rose Canyon Creek. Photo by Jeremy Haas</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>Noble Canyon Creek. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>94</u>
<u>Underground storage tank. Photo by Division of Water Rights, State Water Resources Control Board ...</u>	<u>95</u>
<u>Naval Base, Point Loma (submarine facility). Photo by Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman. Retrieved</u>	
<u>13 August 2004 from http://www.californiacoastline.org. Copyright © 2002-2004</u>	
<u>Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman, California Coastal Records Project www.californiacoastline.org</u>	<u>96</u>
<u>Crow Creek. Photo by Jeremy Haas</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>Chollas Creek at Federal Boulevard crossing. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>110</u>
<u>Chollas Creek streamside. Photo by Linda Pardy</u>	<u>110</u>
<u>Shelter Island Yacht Basin. Photo by David Barker</u>	<u>115</u>

4. IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION



Elegant tern

The purpose of this chapter is to describe actions that are necessary to protect the beneficial uses described in Chapter 2 and achieve the water quality objectives specified in Chapter 3. One of the elements in a Water Quality Control Plan as defined in California Water Code [\(Water Code\)](#) section 13050(j) is the implementation program for achieving water quality objectives. This chapter describes the Regional Board's implementation program.

~~California~~ Water Code section 13242 requires that the implementation program have the following elements:

- A description of the actions which are necessary to achieve water quality objectives. (This may include recommendations for appropriate action directed to any entity, public or private);
- A time schedule for the actions to be taken; and
- A description of surveillance to be undertaken to determine compliance with the water quality objectives.

The Regional Board's mission is to achieve and maintain water quality objectives that are necessary to protect all beneficial uses of the waters in the Region. Depending on the nature of the water quality problem, several different strategies, as outlined below, are employed to accomplish this mission.

This Chapter is divided into four sections, Control of Point Source Pollutants, Control of Nonpoint Source Pollutants, Remediation of Pollution, and Other Programs as shown below. Areas of overlap between the point and nonpoint source categories are described later in this Chapter.

★ **Control of Point Source Pollutants:** Pollutants from point sources are discharged to waterbodies from discrete conveyance systems (e.g., pipes and

channels) in controlled flows at well-defined locations. Examples of point sources include waste discharges from municipal and industrial wastewater treatment facilities.

Programs that protect water quality from point source pollutants are primarily regulatory in nature. Waste discharge permitting programs such as California's Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and the federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) are examples of key regulatory point source control programs. Significant progress toward the control of point source pollutants has been made through these permitting programs.

★ **Control of Nonpoint Source Pollutants:** Pollutants from nonpoint sources are diffuse, both in terms of their origin and mode of transport to surface and ground waters. Unlike pollutants from point sources, nonpoint source pollutants often enter waters in sudden episodic surges and large quantities. This occurs as rain, irrigation, and other types of runoff mobilizes and transports contaminants into surface and ground waters. Nationwide, pollutants from nonpoint sources represent the greatest threat to water quality. Examples of nonpoint sources in southern California include lawn and garden chemicals transported by storm water or water from irrigation sprinklers; household and automotive care products dumped or drained on streets and into storm drains; fertilizers and pesticides washed from agricultural fields by rain or irrigation waters; sediment that erodes from construction sites; and various pollutants deposited by atmospheric deposition.

Nonpoint source pollutants are more difficult to control than point source pollutants, and require different control strategies. For example, traditional permitting programs are neither a practical nor effective means of water quality protection from lawn and garden chemicals. Accordingly, the Regional Board integrates non-regulatory programs with regulatory programs in order to control pollutants from nonpoint sources. Through public outreach (an example of a non-regulatory program), residents are informed of threats to the quality of the waters in their communities and are encouraged to voluntarily implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that eliminate or reduce

nonpoint sources of pollution. Emphasis is placed on pollution prevention through careful management of resources, as opposed to cleaning up the waterbody after the fact. Local governments play a key role in the control of nonpoint sources by adopting and enforcing ordinances and by supplementing the Regional Board's public outreach efforts. This flexible approach can be an effective means of controlling pollutants from many nonpoint sources.

★ **Remediation of Pollution:** The Regional Board oversees remediation of both ground and surface waters through the investigation of polluted waters and enforcement of corrective actions needed to restore water quality. These activities are managed through the following programs, namely: Underground Storage Tanks; Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC); Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tanks; ~~National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System~~ NPDES Program (~~NPDES~~), Chapter 15 and Non Chapter 15 Regulatory Programs; US Department of Defense (DoD) and Department of Energy (DOE) Sites; Toxic Pits Cleanup Act; and Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup.

These programs are designed to return polluted sites to productive use by identifying and eliminating the sources of pollutants, preventing the spread of pollution, and restoring water quality.

★ **Other Programs:** The Regional Board is involved with the investigation, assessment and protection of water quality through other programs which are discussed in this Basin Plan. These include California's Clean Water Act section 303(d) process and California's water quality assessment program.

CONTROL OF POINT SOURCE POLLUTANTS

DEFINITION OF POINT SOURCE

Waste loads from point sources are those that are generally associated with pollutant

discharges from an identifiable location to waters of the state. A point source is any discernable, confined, and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to, any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, landfill leachate collection system, vessel or other floating craft from which pollutants are or may be discharged. Point source wastes can be generated by residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, certain recreational and solid waste disposal activities and/or practices. Other wastes are considered under the category of nonpoint source waste loads and are discussed in appropriate sections of this chapter. Many of the water quality problems in the San Diego region have been attributable to point source discharges.

The Regional Board regulates most point source discharges of waste through the issuance of waste discharge requirements and ~~NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System~~ permits. Certain surface water discharges of waste described in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 122.3 do not require NPDES permits. The need to obtain waste discharge requirements for certain categories of waste discharges to land may be waived by the Regional Board where such waiver is not against the public interest. The waste discharge requirements and the NPDES permits establish terms and conditions such as effluent limitations to ensure that point source waste discharges comply with applicable water quality objectives and ensure protection of beneficial uses.

EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

Effluent limitations for discharge of treated point source wastes are developed for individual point sources and are included in the waste discharge requirements or NPDES permits. The effluent limitations are placed on the quality and quantity of the waste discharge or effluent and can be either numeric and/or narrative limitations. Effluent limitations are based on applicable water quality objectives, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) effluent guidelines and standards, beneficial uses for the area of effluent disposal, and applicable state and federal regulations and policies.

POINT SOURCE CONTROL CATEGORIES

Waste discharge requirements for waste discharges to land are issued for reclaimed water discharges, sanitary landfills, subsurface waste disposal by septic tank systems, dredge spoil disposal projects, sewage treatment plants and a variety of other activities which can affect ground water quality. NPDES permits are issued for waste discharges to surface waters from facilities such as power plants, sewage treatment plants, shipyards, boatyards, dewatering operations, ground water cleanups and a variety of other activities which can affect surface water quality.

Table 4-1 contains a summary listing of facility types regulated under waste discharge requirements and NPDES permits as of July 1994.

Table 4-2 contains examples of pollutants found in industrial and municipal point source discharges to surface and ground waters.

REGIONAL BOARD PERMITTING PROGRAMS

The Regional Board's primary means of protecting the Region's water resources is through the issuance of ~~Waste Discharge Requirements~~ (WDRs), Water Reclamation Requirements (WRRs), and Master Reclamation Permits (MRP) for each individual discharger. The ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ impose conditions which protect water quality, implement the Water Quality Control Plan, and when the discharge is to waters of the United States, meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act. The ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ impose limits on the quality and quantity of waste discharges and specify conditions to be maintained in the receiving waters. ~~WRRs~~ ~~Water reclamation requirements~~ impose conditions for all reuses of treated wastewater. In addition, because the USEPA has delegated responsibility to the State and regional boards for implementation of the federal NPDES program, WDRs for discharges to surface waters also serve as NPDES permits. These programs are the legal means to regulate controllable discharges. It is illegal to discharge wastes into any waters of the State and to reuse treated wastewater without obtaining appropriate WDRs, WRRs, or NPDES permits.

Any person who discharges or proposes to discharge wastes to waters in the Region (other than into a community sanitary sewage system) must describe the quantity and nature of the proposed discharge in a report of waste discharge (ROWD) or an NPDES permit application. The ~~RWD~~ ~~report of waste discharge~~ must contain information required by the Regional Board. The filing of the ~~RWD~~ ~~report of waste discharge~~ with the Regional Board is mandatory unless waived by the Board on the grounds that the waiver is not against the public interest. Such waivers are conditional and can be revoked by the Regional Board at any time. Upon review of the ROWD or NPDES permit application and all other pertinent information (including comments received at a public hearing), the Regional Board will hold a public hearing to consider issuance of ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ containing appropriate measures and limitations to protect public health and water quality. The basic elements of ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ or NPDES permits include:

- Effluent limitations on the quality and quantity of the waste discharge. The effluent standards or limitations are designed to implement water quality control plans, protect beneficial uses, and prevent nuisance;
- Standard terms and conditions and discharge prohibitions to ensure compliance with applicable provisions of state and federal law; and
- A monitoring and reporting program requiring the discharger to collect and analyze samples and submit monitoring reports to the Regional Board on a prescribed schedule.

~~California~~ Water Code section 13263 provides that in prescribing ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ the Regional Board need not authorize the utilization of the waste assimilation capacities of the receiving waters. No discharge of waste into waters of the state creates a vested right to continue the discharge. All discharges of waste into waters of the state are privileges, not rights.

Waste discharges are categorized according to their threat to water quality and operational complexity (Table 4-3). Additionally, discharges to surface waters are categorized as major or minor discharges. Filing and annual fees are

based on these categories. WDRs or WRRs do not have an expiration date but are reviewed periodically on a schedule based on the level of

threat to water quality. NPDES permits are adopted for a five-year period.

Table 4-1. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System **NPDES** Permitted Facilities ~~in the~~
In the San Diego Region (as of July 28, 1994)¹

Facility Type	Number Regulated
Above Ground Tanks	2
Boatyards	7
Ground Water Cleanup	7
Ground Water Dewatering	9
Industrial	8
Military	13
Power Plants	7
Sewage Treatment Plants	24
Shipyards	4
Storm Water (Construction)	542
Storm Water (Industrial)	619
Storm Water (Municipal)	34
Water Softener / Brine Treatment	6
Total	1283

Table 4-1. Waste Discharge Requirement **WDR** Permitted Facilities in the
San Diego Region (as of July 28, 1994)²

Facility Type	Number Regulated
Campgrounds	59
Dairy	25
Dredging	5
Ground Water Cleanup	3
Industrial	4
Landfills	29
Miscellaneous	5
Nursery	1
Private Sewage Treatment Plants	7
Sand and Gravel	33
Sewage Treatment Plants	42
Sludge Treatment	1
Water Reclamation Requirements	16
Water Softener / Brine Treatment	1
Winery	3
Total	234

¹ The list of regulated facilities under NPDES permits is updated periodically and is available at the Regional Board office.

² The list of regulated facilities under WDR permits is updated periodically and is available at the Regional Board office.

Table 4-2. Examples of Industrial and Municipal Point Source Discharges to Surface and Ground Waters.

Discrete Discharge	Examples of Pollutants	Examples of Affected Waterbodies
Municipal wastewater treatment plants (See Table 4-4 for more information).	Biological oxygen demand (BOD) , chemical oxygen demand (COD) , TDS, chlorides, sulfates, nutrients, ammonia (NH₃) , residual chlorine, metals, organic chemicals	Most inland waters, Pacific Ocean, various ground water basins
Power generation plants	Temperature, chemical additives, minerals	San Diego Bay, Pacific Ocean
Waste water discharge from remediation or construction de-watering projects	TDS; chlorides; sulfates; volatile organic chemicals (VOC's) ; BTEX (e.g., benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene) and other petroleum hydrocarbons	Surface waters region-wide
Underground Storage Tanks	TDS; chlorides; sulfates; VOC's; BTEX (e.g., benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene) and other petroleum hydrocarbons	Ground waters region-wide
Shipyards, boatyard wastes	Oil and grease, metals [lead (Pb) , chromium (Cr) , copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn)], suspended solids, settleable solids, tributyltin (TBT) , temperature, chemical additives	San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, Dana Point, Oceanside Harbor
Sand and gravel	TDS Total dissolved solids , turbidity, sedimentation	San Diego River, Otay River, San Luis Rey River, Temecula Creek, San Dieguito River, Aliso Creek, San Clemente Canyon Creek, San Vicente Creek, Trabuco Canyon Creek, El Toro Creek, Carroll Canyon Creek or their tributaries.
Dairies	BOD, TDS, bacteria, nutrients	Various groundwater basins
Dredging	Suspended solids, turbidity	San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, Dana Point
Landfills	Metals; TDS; chlorides; sulfates; VOC's; BTEX (e.g., benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene) and other petroleum hydrocarbons	Various groundwater basins
Recreational Vehicle (RV) Campgrounds	Formaldehyde, phenols, zinc, chlorides, aluminum sulfates	Various groundwater basins

Table 4-3. "Threat to Water Quality" and "Complexity" Definition.

CATEGORY & THREAT TO WATER QUALITY	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
Category I (Major threat)	Those discharges which could cause the long-term loss of a designated beneficial use of the receiving water, render unusable a ground water or surface water resource used as a significant drinking water supply, require closure to an area used for contact recreation, result in long-term deleterious effects on shellfish spawning or growth areas of aquatic resources, or directly expose the public to toxic substances.	Loss of a drinking water supply
Category II (Moderate threat)	Those discharges of waste which could cause short-term violations of water quality objective, cause secondary drinking water standards to be violated, or cause a nuisance. The discharge could have a major adverse impact on receiving biota, cause aesthetic impairment to a significant human population, or render unusable a potential domestic or municipal supply.	Aesthetic impairment from nuisance from a waste treatment facility.
Category III (Minor threat)	Those discharges of waste which could degrade water quality without violating water quality objectives, or cause a minor impairment of designated beneficial uses compared with Category I and Category II.	Small pulses of water from low volume discharges.
COMPLEXITY		
Category "a"	Any major NPDES discharger, and any discharge of toxic wastes; any small volume discharge containing toxic waste or having numerous discharge points or ground water monitoring; any Class I waste management unit.	Small volume complex discharger with numerous discharge points, leak detection systems or ground water monitoring wells.
Category "b"	Any discharger not include above which has a physical, chemical, or biological treatment system (except for septic systems with subsurface disposal), or any Class II or Class III waste management unit.	Marinas with petroleum products, solid wastes or sewage pump-out facilities.
Category "c"	Any discharger for whom WDRs waste discharge requirements have been or would be prescribed pursuant to section 13263 of the Water Code not included as a Category "a" or Category "b" as described above.	Discharges having no waste treatment systems or that must comply with BMPs best management practices , discharges having passive treatment and disposal systems, or discharges having waste storage system with land disposal such as dairy waste ponds.
NPDES		
Major	Publicly owned treatment works with a yearly average flow of over 0.5 million gallons per day (MGD) or an industrial source with a yearly average flow of over 0.1 MGD and those with lesser flows but with acute or potential adverse environmental impacts.	
Minor	All other dischargers that are not categorized as a major.	

Most ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ and NPDES permits establish conditions tailored to specific discharges. In some cases, discharges can be regulated under general WDRs or NPDES permits (General Permits) which simplify the permit process for certain types of discharges. These General Permits are issued administratively to the discharger after a completed Notice of Intent ~~(NOI)~~ or appropriate application has been filed and, if necessary, the Regional Board Executive Officer has determined that the discharger meets the conditions specified in the General Permit. The Regional Board plans to increase the use of General Permits for regulating similar categories of waste discharges in the future. The use of General Permits is a step towards permit streamlining and the reduction of permitting delays. The Regional Board will use the following principles in issuing or reviewing General Permits:

- The General Permit will have a streamlined process for obtaining coverage with adequate protective measures to assure compliance.
- The General Permit will focus on constituents of environmental concern for which there is a reasonable likelihood the constituent is, or may be, present in the discharge.
- The General Permits should be flexible to the extent practicable, and should allow for different testing, monitoring, and reporting requirements recognizing various significance levels of discharges.
- Duration, volume, and dilution of discharge should be considered in determining the significance of a discharge.

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

~~WDRs Waste discharge requirements~~ are permits for waste discharges to land which could primarily affect ground water quality and beneficial uses. All waste discharges, whether to land or water, are subject to ~~California~~ Water Code section 13263. Furthermore unless exempt, discharges to land (e.g., landfills) are also subject to Title 23, California Code of Regulations ~~(CCR)~~, Chapter 15. Examples of such waste discharges include:

- Sewage treatment plants with discharges to land;
- On-site disposal systems (septic tank systems);
- Sanitary landfills;
- Industrial discharges;
- Land treatment units (bioremediation);
- Dairies; and
- A variety of other activities which can affect ground water quality.

Some types of dredging operations in surface waters are also regulated under ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~. ~~WDRs Waste discharge requirements~~ may also protect surface waters in those instances where surfacing ground water may adversely affect surface water quality or beneficial uses.

A standard WDR permit typically includes the following elements:

- **Findings:** Official description of the facility, processes, type and quantity of wastes, existing WDRs, enforcement actions, public notice and applicable Water Quality Control Plans, beneficial uses and water quality objectives;
- **Effluent limitations:** Narrative and numerical limits for effluent and discharge prohibitions;
- **Receiving water limitations:** Narrative and numerical objectives for the receiving waters;
- **Provisions:** Standard provisions required by the Regional Board and by state and federal law;
- **Compliance schedules:** Time schedules for completion of activities to achieve compliance with permit conditions;
- **Sludge requirements:** Sludge monitoring and control requirements, if necessary; and a
- **Monitoring and reporting program:** Specific locations of monitoring stations and sampling frequency for all constituents limited in the

permit, including flow, and other constituents that may be required by the Board.

Any person proposing to discharge waste, other than to a community sanitary sewage system, must file a report of waste discharge (application) to obtain [WDRs](#) ~~waste discharge requirements~~ at least 120 days prior to commencing the discharge.

The ~~California~~ Water Code, Division 7, Chapter 4, Article 4 authorizes the Regional Board to issue [WDRs](#) ~~waste discharge requirements~~, review self-monitoring reports submitted by the discharger, and perform independent compliance checking. The Regional Board is authorized to take a variety of enforcement actions to obtain compliance with [WDRs](#) ~~waste discharge requirements~~. Enforcement of [WDRs](#) ~~waste discharge requirements~~ is done through the issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, cease and desist orders, administrative civil liability orders and court action. The Regional Board is also authorized to update and review [WDRs](#) ~~waste discharge requirements~~ periodically.

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM ~~(NPDES)~~

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits are issued to regulate discharges of "pollutants" from point sources to "waters of the United States" to ensure that the quality and quantity of such discharges does not adversely affect surface water quality or beneficial uses. The phrase "waters of the United States" is defined in Title 40, [CFR](#) ~~Code of Federal Regulations~~, Parts 122.2, 230.3 and 232.3. The definition of "waters of the United States" emphasizes protection of a broad range of surface waters, including interstate and intrastate lakes, creeks, streams, wetlands, rivers, bays, and ocean waters. Ephemeral creeks, and streams are considered to be "waters of the United States" for the purpose of issuing NPDES permits. In this Basin Plan the term "waters of the United States" is used interchangeably with the term "surface waters".

NPDES permits are authorized by section 402 of the Clean Water Act and section 13370 of the ~~California~~ Water Code. Permit conditions and the

issuance process are described in Title 40, [CFR](#) ~~Code of Federal Regulations~~, Part 122 (40 CFR 122) and [CCR](#) ~~California Code of Regulations~~, Title 23, Chapters 3 and 4. The responsibility for issuing NPDES permits in California has been delegated to the regional boards, subject to review and approval by the Regional Administrator (USEPA Region IX, San Francisco). NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board are also "waste discharge requirements" issued under the authority of the ~~California~~ Water Code, Chapter 5.5.

A standard NPDES permit typically includes the following elements:

- **Findings:** Official description of the facility, processes, type and quantity of wastes, existing NPDES permits, enforcement actions, public notice and applicable USEPA effluent guidelines and standards, Water Quality Control Plans, beneficial uses and water quality objectives;
- **Effluent limitations:** Narrative and numerical limits for effluent and discharge prohibitions;
- **Receiving water limitations:** Narrative and numerical objectives for the receiving waters;
- **Provisions:** Standard provisions required by the Regional Board and by state and federal law, expiration date of permit;
- **Compliance schedules:** Time schedules for completion of activities to achieve compliance with permit conditions;
- **Pretreatment requirements:** Standard pretreatment requirements for municipal facilities (see below);
- **Sludge requirements:** Sludge monitoring and control requirements, if necessary; and a
- **Monitoring and reporting program:** Specific locations of monitoring stations and sampling frequency for all constituents limited in the permit, including flow, and other constituents that may be required by the Regional Board.

The NPDES permit regulates discharges of wastes for the purpose of limiting the quantity of pollutants and volume of waste discharged to surface waters. NPDES permits contain prerequisite conditions which must be met by

dischargers to ensure protection of beneficial uses of the receiving water as described in the Regional Board's Water Quality Control Plan, Any person proposing to discharge pollutants into surface waters must submit a report of waste discharge in application for an NPDES permit at least 180 days in advance of the date on which it is desired to commence the proposed discharge. Certain discharges do not require an NPDES permit. The following discharges are exempt from the requirements for NPDES coverage pursuant to 40 CFR 122.3:

- Any discharge of sewage from vessels, effluent from properly functioning marine engines, laundry, shower, and galley sink wastes, or any other discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel;
- Discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States which are regulated under the Clean Water Act, section 404;
- The introduction of sewage, industrial wastes, or other pollutants into publicly owned treatment works by indirect dischargers;
- Any discharge in compliance with the instructions of an On-Scene Coordinator pursuant to 40 CFR 300 (The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan) or 33 CFR 153.10(e) (Pollution by Oil and Hazardous Substances);
- Any introduction of pollutants from nonpoint source agricultural and silvicultural activities, including storm water runoff from orchards, cultivated crops, pastures, range lands, and forest lands;
- Return flows from irrigated agriculture; and
- Discharges into a privately owned treatment works.

NPDES permits are issued for a term of five years or less. The terms and conditions of the permit are regularly updated as necessary. NPDES permits can be revoked for cause by the Regional Board.

The ~~California~~ Water Code, Division 7, Chapter 5.5, Article 6 authorizes the Regional Board to issue NPDES permits, review self-

Statewide Water Quality Control Plans, and other water quality control policies.

monitoring reports submitted by the discharger, and perform independent compliance checking. The Regional Board is authorized to take a variety of enforcement actions to obtain compliance with an NPDES permit. Enforcement of NPDES permits is done through the issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, cease and desist orders, administrative civil liability orders and court action.

The Regional Board will consider the establishment of mixing zones for inland surface waters and enclosed bays and estuaries on a case-by-case basis. Criteria to be established for mixing zones will be specified in the waste discharge requirements established for the discharge.

In addition to regulating discharges of wastewater to surface waters, NPDES permits also require municipal sewage treatment plants having a design capacity greater than 5 ~~million gallons per day~~ (MGD) to conduct pretreatment programs. Smaller municipal treatment systems may be required to conduct pretreatment programs if there are significant industrial users of their systems. Pretreatment is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT WAIVER POLICY

The Regional Board may waive issuance of waste discharge requirements for a specific discharge or types of discharge pursuant to ~~California~~ Water Code section 13269 if such waiver is determined not to be against the public interest.

The waiver of adoption of waste discharge requirements is not applicable to discharges subject to NPDES permit regulation. The Clean Water Act does not provide for a waiver of the need to obtain an NPDES permit for point source discharges of pollutants to surface waters.

Amendments to ~~California~~ Water Code section 13269, effective January 1, 2003 provided that waivers may not exceed five years duration and must be conditional. Under these amendments the regional boards were required to:

- Renew waivers every five years;
- Review the terms, conditions and effectiveness of each type of waiver included in their waiver policies at a public hearing;
- Determine if general or individual waste discharge requirements should be issued for ongoing discharges where waivers have been terminated; and,
- Require compliance with waiver conditions.

The waiver of ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ is conditional and may be terminated at any time by the Regional Board for any specific discharge or any specific type of discharge.

The Regional Board has determined that a waiver of adoption of ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ for a specific type of discharge would not be against the public interest under one or more of the following circumstances:

- The type of discharge is effectively regulated by other public agencies; or
- The type of discharge does not adversely affect the quality of the beneficial uses of the waters of the state; or
- The type of discharge is not readily amenable to regulation through adoption of ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ but warrants Regional Board oversight to insure compliance with mandated conditions.

On September 11, 2002, the Regional Board conditionally waived adoption of ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ for certain specific types of discharges described in Table 4-4. Subsequently the Waiver Policy was reviewed and approved by the State Water Resources Control Board and the State Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The Waiver Policy took effect on August 19, 2003 following OAL approval. The waivers expire on August 19, 2008, except for discharges for which Table 4-4 specifies an earlier expiration date.

The following general conditions apply to all discharges described in Table 4-4:

- The discharge shall not create a nuisance as defined in the ~~California~~ Water Code; and
- The discharge shall not cause a violation of any applicable water quality standard; and

- The discharge of any substance in concentrations toxic to animal or plant life is prohibited.

In addition, the discharges must satisfy the specific conditions described in Table 4-4.

The discharges in Table 4-4 have been assigned to either Category 1 or Category 2, for purpose of Regional Board oversight for determination of compliance with waiver conditions. Discharges covered by Category 1 waivers pose a greater potential threat to water quality than those in Category 2.

For Category 1 waivers, ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ for a specific discharge shall be considered waived only after enrollment. For most of the discharges in Category 1, programs administered by the Regional Board or other public agencies will provide the information necessary to satisfy the enrollment requirements. For the remainder of Category 1 discharges, submission of an enrollment form is required. The enrollment form requires entry of owner/agent name and contact information, type of discharge, location information and a certification of waiver applicability and intent to comply. The "*Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirement Enrollment Form*," 10/1/02 version, is used for this purpose.

Dischargers may contact the Regional Board office to determine if enrollment is necessary for a specific discharge. The Regional Board will determine compliance with Category 1 waiver conditions using a program that includes on-site inspections and/or review of the records of other public agencies that regulate these discharges.

For Category 2 waivers, enrollment is not necessary. The Regional Board will assess compliance with Category 2 waiver conditions by means of surveys or other indirect methods.

WATER RECLAMATION REQUIREMENTS

Reclaimed water is water that, as a result of treatment, is suitable for a direct beneficial use or a controlled use that would otherwise not occur. Reclaimed water uses in the Region include, but are not limited to, landscape irrigation, crop irrigation, freeway landscape irrigation, groundwater recharge, soil compaction at construction sites, and for recreational lakes.

The Regional Board may prescribe water reclamation requirements to reclaimed water producers and those governing the use of reclaimed water, which the Regional Board has determined are necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare pursuant to

Table 4-4. Types of Discharges Identified for Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements.

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
<p>1. Conventional septic tank / subsurface disposal systems for residential units.</p> <p>2. Conventional septic tanks/ subsurface disposal systems for commercial / industrial establishments.</p> <p>3. Alternative individual sewerage systems.</p>	<p>Subject to the conditions set forth in the Basin Plan, Chapter 4, (Implementation) section entitled <i>Guidelines for New Community and Individual Sewerage Facilities</i>, and where systems are not constructed within areas designated as Zone A as defined by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program. This waiver applies until six months after the State BoardState Water Resources Control Board adopts statewide criteria for on-site disposal systems pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 885.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Basin Plan, Chapter 4 (Implementation) section entitled <i>Guidelines for New Community and Individual Sewerage Facilities, Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program</i>, California Department of Health Services (DHS).</p> <p>AB 885 requires that the State Water Resources Control Board develop statewide criteria for on-site disposal systems by January 1, 2004.</p>
<p>4. Conventional septic tank / subsurface disposal systems for campgrounds.</p>	<p>Where no facilities are provided which would enable recreational vehicles to connect with the campground sewerage system, and where systems are not constructed within areas designated as Zone A as defined by the DHSCalifornia Department of Health Services Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Basin Plan, Chapter 4 (Implementation) section entitled <i>Guidelines for New Community and Individual Sewerage Facilities, Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program</i>, California Department of Health Services (DHS).</p>
<p>5. Construction and test pumping of water wells.</p>	<p>Where the well water pumped is uncontaminated; and where the well was not constructed for and is not to be used in ground water cleanup operations.</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>6. Air conditioner condensate.</p>		<p>2</p>	

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
<p>7. Animal feeding operations for the following species in the numbers indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 300 to 999 veal calves; - 300 to 999 cattle other than mature dairy cows or veal calves (including, but not limited to heifers, steers, bulls and cow/calf pairs); - 750 to 2,499 swine each weighing 55 pounds or more; - 3,000 to 9,999 swine each weighing less than 55 pounds; - 150 to 499 horses; - 3,000 to 9,999 sheep or lambs; - 16,500 to 54,999 turkeys; - 9,000 to 29,999 laying hens or broilers (if a liquid manure handling system is used); - 37,500 to 124,999 chickens (other than laying hens, if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - 25,000 to 81,999 laying hens (if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - 10,000 to 29,999 ducks (if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - 1,500 to 4,999 ducks (if the operation uses a liquid manure handling system). 	<p>Where the facility is operated and maintained in conformance with the regulations cited in sections 22562 through 22565, Division 2, Title 27 of the CCR California Code of Regulations, and where pollutants are not discharged (1) to waters of the United States through a man-made ditch, flushing system or other similar man-made device; or (2) directly into waters of the United States which originate outside of and pass over, across or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.</p> <p>Where the facility has not been designated as a Confined Animal Feeding Operation pursuant to USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Administered Permit Programs: NPDES, 40 CFR 122.23 as revised December 15, 2002.</p>	1	<p>USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Administered Permit Programs: NPDES, 40 CFR 122.23 as revised December 15, 2002, and USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency <i>Guide Manual on NPDES Regulations for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.</i></p>

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
<p>8. Animal feeding operations for the following species in the numbers indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - less than 300 veal calves; - less than 300 cattle other than mature dairy cows or veal calves (including, but not limited to heifers, steers, bulls and cow / calf pairs); - less than 750 swine each weighing 55 pounds or more; - less than 3,000 swine each weighing less than 55 pounds; - less than 150 horses; - less than 3,000 sheep or lambs; - less than 16,500 turkeys; - less than 9,000 laying hens or broilers (if a liquid manure handling system is used); - less than 37,500 chickens (other than laying hens, if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - less than 25,000 laying hens (if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - less than 10,000 ducks (if the operation does not use a liquid manure handling system); - less than 1,500 ducks (if the operation uses a liquid manure handling system); - any number of goats; - any number of buffalo. 	<p>Where the facility is operated and maintained in conformance with the regulations cited in sections 22562 through 22565, Division 2, Title 27 of the CCR California Code of Regulations, and where pollutants are not discharged (1) to waters of the United States through a man-made ditch, flushing system or other similar man-made device; or, (2) directly into waters of the United States which originate outside of and pass over, across or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.</p> <p>Where the facility has not been designated as a Confined Animal Feeding Operation pursuant to USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Administered Permit Programs: NPDES, 40 CFR 122.23 as revised December 15, 2002.</p>	2	<p>USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Administered Permit Programs: NPDES, 40 CFR 122.23 as revised December 15, 2002, and USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency <i>Guide Manual on NPDES Regulations for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.</i></p>

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
9. Plant crop residues.	Where such residues are plowed into fields (as opposed to being disposed of en masse, e.g., in a pit).	2	For the purposes of this document, " <i>plant crop residues</i> " shall be defined as waste plant crops and nonmarketable portions of plants.
10. Storm water runoff.	Where no NPDES permit is required, and where appropriate BMPs <i>best management practices</i> , such as those recommended by USEPA's Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory, are implemented to minimize the discharge of contaminants in runoff infiltrating to ground water aquifers.	2	USEPA <i>United States Environmental Protection Agency</i> Project Summary, <i>Potential Groundwater Contamination from Intentional and Nonintentional Stormwater Infiltration</i> .
11. Sand and gravel mining operations.	Where operations are not conducted in flowing streams; and where water quality certification pursuant to federal Clean Water Act section 401 has been issued.	1	This waiver does not apply to wash water or other discharges from sand and gravel processing operations.
12. Intermittent swimming pool discharges.	Where pool filter backwash is not discharged.	2	
13. Dredging project wastes.	Where the dredging project does not involve more than 5,000 yd ³ of material and where water quality certification pursuant to federal Clean Water Act section 401 has been issued.	1	
14. Short-term construction dewatering operations.	Where there is no discharge to surface waters.	2	
15. Manure composting and soil amendment operations.	Where State Water Resources Control Board Minimal Guidelines for Protection of Water Quality from Animal Wastes are followed.	1	Adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on March 1, 1973.
16. Solid waste disposal facilities accepting only inert wastes.	Where State Water Resources Control Board regulations, requirements and guidelines for disposal of such wastes are satisfied; and where Fish and Game Code section 5650 is not violated.	1	The applicable document as of the date of adoption of the Resolution is <i>Discharges of Waste to Land</i> (CCR Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15).

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
17. Stream channel alterations.	Where water quality certification pursuant to Federal Clean Water Act section 401 has been issued.	1	
18. Agricultural irrigation return water.	Where management measures and BMPs best management practices have been implemented as described in the <i>Plan for California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program</i> .	2	For the purposes of this document, " <i>agriculture</i> " shall be defined as the production of fiber and/or food (including food for animal consumption, e.g., alfalfa).
19. Nursery irrigation return water.	Where there is no discharge to waters of the U.S., and where BMPs best management practices have been implemented as described in the <i>Plan for California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program</i> .	1	For the purposes of this document, a " <i>nursery</i> " shall be defined as a facility engaged in growing plants (shrubs, trees, vines, etc.) for sale.
20. Short-term use of reclaimed wastewater.	See Appendix D.	1	
21. On-site drilling mud discharge.	<p>Where discharge is to a sump with a minimum freeboard of two feet; and</p> <p>Where sump is not to be used for ultimate disposal of drilling mud (unless discharger demonstrates that material is nontoxic and does not contain dissolved or soluble salts in quantities which could adversely affect basin groundwater quality); and</p> <p>Where sump site is restored to predrilling state within 60 days of completion or abandonment of well.</p>	2	

Type of Waste Discharge	Specific Condition(s)	Waiver Category	References, Remarks, Etc.
22. Timber harvesting.	Where harvesting occurs on National Forest System lands managed by the United States Forest Service in accordance with the practices and procedures set forth in the document entitled <i>Water Quality Management for National Forest System Lands in California</i> .	2	Management Agency Agreement between State Water Resources Control Board and the United States Forest Service (United States Department of Agriculture).
23. Temporary discharge of specified contaminated soils.	See Appendix D.	1	
24. Green waste composting facilities.	See Appendix D.	2	
25. Incidental discharges within a response area during a spill response.	The discharge must meet the definition of "incidental discharge" as this, and related terms are defined in the <i>Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Fish and Game's Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response and the State Water Resources Control Board Relating to Discharges Associated with Response Activities Conducted Pursuant to Ch. 7.4, Division 1 of the Government Code</i> .	2	
26. Permanent reclaimed water projects.	See Appendix D.	1	

~~California~~—Water Code, Division 7, Chapter 7, sections 13500-13556 "*Water Reclamation Law*". Water Reclamation Law provides that no person shall reclaim water or use reclaimed water for any purpose subject to Title 22 criteria until water reclamation requirements have been established or the Regional Board determines no requirements are necessary. The Regional Board may not deny issuance of water reclamation requirements to a project which violates only a salinity standard in the Basin Plan.

In lieu of issuing water reclamation requirements pursuant to ~~California~~—Water Code, section 13523, for each user of reclaimed water, the Regional Board establishes master reclamation requirements as part of the waste discharge requirements which are issued to a supplier or distributor, or both, of reclaimed water. Reclamation requirements must include the following components:

- A requirement that the permittee comply with the uniform statewide reclamation criteria established pursuant to section 13521. Permit conditions for a use of reclaimed water not addressed by the uniform statewide reclamation criteria shall be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- A requirement that the permittee establish and enforce rules or regulations for reclaimed water users, governing the design and construction of reclaimed water use facilities and the use of reclaimed water, in accordance with the uniform statewide reclamation criteria established pursuant to section 13521;
- A requirement that the permittee submit a quarterly report summarizing reclaimed water use, including the total amount of reclaimed water supplied, the total number of reclaimed water use sites, and the locations of those sites, including the names of the hydrologic areas underlying the reclaimed water use sites;
- A requirement that the permittee conduct periodic inspections of the facilities of the reclaimed water users to monitor compliance by users with the uniform statewide reclamation criteria and the requirements of the master reclamation permit; and

- Any other requirements determined to be appropriate by the Regional Board.

The "*Rules and Regulations for Reclaimed Water Users*" that must be issued and enforced by the permittee govern the design and construction of reclaimed water use facilities and the use of reclaimed water. The rules and regulations must have the following elements:

- Provisions implementing Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3, Wastewater Reclamation Criteria; and Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Group 4, Articles 1 & 2, of the ~~CCR~~[California Code of Regulations](#);
- Provisions implementing the State Department of Health Services (DHS) "*Guidelines For Use of Reclaimed Water and Guidelines for Use of Reclaimed Water for Construction Purposes*" and measures that are deemed necessary for protection of public health, such as the "*American Water Works Association (AWWA) California/Nevada Section, Guidelines for the Distribution of Non-Potable Water*" or alternate measures, acceptable to DHS, providing equivalent protection of public health;
- Provisions authorizing the Regional Board, the discharger/producer, or an authorized representative of these parties, upon presentation of proper credentials, to inspect the facilities of any reclaimed water user to ascertain whether the user is complying with the discharger/producer's rules and regulations;
- Provision for written notification, in a timely manner, to the discharger/producer by the reclaimed water user of any material change or proposed change in the character of the use of reclaimed water;
- Provision for submission of a preconstruction report to the discharger/producer by the reclaimed water user in order to enable the discharger/producer to determine whether the user will be in compliance with the discharger/producer's rules and regulations;
- Provision requiring reclaimed water users to designate a reclaimed water supervisor responsible for the reclaimed water system at

each use area under the user's control. Reclaimed water supervisors should be responsible for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the irrigation system, enforcement of the discharger/producer's reclaimed water user rules and regulations, prevention of potential hazards, and maintenance of the reclaimed water distribution system plans in "as built" form;

- Provision authorizing the discharger/ producer to cease supplying reclaimed water to any person who uses, transports, or stores such water in violation of the discharger/producer's rules and regulations;
- Provision requiring notification and concurrence of the State ~~DHS~~Department of Health Services and the local county health department for new reclaimed water users. The notification of the county health department shall include a site distribution plan for new and retrofit facilities and a cross-connection control inspection plan for sites containing both potable and reclaimed water distribution lines;
- Provision requiring all windblown spray and surface runoff of reclaimed water applied for irrigation onto property not owned or controlled by the discharger or reclaimed water user to be prevented by implementation of ~~BMPs~~best management practices;
- Provision requiring all reclaimed water storage facilities owned and/or operated by reclaimed water users to be protected against erosion, overland runoff, and other impacts resulting from a 100-year frequency storm, 24 hour storm. This requirement may be waived if the discharger submits information demonstrating that releases from the storage facilities caused by storm events of less than 100-year frequency will not cause violation of the Basin Plan water quality standards;
- Provision requiring all reclaimed water storage facilities owned and/or operated by reclaimed water users to be protected against 100-year frequency peak stream flows as defined by the local flood control agency. However, if information is made available to the Regional Board which shows that a reclaimed water storage facility

presents no potential impairment to the beneficial uses, the Regional Board may exempt requirements for 100-year flood protection on a case-by-case basis;

- Provision for notification to reclaimed water users that the Regional Board may initiate enforcement action against any reclaimed water user who discharges reclaimed water in violation of any applicable discharge prohibitions prescribed by the Regional Board or in a manner which creates, or threatens to create conditions of pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined in Water Code section 13050; and
- Provision for notification to reclaimed water users that the Regional Board may initiate enforcement action against the discharger/producer, which may result in the termination of the reclaimed water supply, if any person uses, transports, or stores such water in violation of the discharger/producer's rules and regulations or in a manner which creates, or threatens to create conditions of pollution, contamination, or nuisance, as defined in Water Code section 13050.

WASTE DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

~~California~~Water Code section 13243 provides that a Regional Board, in a water quality control plan, may specify certain conditions or areas where the discharge of waste, or certain types of waste is not permitted. The following discharge prohibitions are applicable to any person, as defined by section 13050(c) of the ~~California~~ Water Code, who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of California whose activities in California could affect the quality of waters of the state within the boundaries of the San Diego Region.

- (1) The discharge of waste to waters of the state in a manner causing, or threatening to cause a condition of pollution, contamination or nuisance as defined in ~~California~~Water Code section 13050, is prohibited.
- (2) The discharge of waste to land, except as authorized by ~~WDRs~~waste discharge requirements or the terms described in

~~California~~—Water Code section 13264 is prohibited.

- (3) The discharge of pollutants or dredged or fill material to waters of the United States except as authorized by an NPDES permit or a dredged or fill material permit (subject to the exemption described in ~~California~~—Water Code [section](#)§13376) is prohibited.
- (4) Discharges of recycled water to lakes or reservoirs used for municipal water supply or to inland surface water tributaries thereto are prohibited, unless this Regional Board issues a NPDES permit authorizing such a discharge; the proposed discharge has been approved by the State ~~DHS~~Department of Health Services and the operating agency of the impacted reservoir; and the discharger has an approved fail-safe long-term disposal alternative.
- (5) The discharge of waste to inland surface waters, except in cases where the quality of the discharge complies with applicable receiving water quality objectives, is prohibited. Allowances for dilution may be made at the discretion of the Regional Board. Consideration would include streamflow data, the degree of treatment provided and safety measures to ensure reliability of facility performance. As an example, discharge of secondary effluent would probably be permitted if streamflow provided 100:1 dilution capability.
- (6) The discharge of waste in a manner causing flow, ponding, or surfacing on lands not owned or under the control of the discharger is prohibited, unless the discharge is authorized by the Regional Board.
- (7) The dumping, deposition, or discharge of waste directly into waters of the state, or adjacent to such waters in any manner which may permit its being transported into the waters, is prohibited unless authorized by the Regional Board.
- (8) Any discharge to a storm water conveyance system that is not composed entirely of "storm water" is prohibited unless authorized by the Regional Board. [The federal regulations,

40 CFR 122.26(b)(13), define storm water as storm water runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage. 40 CFR 122.26(b)(2) defines an illicit discharge as any discharge to a storm water conveyance system that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit and discharges resulting from fire fighting activities.] [~~Section~~§122.26 amended at 56 FR 56553, November 5, 1991; 57 FR 11412, April 2, 1992].

- (9) The unauthorized discharge of treated or untreated sewage to waters of the state or to a storm water conveyance system is prohibited.
- (10) The discharge of industrial wastes to conventional septic tank/ subsurface disposal systems, except as authorized by the terms described in ~~California~~—Water Code section 13264, is prohibited.
- (11) The discharge of radioactive wastes amenable to alternative methods of disposal into the waters of the state is prohibited.
- (12) The discharge of any radiological, chemical, or biological warfare agent into waters of the state is prohibited.
- (13) The discharge of waste into a natural or excavated site below historic water levels is prohibited unless the discharge is authorized by the Regional Board.
- (14) The discharge of sand, silt, clay, or other earthen materials from any activity, including land grading and construction, in quantities which cause deleterious bottom deposits, turbidity or discoloration in waters of the state or which unreasonably affect, or threaten to affect, beneficial uses of such waters is prohibited.
- (15) The discharge of treated or untreated sewage from vessels to Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, Dana Point Harbor, or other small boat harbors is prohibited.
- (16) The discharge of untreated sewage from vessels to San Diego Bay is prohibited.
- (17) The discharge of treated sewage from vessels to portions of San Diego Bay that

are less than 30 feet deep at ~~mean lower low water~~ (MLLW) is prohibited.

(18) The discharge of treated sewage from vessels, which do not have a properly functioning ~~USCG US Coast Guard~~ certified Type I or Type II marine sanitation device, to portions of San Diego Bay that are greater than 30 feet deep at ~~mean lower low water~~ (MLLW) is prohibited.

WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION (SECTION 401)

In addition to the issuance of NPDES permits or ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~, the Regional Board acts to protect the quality of surface waters through water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Section 401 requires that any person applying for a federal permit or license which may result in a discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States, must obtain a state water quality certification that the activity complies with all applicable water quality standards, limitations, and restrictions.

No license or permit may be issued by a federal agency until certification required by section 401 has been granted or waived by the state. Further, no license or permit may be issued if certification has been denied by the state. The activity must also meet the requirements of the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program required under the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA).

The following permits or licenses are subject to section 401 of the Clean Water Act:

- NPDES permits issued by the USEPA under section 402 of the Clean Water Act;
- Clean Water Act, section 404 permits issued by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE);
- Permits issued under sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (for activities which may affect navigation);
- Licenses for hydroelectric power plants issued by the federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the Federal Power Act; and

- Licenses issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Regional Board's water quality certification activities have focused on applications for permits for the discharge of dredged or fill material to surface waters. These permits are issued by the USACOE Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act, section 404 permits) subject to any conditions imposed by the Regional Board pursuant to section 401.

The section 404 program is administered at the federal level by the ~~US Army Corps of Engineers~~ USACOE and the USEPA. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have important advisory roles. The ~~US Army Corps of Engineers~~ USACOE has the primary responsibility for the permit program and is authorized, after notice and opportunity for a public hearing, to issue permits for the discharge of dredged or fill material. USEPA develops the regulations under which permits may be granted.

The Regional Board evaluates the projects for which section 404 permits are requested and determines whether to deny water quality certification, issue a certification with or without conditions, or waive the certification pursuant to regulations in Article 4, Title 23. Regional Board certification is dependent upon assurance that the project will not reduce water quality below applicable standards as defined in the Clean Water Act (i.e., the water quality objectives established and the beneficial uses which have been designated for the surface waters). A certification is usually denied if the proposed activity does not meet water quality standards. If the activity may violate standards, a conditional certification is given. If the activity does not violate any standards, a section 401 waiver may be given. The Executive Director of the State Board may issue a water quality certification after review of the application, all relevant data, and taking into consideration any recommendations from the Regional Board.

SELF MONITORING, COMPLIANCE MONITORING, AND INSPECTIONS

Compliance with NPDES permits and ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ is generally self-monitored by each individual discharger, with oversight by the Regional Board.

Dischargers are required to report and take necessary corrective actions when they discover that they are not in compliance with the permit effluent limits. The Regional Board conducts periodic inspections and compliance monitoring and, as necessary, will take enforcement actions to ensure compliance.

Self Monitoring Program: ~~WDRs~~ ~~Waste discharge requirements~~ and NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board include requirements for the discharger to collect samples of the waste discharge. In some cases, the receiving waters must also be monitored by the dischargers. The results of the "self monitoring" programs are reported to the Board and are used to determine compliance with the ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~. (Additional information on this topic is presented in Chapter 6, Surveillance and Monitoring).

Compliance Monitoring and Inspections: Regional Board staff can conduct unannounced inspections (including collection of samples) to determine the status of compliance with NPDES permit or WDRs / WRRs requirements. All major dischargers are inspected at least once a year. (Additional information on this topic is presented in Chapter 6, Surveillance and Monitoring).



ENFORCEMENT

The Regional Board is committed to the maintenance of a strong and uniform enforcement program. Appropriate and timely response to instances of noncompliance with Regional Board NPDES permits, ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~, waste discharge prohibitions and enforcement orders is necessary to ensure protection of the quality of surface and ground waters in the Region.

Regional Board response to noncompliance incidents include the establishment of a specific time frame for compliance and or correction. All dischargers are expected to correct violations in the shortest time frame possible. With the exception of special circumstances, failure to terminate, comply, or complete corrective actions on a noncompliance incident in a specified time frame will result in the escalation of the matter to a higher level enforcement action.

Regional Board responses to instances of violation correspond to the following

enforcement action level sequence, unless circumstances warrant a more expeditious escalation to a higher level.

LEVEL A ENFORCEMENT ACTION

In this action level the Regional Board staff requests the discharger, by telephone or letter, to correct the problem and prevent recurrence. Regional Board staff may also request the discharger to correct the problem during routine compliance inspections.

LEVEL B ENFORCEMENT ACTION


In this action level the Regional Board Executive Officer issues a notice of violation to the discharger for failure to comply with a compliance schedule for corrective action.

LEVEL C ENFORCEMENT ACTION

In this action level the Regional Board may take a variety of formal higher level enforcement actions. The ~~California~~ Water Code provides the Regional Board with a number of enforcement remedies for violations of requirements. These remedies include time schedules, cease and desist orders, cleanup and abatement orders, and administrative civil liability orders.

Time Schedule Orders

When a discharge is taking place or threatening to occur that will cause a violation of a Regional or State Board requirement, a discharger may be required to submit a detailed list of specific actions the discharger will take to correct or prevent the violation. (~~California~~ Water Code [section §13300](#)). These schedules may also be required when the waste collection, treatment, or disposal facility of a discharger are approaching capacity. Time schedule orders are adopted by the Board after a public hearing or issued by the Executive Officer pursuant to authority delegated by the Regional Board.



Cleanup and Abatement Orders

The Regional Board may issue a cleanup and abatement order to any person who has discharged, is discharging or is threatening to discharge wastes that will result in a violation of ~~WDRs~~ ~~waste discharge requirements~~ or other

order or prohibition of the State or Regional Board. The Regional Board may also issue a cleanup and abatement order to any person who discharges or has discharged waste to waters of the state and causes, or threatens to cause, a condition of pollution or nuisance. The cleanup and abatement order may require the waste discharger(s) to cleanup and abate the effects of the discharge or to take other appropriate remedial action (~~California~~ Water Code [section](#) §13304). A cleanup and abatement order is issued if a pollutant can actually be cleaned up or the pollutant effects abated. The Regional Board has delegated issuance of these orders to the Executive Officer. Cleanup and abatement orders do not require Board adoption, but may be brought before the Regional Board for consideration at the request of the discharger.

Cease and Desist Orders

If discharge prohibitions or requirements of the State Board or Regional Board are violated or threatened, the Regional Board may adopt a cease and desist order (~~California~~ Water Code [section](#) §13301) requiring the discharger to comply forthwith, to comply in accordance with a time schedule, or if the violation is threatened, to take appropriate remedial or preventive action. Cease and desist orders may restrict or prohibit the volume, type or concentration of waste added to community sewer systems, if existing or threatened violations of waste discharge requirements occur. Cease and desist orders may specify interim time schedules as well as limitations that must be complied with until full compliance is achieved. Cease and desist orders are adopted by the Regional Board after a public hearing.

Administrative Civil Liability

Administrative civil liability complaints and orders may be issued by the Regional Board for certain categories of violations. In this process the Regional Board may impose monetary penalties on dischargers. The Regional Board (or the Executive Officer) may issue Administrative Civil Liability complaints (ACLs) to persons who intentionally or negligently violate enforcement orders of the Board, or who intentionally or negligently discharge wastes in violation of any order, prohibition, or requirement of the Board where the discharge causes conditions of pollution or nuisance (~~California~~ Water Code [section](#) §13350). ACLs may also be issued in

cases where a person fails to submit reports requested by the Board (~~California~~ Water Code [sections](#) §13261 and §13268) or when a person discharges waste without first having filed the appropriate ~~Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD)~~ (~~California~~ Water Code [section](#) §13265). ACLs may be issued pursuant to ~~California~~ Water Code section 13385 for violations of any Regional Board prohibition or requirement implementing specified sections of the Clean Water Act, or any requirement in an approved pretreatment program. Amounts of administrative civil liability that the Board can impose range up to \$10,000 per day of violation. The Water Code also provides that a superior court may impose civil liability assessments in substantially higher amounts. The Regional Board may conduct a hearing if a discharger contests the imposition of the Administrative Civil Liability.

LEVEL D ENFORCEMENT ACTION

Referral to the Attorney General or District Attorney

Judicial Civil Liability: The ~~California~~ Water Code provides that a Regional Board may request the State Attorney General to petition a superior court to enforce orders and complaints issued by the Board and impose civil monetary remedies. The monetary remedies may be in excess of the administrative civil liability penalties that the Regional Board is authorized to impose. The court imposed fines and or imprisonment vary depending upon the seriousness of the violation.

Injunctive Relief: The Regional Board may also request that the Attorney General seek injunctive relief in specific situations, such as violations of cease and desist orders or discharges which cause or threaten to cause a nuisance or pollution that could result in a public health emergency (~~California~~ Water Code [section](#) §13331 and [section](#) §13340).

Criminal Penalties: The Regional Board may also refer violations to the District Attorney to seek criminal penalties by judicial action in the county where the discharge occurred. The court imposed fines and or imprisonment vary depending upon the seriousness of the violation.

SELECTION OF APPROPRIATE ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The following criteria are considered by the Regional Board in selecting the appropriate enforcement action in response to an incident of noncompliance:

- Degree of water quality impairment and/or threat to the public health including the degree of toxicity of the discharge;
- Past history of discharge violations;
- Degree of cooperation or recalcitrance shown by the discharger;
- Culpability of the discharger;
- Financial resources of the discharger;
- Whether the circumstances leading to the noncompliance have been corrected;
- Whether the discharge violations are likely to continue in the future;
- Whether the discharge can be cleaned up;
- The need to take immediate cleanup action;
- Any economic benefit realized by the discharger as a result of the noncompliance; and
- Other actions as justice may require.



STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD PLANS AND POLICIES

The [State Water Resources Control Board](#) (State Board) has adopted a number of plans and policies for statewide water quality management. The Regional Board implements these plans through [WDRs](#) ~~Waste Discharge Requirements~~, NPDES permits, and any necessary enforcement actions. These policies are explained in more detail in Chapter 5, Plans and Policies.

HAZARDOUS WASTE SOURCE REDUCTION

The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) has adopted regulations regarding hazardous waste source reduction pursuant to the Hazardous Waste Source Reduction

and Management Review Act of 1989 (Article 11.9, starting with [section 525244.12](#) of the Health and Safety Code). These regulations are contained in sections 67100.1 through sections 67100.14 of Title 22 of the [CCR](#) ~~California Code of Regulations~~. These regulations require that each generator of hazardous or extremely hazardous waste within the limits set by the regulations conduct a source reduction evaluation review and plan, plan summary, hazardous waste management performance report, and report summary on or before September 1, 1991 and every four years thereafter. Every generator is required to retain a copy of the current review and plan, plan summary, report, report summary, progress report, and compliance checklist at each site, at a public library, or at a local governmental agency. The Regional Board supports these efforts of hazardous waste source reduction because any successes achieved will mean less hazardous waste which could pollute California's waters.

MUNICIPAL AND DOMESTIC WASTEWATER

Municipal wastewater in the San Diego Region consists primarily of domestic sewage and minor quantities of industrial wastes in some of the more highly urbanized and industrialized areas. Facilities to control municipal wastewater include wastewater collection systems, pumping stations, transport pipelines, treatment plants, storage ponds and ocean outfalls. These facilities are sometimes collectively referred to by the term Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW).

Municipal wastewater treatment in the San Diego Region is generally at the secondary treatment level. Secondary treatment results in the removal of more than 85 percent of the biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solids found in municipal wastewater. Tertiary (advanced) wastewater treatment is used at some treatment plants for additional removal of pollutants to reclaim wastewater for beneficial reuse. Effluent from the wastewater treatment plants is disposed of by various means including:

- Discharge to the Pacific Ocean via long deep ocean outfalls;
- Percolation into the soil; and

- Reclamation and reuse in conformance with uniform reclamation criteria (~~CCR California Code of Regulations~~, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3).

Sludge disposal at most major municipal wastewater treatment plants in the Region consists of aerobic or anaerobic digestion and land disposal. Dried sludge is either disposed of at landfills or made available to the public as a soil conditioner. Some treatment plants, located upstream of major regional wastewater treatment plants discharge sludge to the sewage collection system for treatment at a "downstream" regional wastewater plant. The term municipal sewage treatment plant and Publicly Owned Treatment Works are used interchangeably in the Basin Plan.

The Regional Board regulates wastewater discharges from municipal wastewater treatment plants through either the issuance of ~~National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)~~ permits where the discharge is to surface waters or through ~~waste discharge requirements (WDRs)~~ where the discharge is to land.

Discharges of wastewater to surface water must meet the effluent limitations prescribed in the NPDES permit issued by the Regional Board. Effluent limitations are based on the following criteria:

- Secondary treatment effluent limitations defined by USEPA contained in 40 CFR 133, unless a waiver to the secondary treatment standards is obtained (more stringent effluent limitations than secondary treatment may be imposed by the Regional Board if necessary);
- Applicable water quality objectives and beneficial uses contained in the Basin Plan and State Board Water Quality Control Plans;
- Applicable public health protection standards for total and fecal coliform;
- Assimilative capacity of the receiving water;
- The terms and conditions of the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12) and the State Antidegradation Policy (Resolution No. 68-16) (See Chapter 3);
- Anti-backsliding ~~p~~Provisions described in Clean Water Act section 404; and

- Land disposal or recycling of sludge as a soil amendment.

Discharges of wastewater onto land must meet the effluent limitations in the waste discharge requirements prescribed by the Regional Board through the issuance of ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~. The ~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ contain effluent limitations based on the following criteria:

- The treatment capability of the treatment process employed by the dischargers;
- Applicable water quality objectives and beneficial uses contained in the Basin Plan;
- Applicable public health protection standards for total and fecal coliform;
- Assimilative capacity of the receiving water;
- The terms and conditions of the State Antidegradation Policy (Resolution No. 68-16) (See Chapter 3); and
- Land disposal or recycling of sludge as a soil amendment.



CLEAN WATER GRANTS AND LOANS

From 1972 until 1988 the State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board assisted the USEPA in administering the multibillion dollar Clean Water Grants Program in California to finance the construction of municipal wastewater treatment facilities. This program ended in 1988. The Clean Water Act provides for the creation of a State Revolving Fund (SRF) Loan Program capitalized in part by federal funds. The Clean Water Act authorizes loan funding for construction of Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs), for implementation of a nonpoint source pollution control management program, and for the development and implementation of an estuary conservation and management program. The State Board converted the Clean Water Grant Program to a Grants and Loans program on October 1, 1988, and ultimately replaced this completely with the State Revolving Fund Loan Program on June 30, 1989.

INDIVIDUAL DOMESTIC SUBSURFACE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

Some areas in the Region rely on subsurface disposal systems for disposal of domestic household sewage. The most common type of subsurface disposal system is the septic tank-leach field disposal system. Seepage pits are sometimes used when site conditions are not suitable for leachfields. Occasionally, alternatives to conventional septic tank/leachfield or seepage pit systems are proposed for individual residences. Alternatives that have been proposed but not necessarily approved in the Region have included mound systems, evapotranspiration (ET), evapotranspiration/ infiltration (ETI), small in-house package treatment facilities, sand filters, and other innovative approaches.

The purpose of a septic tank system is to treat household wastes so that the discharge will readily percolate into the soil. Treatment or conditioning of the waste is achieved by the removal of solids through settling and decomposition of some of the soluble organic chemicals in the tank portion of the system. Further treatment of organic chemicals, nutrients, and bacteria occurs as the effluent released from the tank percolates through the soil. Proper construction of septic systems is imperative. Poorly designed and constructed systems will not function properly and can result in pollution of surface or ground waters. Septic tank systems used in undersized lots or unsuitable soils are subject to failure, and can lead to untreated or poorly treated sewage seeping into yards, roadside ditches, streams, lagoons, or into ground water, thus creating a public nuisance and health hazard. Even well-functioning septic systems can pollute ground water under adverse conditions.

Nitrogen compounds, which are typically present in effluent from septic systems, are highly soluble and stable in aqueous environments. When not denitrified by bacteria or assimilated into organic growth in the unsaturated zone, these nitrogen compounds are easily transported to ground water. Although there is controversy about the possible health effects of nitrate on adults, it has been shown that high levels of nitrate cause methemoglobinemia (blue-baby syndrome) in infants. Both the federal drinking water standard of 10 mg/l nitrate plus nitrite (expressed as nitrogen) and the equivalent state drinking water standard of

45 mg/l nitrate (expressed as NO₃) is based on this relationship.

The ~~California~~ Water Code, Chapter 4, Article 5, sets forth criteria for regulating on-site disposal systems. In the past, the Regional Board placed certain types of septic tank systems under individual waste discharge requirements. However, the regulatory process for establishing and enforcing waste discharge requirements for individual disposal systems is cumbersome and for the most part overlaps the regulatory process of local agencies. Consequently, the Regional Board has deferred regulation of most single-family dwellings and certain commercial septic tank disposal systems to the local health departments. The Regional Board has asserted its authority with multiple-dwelling units, some larger developments in problem areas, non-domestic septic tank systems, and any situation which is creating, or has the potential to create, a water quality problem.

In the past, the Regional Board staff reviewed all proposals of individual sewerage systems for residential subdivisions involving more than five family units and for all commercial and industrial establishments. As part of this review, the Regional Board staff evaluated the adequacy of the consultants' field tests, the conformance of the design proposal with the criteria of the appropriate county regulatory agency, and in most instances, the cumulative impacts of the discharges on nitrate concentrations in the groundwater. Letters were forwarded to the appropriate local health agency approving those projects that demonstrated: (a) surfacing sewage from the proposed disposal systems will not take place either adjacent to, or within, the project boundaries; (b) the historic high groundwater and the effects of the discharge will not result in groundwater rising within 5 feet below the base of the disposal system; and (c) the cumulative impacts of the discharges will not cause nitrate concentrations in the ground water to exceed water quality standards.

Generally, project proponents have been able to address water quality issues by completing the routine field investigations required by the local health agencies. Regional Board staff review of the investigation reports often duplicated the review efforts of the local agencies. On occasion, the Regional Board staff has required further investigations to address concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of the

discharges. These investigations are not part of the local agencies' normal review process and the criteria for conducting these investigations are not specified by local regulations. On these occasions, significant staff resources are expended evaluating the technical information submitted by the project proponents.

In 1990, Regional Board staff suspended review of all proposed subsurface disposal system projects in order to direct staff resources to more critical water quality issues. In lieu of reviewing individual projects, staff prepared interim screening procedures for implementation by the appropriate local agencies. The objective of the procedures is to assist the local agencies in identifying those projects with potential for causing degradation of ground water quality. Only those projects would then be referred to the Regional Board staff.

The determination by Regional Board staff to require project proponents to conduct an investigation of the cumulative impacts of the individual systems has been on a case-by-case basis. Staff considers factors such as the location of proposed project, the number of proposed lots, and the density of the development. However, without written review criteria, staff decisions requiring project proponents to conduct further investigations has been inconsistent.

GUIDELINES FOR NEW COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL SEWERAGE FACILITIES

Background

The Regional Board adopted *Guidelines for New Community and Individual Sewerage Facilities* (Resolution No. 79-44) on June 25, 1979. By the mid-1980s, the Regional Board recognized the need to update the 1979 guidelines to simplify the regulatory process by providing local agencies with the necessary review criteria for addressing cumulative impacts from individual systems. Those projects complying with the criteria would not be directly subject to the Regional Board regulatory process.


As part of the Clean Water Act section 205(j) Basin Plan update project, the Regional Board contracted a study to review the portion of the 1979 guidelines pertaining to subsurface disposal and to recommend any changes that would result in a more effective and efficient regulatory program. The contractor was directed to conduct file research and literature review regarding the impacts of subsurface disposal on ground water quality and to interview the staff of responsible regulatory agencies in San Diego, Riverside, and Orange Counties to incorporate their concerns and recommendations into a revised set of subsurface disposal guidelines. A report, entitled "*Review Of Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Policy, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board*" discusses phosphates, nitrate contamination, sources of nitrates in the ground water, reasons for septic systems failure, local and regional water table rises, and the implications of regulatory restrictions.

The report recommends that:

- The Regional Board should delegate the authority for review and approval of all septic systems and seepage pits to appropriate county regulatory agencies, eliminating the duplicative review function of the board staff.
- Effort currently directed toward review of subsurface disposal applications should be redirected to investigation of basin-specific limitations on subsurface disposal. These studies should be undertaken in cooperation with county regulatory agencies.
- The Regional Board should establish guidelines for the county regulatory agencies at the time that authority for review is delegated. These guidelines should:
 - ✓ Specify a continuation of existing design criteria for leachline length, spacing, setback, and slope requirements.
 - ✓ Increase minimum unsaturated soil thickness below the leachlines to 9 feet for soils with good percolation rates, 12 feet for moderate percolation rates, and 14 feet for soils with poor percolation rates for individual systems.
 - ✓ Require hydrogeological studies in areas of imported domestic water if the minimum lot size is not met, or if significant downslope accumulation of effluent is likely, or if septic systems discharge to a basin with restricted outflow.
 - ✓ Restrict septic system densities to those indicated in Figure 4-1 in those areas where ground water is a significant source of drinking water.

The policy described below update and supersedes Resolution No. 79-44. The policy incorporated current practice and conclusion based upon the above recommendations to improve the efficiency of the review process, to eliminate unnecessary Regional Board regulation, and to improve protection of ground water quality.

Figure 4-1. Required Recharge Rates to Maintain 10 mg/l N Nitrate Standard.



Principles

The following management principles are designed to ensure that the goals of the Basin Plan are implemented:

- Sewerage systems must be designed, constructed, and installed so as to be capable of preventing pollution or contamination of the waters of the State or creating nuisance for the duration of the development.
- Sewerage systems must be operated, maintained and monitored so as to continually prevent pollution or contamination of the waters of the State and the creation of a nuisance.
- The responsibility for both of the above must be clearly and legally assumed by an entity with the financial and legal capability to assure that the system provides protection to the quality of the waters of the State for the duration of the development.

Purpose

The purpose of the guidelines below is to provide guidance to proponents of projects involving new discharges of wastes from community or individual sewerage facilities. However, the Regional Board may exercise discretion and approve exceptions to these guidelines if it is demonstrated that conformance with the above principles will be achieved. The Regional Board recognizes that there are certain actions which are best undertaken by local governments to minimize the potential water quality problems resulting from new community and individual sewerage systems. The guidelines are based on the assumption that it is desirable that city and county governments:

- Prohibit the use of new community and individual sewerage systems where existing community sewerage systems are reasonably available. The determination of whether or not existing systems are reasonably available should be the responsibility of the local agency or agencies having jurisdiction over the project.
- Prohibit the use of new individual disposal systems for any subdivision of land unless the governing body having jurisdiction

determines that the use of individual disposal systems will be in the best public interest.

- Assure that individual disposal systems are maintained to the satisfaction of the responsible health officer. This could be accomplished through establishment of special maintenance districts, by the amendment of existing ordinances to assure adequate maintenance documented through periodic inspections, or other alternatives as deemed appropriate by the local health officer.
- Consider the cumulative impacts of individual disposal system discharges as a part of the approval process for development.

Community Sewerage Systems

The Regional Board will regulate all discharges of wastes from community sewerage systems. The Regional Board will require a ~~RWD report of waste discharge~~ to be filed for all proposed waste discharges which involve the use of new community sewerage systems. Before the Board will consider the ~~RWD report of waste discharge~~ to be complete, the following requirements must be met:

- A public entity must assume legal authority and responsibility for the ownership, operation, and maintenance of the proposed wastewater treatment and disposal system. The ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ must be submitted by the public entity.
- The ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ must include the following:
 - ✓ A final Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration covering the total project, unless categorically exempt, prepared and approved by the local lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended) and Chapter 3, Division 6, Title 14, of the ~~CCR California Code of Regulations~~ (as amended). In the approval process the Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration must be circulated through the State Clearinghouse; and
 - ✓ Operation, maintenance, revenue and contingency plans for the wastewater

treatment and disposal facilities or a commitment by the public entity to prepare such plans and submit them to the Regional Board at least 60 days prior to the initiation of discharge.

In the absence of a satisfactory ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~, the discharge will be prohibited.

Individual Sewerage Systems

Projects Involving Five Family Units or Less - Conventional Septic Tank/Subsurface Disposal

When individual sewerage systems consisting of conventional septic tanks and leach fields or seepage pits would be provided to serve each dwelling for projects of five family units or less, or to serve to dispose domestic waste from commercial or industrial projects with a design flow of equal to or less than 1,200 gallons per day, the Regional Board will defer the authority to regulate the discharge of domestic wastes to the appropriate county health officer.

Projects Involving More Than Five Family Units - Conventional Septic Tank/Subsurface Disposal

The above deferral of authority to the appropriate county health officer to regulate the discharge of domestic wastes will also apply when individual sewerage systems consisting of conventional septic tanks and leach fields or seepage pits would be provided to: (1) serve dwellings involving more than five family units in a single appropriate county health officers that the following conditions are met:

- The use of new individual subsurface disposal systems for any subdivision of land will be in the best public interest; and
- Individual disposal systems will comply with all existing county design criteria including but not limited to percolation testing, minimum required leachline length, leachline spacing, setback and slope requirements; and
- Individual disposal systems will meet the minimum unsaturated soil thickness between the bottom of leachlines or the bottom of seepage pits and the historic high ground water level. The minimum unsaturated soil thickness is 9 ft for soils with good percolation rates [less than 15 minutes

per inch (mpi)], or 12 ft for soils with moderate percolation rates (15 to 40 mpi), or 14 ft for soils with poor percolation rates (greater than 40 mpi). However, exceptions to the unsaturated soil thickness criteria may be allowed by the appropriate county health officer, based upon knowledge of local site conditions; and

- The cumulative impact from proposed individual disposal system(s) or from new commercial and/or industrial development(s) will not cause adverse impacts to the beneficial uses of ground water.

If it is determined that the discharge could cause a significant water quality problem, then a ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ must be filed with the Regional Board and waste discharge requirements must be obtained prior to final subdivision map recording.

For any discharge of industrial wastes a ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ must be filed with the Regional Board and waste discharge requirements must be obtained prior to recording of the final map and/or issuance of a building permit.

Alternative Systems

When an ~~evapotranspiration (ET)~~, or an ~~evapotranspiration/infiltration (ETI)~~, or a mound system is proposed to serve a single residential project, Regional Board defers regulation of the discharge to the appropriate county health officers provided that the project proponents

_demonstrate to the satisfaction of appropriate county health officers that the following conditions are met:

- ET, or ETI, or mound systems will comply with all conditions for conventional subsurface disposal systems as noted above; and
- The design, construction, and installation of an ET or ETI system will comply with the criteria approved by this Regional Board Resolution No. 80-84 and the criteria contained in the State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board, *Guidelines for Evapotranspiration Systems* dated January 1980. The design, construction, and installation of mound systems will comply with criteria contained in the State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board, *Guidelines for Mound Systems* dated January 1980; and
- The ET, or ETI, or mound systems will be for domestic waste only; and
- The ET, or ETI, or mound systems will be used for single family dwelling on a single lot which has previously undergone a proper satisfactory CEQA process; and
- The ET, or ETI, or mound systems will not be used as a waste discharge method for new subdivisions; and
- The ET, or ETI, or mound systems will not be used as a group collection system; and
- The ET, or ETI, or mound systems is considered experimental, and will be monitored for at least three years.

As the counties develop and adopt standards for alternative systems, the Regional Board may, in the future, defer regulation of additional types of individual sewerage systems to the appropriate county health officer in much the same manner as is now done for conventional septic tank/subsurface disposal systems.

Report of Waste Discharge Submission

The Regional Board will review specific proposals not meeting the above criteria at the request of the appropriate county authority. For such proposals, a ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ must be filed with the Regional Board and

~~WDRs waste discharge requirements~~ must be obtained or waived by the Regional Board prior to recordation of the final map and/or issuance of a building permit. Before the Regional Board considers the ~~RWD Report of Waste Discharge~~ to be complete, the following technical information must be submitted:

- A hydrogeologic study which will, using accepted ground water hydrologic techniques and practices, assess the probable rise in the water table associated with the project, including effects of septic system recharge, landscape irrigation, and ground water pumpage. The study will additionally address the impact of the projected water table rise or fall on the operation of new and existing septic systems.
- A nitrate study which will, using an acceptable mass balance method, demonstrate that the proposed project will not cause the basin plan objective for nitrate to be exceeded.

In addition to the technical information submitted, the following conditions must be met:

- In most instances a public entity must assume legal authority and responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the proposed individual wastewater treatment and disposal systems;
- In some instances, such as commercial/industrial establishments, or projects involving only a single homesite, or special extenuating circumstances, the public entity condition may be set aside;
- A final Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration must be included covering the total project, unless categorically exempt, prepared and approved by the local lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (as amended) and Chapter 3, Division 6, Title 14, of the California Administrative Code (as amended). In the approval process the Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration must be circulated through the State Clearinghouse;
- Operation, maintenance, revenue, and contingency plans must be submitted for the wastewater treatment and disposal facilities

or a commitment must be made by the public entity to prepare such plans and submit them to the Regional Board at least 60 days prior to the initiation of discharge; and

- In the absence of a satisfactory Report of Waste Discharge, the discharge will be prohibited without prejudice.

WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE

Water reclamation is a process consisting of the following elements:

- Treatment of wastewater to a level of quality suitable for reuse;
- Transportation of reclaimed water to reuse areas; and
- Application of reclaimed water to an actual use.

Reclaimed water use typically falls into the following seven broad categories:

- Agricultural irrigation;
- Landscape irrigation (including highway landscape and golf courses);
- Impoundments for landscape, recreational or wildlife uses, wetland and wildlife enhancement;
- Industrial and Construction processes (e.g., cooling water, process water, washdown water or for dust control);
- Ground water recharge.
- Flushing of toilet and urinals in non-residential buildings; and
- Stream enhancement.

The State of California has a strong interest in promoting the conservation and efficient use of water through water reclamation. The California Constitution, Article X, section 2 provides that:

"...Water resources of the state be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that waste or unreasonable use of water be prevented, and that conservation of such waters is to be exercised with a view to the reasonable and beneficial use thereof in the interest of the people and for the public welfare..."

The State interest in the conservation and efficient use of its waters is further emphasized by ~~California~~ Water Code section 13510 which deals specifically with water reclamation. Section 13510 provides that:

"It is hereby declared that the people of the state have a primary interest in the development of facilities to reclaim water containing waste to supplement existing surface water and underground water supplies and to assist in meeting the future water requirements of the state."

In addition, ~~California~~ Water Code section 13241 provides that the Regional Board consider the need to develop and use reclaimed water when establishing water quality objectives.

The State Board adopted the "*Policy with Respect to Water Reclamation In California*" and the related "*Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California*" in 1977 (State Board Resolution No. 77-1). The policy directs the State Board and Regional Boards to encourage reclamation and reuse of water, and to promote water reclamation projects which preserve, restore, or enhance instream beneficial uses. The policy also states that the State and Regional Boards recognize the need to protect public health and the environment in the implementation of reclamation projects.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act also requires the State ~~Department of Health Services~~ (DHS) to establish statewide reclamation criteria (see Table 4-5) for each type of reclaimed water use to protect public health. Any person proposing to discharge reclaimed water must file a report of waste discharge containing appropriate information related to the discharge with the Regional Board. The Regional Board, after consultation with DHS, may adopt

waste discharge requirements for the reclaimed water discharge.

When reviewing potential reclamation projects, the Regional Board must also consider potential impacts from reclamation on ground and surface water quality. It is common for the use of reclaimed water to cause an increase in total dissolved solids concentration in the receiving ground waters due to the effects of evapotranspiration. A variety of techniques can be employed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Where well controlled irrigation is practiced, nitrate problems in the dry season will be controlled. Vegetative uptake will utilize soluble nitrates which could otherwise migrate into ground water. Demineralization techniques or source control of total dissolved solids may be necessary in some inland areas where ground waters have been or may be degraded. Presence of excessive salts, boron, or sodium could be the basis for rejection of proposals to irrigate cropland with effluent.

Table 4 - 5. Permitted Uses and California Title 22 Health Requirements for Reclaimed Water.

Permitted Use of Reclaimed Water	Summary of Title 22 (sections 60303 et. seq.) Health Requirements
Spray irrigation of food crops	Reclaimed water used for spray irrigation of food crops shall be at all times adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, filtered wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process, the median number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 <u>milliliters (ml)</u> in more than one sample within any 30-day period. The median value shall be determined from the bacteriological results of the last <u>7</u> -days for which analyses have been completed.
Surface irrigation of food crops	<p>Reclaimed water used for surface irrigation of food crops shall be at all times an adequately disinfected, oxidized wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process, the median number of coliform organisms does not exceed 2.2 per 100 ml as determined from the bacteriological results of the last <u>7</u>-days for which analyses have been completed.</p> <p>Orchards and vineyards may be surface irrigated with reclaimed water that has the quality at least equivalent to that of primary effluent provided that no fruit is harvested that has come in contact with the irrigating water or the ground. Exceptions to the quality requirements for reclaimed water used for irrigation of food crops may be considered by the State Department of Health on an individual basis where the reclaimed water is to be used to irrigate a food crop which must undergo extensive commercial, physical or chemical processing sufficient to destroy pathogenic agents before it is suitable for human consumption.</p>
Irrigation of fodder, fiber and seed crops	Reclaimed water used for the surface or spray irrigation of fodder, fiber, and seed crops shall have a level of quality no less than that of primary effluent.
Irrigation of pasture for milking animals	Reclaimed water used for the irrigation of pasture to which milking cows or goats have access shall be at all times an adequately disinfected, oxidized wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process the median number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 ml, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last <u>7</u> -days for which analyses have been completed.
Landscape irrigation of golf courses, cemeteries, freeway landscapes and similar areas	Reclaimed water used for the irrigation of golf courses, cemeteries, freeway landscapes, and landscapes in other areas where the public has similar access or exposure shall be at all times adequately disinfected oxidized wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of coliform organisms in the effluent does not exceed 23 per 100 ml as determined from the bacteriological results of the last <u>7</u> -days for which analyses have been completed, and the number of coliform organisms does not exceed 240 per 100 ml in any two consecutive samples.
Permitted Use of Reclaimed Water	Summary of Title 22 (sections 60303 et. seq.) Health Requirements

Table 4 - 5 (continued). Permitted Uses and California Title 22 Health Requirements for Reclaimed Water.

Permitted Use of Reclaimed Water	Summary of Title 22 (sections 60303 et. seq.) Health Requirements
Irrigation of parks, playgrounds, schoolyards and similar areas	Reclaimed water used for irrigation of parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and other areas where the public has similar access or exposure shall be at all times adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, filtered wastewater or a wastewater treated by sequence of unit processes that will assure an equivalent degree of treatment and reliability. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of coliform organisms in the effluent does not exceed 2.2 per 100 ml, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7—days for which analyses have been completed.
Nonrestricted recreational impoundment (no limitations are imposed on body-contact sport activities)	Reclaimed water used as a source of supply in a nonrestricted recreational impoundment —shall be at all times adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, filtered wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process, the median number of coliform organisms in the effluent does not exceed 23 per 100 ml in more than one sample within any 30 day period. The median value shall be determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7—days for which analyses have been completed.
Restricted recreation impoundment (recreation is limited to fishing, boating, and other non-body-contact water recreation activities)	Reclaimed water used as a source of supply in a restricted recreational impoundment shall be at all times an adequately disinfected, oxidized wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process the median number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 ml, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7—days for which analyses have been completed.
Landscape impoundment (aesthetic enjoyment or other function but no body-contact is allowed)	Reclaimed water used as a source of supply in a landscape impoundment shall be at all times an adequately disinfected, oxidized wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if at some location in the treatment process the median number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 ml, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7—days for which analyses have been completed.
Groundwater recharge of domestic water supply aquifers	Recharge water requirements are made on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the water is of such quality that fully protects public health at all times. Factors considered include treatment provided, effluent quality and quantity, spreading operations, soil characteristics, hydrogeology, residence time, receiving water quality and distance to withdrawal.
Other uses (toilet flush, industrial cooling water, process water, seawater intrusion barrier)	User must demonstrate that methods of treatment and reliability features will assure an equal degree of treatment and reliability.

WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

The water supply in the San Diego Region is largely dependent upon water imported from northern California and the Colorado River. Future increases from these sources may be limited due to environmental concerns, contractual agreements, and over all capital costs. In light of the limited possibilities for future water sources, the need to develop water supply alternatives is important. For many water uses, reclaimed water is a viable alternative water supply.

The status of water reclamation projects in the San Diego Region during March 1993 is shown in Table 4-6. For each water reclamation agency and/or facility in the San Diego Region, the table shows the permitted flow in ~~million gallons per day~~ (MGD), the average effluent flow (in MGD), the average effluent flow reused (in MGD), the annual volume reused in million of gallons (MG) and acre-feet (AC-FT), the treatment process and disposal method, the type of use for the reclaimed water, the reclaimed water user and the status of the project. In the San Diego Region, a total of about 175 MGD of reclaimed water flow is permitted. About 16 MGD is reused from an average effluent flow of about 79 MGD. The annual volume reused is about 5,859 MG (18,597 AC-FT).

REGIONAL BOARD ACTION PLAN ON WATER RECLAMATION

The Regional Board supports water reclamation and reuse to the maximum extent feasible to help meet the growing water needs of the Region. It has long been a policy of the Regional Board to encourage and promote water reclamation while taking into consideration the need to protect beneficial uses of surface and ground waters and protect the public health.

On March 24, 1986 the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 86-06 which amended the Basin Plan to include an action plan for water reclamation. The policy described below updates and supercedes Resolution No. 86-06:

(1) The Regional Board will consider special amendments to the Basin Plan to encourage water reclamation.

- (2) The Regional Board will consider comprehensive water quality monitoring programs for confirmation of original hydrogeological predictions, and an accurate measure of adverse ground water quality effects. These monitoring programs will be considered where water reclamation is not expected to result in adverse ground water quality impacts, and where ground water quality impacts are very difficult to predict.
- (3) The Regional Board will consider projects involving stream and lagoon replenishment with reclaimed water where, as a minimum, a water quality management plan would be implemented and conformance with the Department of Health Services wastewater reclamation criteria for nonrestricted recreational use would be achieved.
- (4) The Regional Board will encourage use of ephemeral streams, that are not used for domestic water supply, for the conveyance of reclaimed water for beneficial uses during periods of need.
- (5) The Regional Board will consider the possibilities for the buyout of a beneficial use that is only minimally realized, and that if protected, would stand in the way of a water reclamation project.
- (6) The Regional Board will continue efforts to seek the most recent and accurate environmental and technical information for the purpose of reviewing Basin Plan standards pertaining to the discharge of reclaimed water.
- (7) The Regional Board will require all ocean and inland dischargers, having the potential to produce reclaimed water, to develop water reclamation plans.
- (8) The Regional Board will encourage economic incentives for using reclaimed water, such as rebates by the San Diego County Water Authority and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to water suppliers engaged in water reclamation.

Table 4-6. Water Reclamation Projects as of March 1993.

Name of Agency/ Facility	Hydro- logic	Permit Flow	Average Effluent Flow		Annual Volume Reused		Treatment Process and Disposal	Type of Use	Reclaimed Water User	Status
	Unit		MGD	MGD	Reused MGD	MG				
ORANGE COUNTY										
Joplin Youth Center	1.20	0.0075	0.0067	0.0067	2.45	7.50	AS, PB	Landscape Irrigation, Groundwater Recharge		Operating
San Clemente, City of San Clemente WRP	1.20 1.30	7.00	3.996	0.610	222.65	683.28	AS, PB, CH, SF, OF	Golf Course Irrigation, Construction	Municipal GC, Arvida Co, Talega, Pacific GC	Operating
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY RECLAMATION AUTHORITY SERVICE AREA										
El Toro WD	1.13	5.50	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	AS, OF	Landscape Irrigation		Proposed
Los Alisos WD	1.13	5.50	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	AS, OF	Landscape Irrigation		Proposed
Moulton Niguel WD Plant 3A STP	1.20	2.40	0.484	0.484	176.66	542.15	AS, CH	Golf Course & Landscape Irrigation	Mission Viejo Country Club	Operating
Laguna Niguel (AWMA/MNWD) Joint Regional WRF	1.13 1.14	12.00	5.191	0.278	100.67	308.93	AS, F, CL, OF	Landscape Irrigation	El Niguel Country Club	Operating
Santa Margarita WD Oso Creek STP	1.13 1.20	3.00	1.693	1.693	617.95	1896.39	AT, F, CH, Of	Landscape Irrigation	Oso Valley Asn. CALTRANS	Operating
Nicholls Institute	1.20	0.04	0.032	0.025	9.13	28.00		Property landscaping	Nichols Inst.	Operating
Chiquita WRF	1.20 1.30	3.50	2.103	0.016	5.92	18.18	CH,F	Nursery, Construction, Dust Control	SeaTree Nursery Los Flores Dev. Desecha Landfill	Operating
South Coast County WD	1.12 1.13 1.14	2.61	0.738	0.738	269.19	826.10	AS, F, CH, OF	Irrigation of parks, greenbelt, golf course	AVCO Community De Ben Brown GC Orange County Parks	Operating
Trabuco Canyon WD Trabuco WRP	1.13 1.20	0.25	0.459	0.561	204.77	628.40	OD, F, CH, PB	Golf Course Irrigation	Dove Canyon GC	Operating
RIVERSIDE COUNTY										
Eastern Municipal WD Rancho Calif. STP	2.51	5.00	4.800	1.210	441.65	1355.4	AS, PB	Irrigation Sod Farm	Ralph Daily Sod Farm	Operating
Rancho California WD Joaquin Ranch STP	2.31	0.60	0.575	0.376	137.24	421.2	OD, F, CH, PB	Golf Course Irrigation	Bear Creek Golf Course	Operating
Santa Rosa SBR WRF	2.51	1.00	0.345	0.345	125.93	386.4	F, CH	Groundwater Recharge		Operating

TREATMENT PROCESS: AQ=aquaculture, AS=activated sludge, CH=chlorination, EA=extended aeration, F=filtration, MS=microscreen, OD=oxidation ditch, OF=ocean outfall, OP=oxidation pond, PB=percolation pond or bed, PS=primary sedimentation, RBC=rotating biological contactor, RO=reverse osmosis, TF=trickling filter

Table 4-6 (continued). Water Reclamation Projects as of March 1993

Name of Agency/ Facility	Hydro- logic	Permit Flow MGD	Average Effluent Flow		Annual Volume Reused		Treatment Process and Disposal	Type of Use	Reclaimed Water User	Status
	Unit		MGD	Reused MGD	MG	AC- FT				
SAN DIEGO COUNTY										
Buena Sanitation Dist. Shadow Ridge WRP	4.32	1.10	0.809	0.062	22.63	69.4	MS, RBC, F, RO, CH, OF	Irrigation	Shadow Ridge Golf Course	Operating
Encina	4.40	22.50	19.000	0.001	0.37	1.1	AS, CH, OP	Landscape Irrigation	Caltrans	Operating
Escondido WRP	4.52 5.21	5.00	0.003	0.003	1.10	3.4	AS, CH	Internal Use, Landscape Irrigation, Golf Course	Escondido San Marcos	Operating
Fairbanks Ranch WRP	5.12	0.28	0.180	0.180	65.70	201.6	EA, PB	Groundwater Recharge		Operating
Fallbrook WD Plants 1 & 2	2.13	3.10	1.720	0.160	58.40	179.2	PS, EA, CH, OF	Landscape Irrigation (I-5 Freeway)	Caltrans Nurseries	Operating
4-S Ranch 4-S Ranch WRP	9.31	0.60	0.062	0.038	13.69	42.0	CH	Compaction Irrigation	Construction Pasture	Operating
Leucadia Water Dist. F.R. Gafner WRF	4.51	0.75	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0	TF, PS, CH, OF	Aviara and La Costa Country Club Irrigation	La Costa & Aviara Country Clubs	Operating
Oceanside, City of N. San Luis Rey STP	3.12	10.50	8.700	0.020	7.30	22.4	AS, CL, OF, PB	Golf Course Irrigation, Groundwater Recharge	Oceanside Golf Course	Operating
La Salina	4.10	0.50	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	EA, AS, CH	Landscape Irrigation	Oceanside	Operating
Otay Municipal WD Ralph W Chapman WRF	9.21	1.30	0.900	0.900	328.50	1008.1	EA, F, RO, CH, OF	Landscape Irrigation	Eastlake Development	Operating
Otay Estates Hidden Valley Estates	9.11	0.15	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0	AS, CH	Landscape Irrigation		Operating
Padre Dam Municipal WD Water Reclamation PI	7.12	1.00	0.521	0.521	190.17	583.6	AS, PS, OP, CH, OF	Recreational Lakes & Park Irrigation	Santee Lakes	Operating
Pauma Valley	4.63	0.00	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0	EA, CH	Groundwater Recharge		Proposed
Ramona Municipal WD Santa Maria WWTP	5.41	1.00	0.600	0.600	219.00	672.1	EA, PB	Irrigation, Pasture Groundwater Recharge	Ramona WD site	Operating
San Vicente STP	7.23	0.60	0.541	0.541	197.47	606.0	OD, CH, F, RO, PB	Avocado Grove Irrig. Groundwater Recharge	Solk Ranch	Operating
Rancho Santa Fe	4.61	0.45	0.220	0.220	80.30	246.4	AS, EA, CH, PB	Golf Course Irrigation	Rancho Santa Fe Golf Course	Operating
San Diego, County of Descanso STP	9.31	0.04	0.026	0.026	9.56	29.3	AS, PB	Landscape Irrigation	Descanso Facil.	Operating
Julian	7.43	0.04	0.035	0.035	12.78	39.20	OP	Irrigation (cattle feed)		Operating
Mount Woodson SD	5.11	0.08	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0	CH	Irrigation	Golf Course	Operating
Rancho Cielo SD	5.11	0.20	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0		Landscape Irrigation		Operating
Whispering Palms CSD	5.11	0.40	0.175	0.175	63.88	196.0	EA, CH, PB	Ground Water Recharge	Del Rayo Prop.	Operating
San Diego, City of Water Utilities Dept San Pasqual WAP STP	5.31	1.00	0.0190	0.0190	6.94	21.3	AS, CH, PB	Irrigation & Animal Stock Watering	Wild Animal Park	Operating

TREATMENT PROCESS: AQ=aquaculture, AS=activated sludge, CH=chlorination, EA=extended aeration, F=filtration, MS=microscreen, OD=oxidation ditch, OF=ocean outfall, OP=oxidation pond, PB=percolation pond or bed, PS=primary sedimentation, RBC=rotating biological contactor, RO=reverse osmosis, TF=trickling filter

Name of Agency/ Facility	Hydro- logic	Permit Flow MGD	Average Effluent Flow		Annual Volume Reused		Treatment Process and Disposal	Type of Use	Reclaimed Water User	Status
	Unit		MGD	Reused MGD	MG	AC- FT				
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CONTINUED										
Mission Valley Pilot Aquaculture Project	7.11	1.00	0.026	0.025	9.13	28.0	AQ, QF	Freeway Landscaping (I-15 & I-8)	Caltrans	Operating
North City	6.10	30.00	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0		Landscape Irrigation	Caltrans	Operating
San Elijo JPA	4.51	3.68	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.0	CH, AS	Landscape Irrigation	Encinitas, Del Mar	Operating
US Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton										
Plant No. 1	2.13	1.50	0.429	0.687	247.54	759.7	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 2	2.11	0.92	0.309	0.694	253.13	776.8	TF, CH, PB	Golf Course Irrigation	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 3	2.12	1.10	0.492	0.753	274.66	842.9	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 8	1.51	0.59	0.074	0.296	107.86	331.0	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 9	1.52	1.10	0.142	0.357	130.34	400.0	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 10	1.51	0.85	0.325	0.378	138.08	423.7	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 11	1.51	0.85	0.836	1.088	397.01	1218.4	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No.12	1.40	0.85	0.142	0.420	153.37	470.7	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 13	2.11	2.50	1.397	1.225	447.16	1372.3	TF, CH, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Plant No. 16	1.53	0.03	0.008	0.008	2.74	8.4	EA, PB	Groundwater Recharge	Camp Pendleton	Operating
Vallecitos WD Meadowlark WRP	4.51	2.00	0.995	0.525	191.63	588.1	MS, RBC, F, CH, OF	Golf Course Irrigation	La Costa GC Carlsbad City	Operating
Valley Center MWD Lower Moosa Canyon WRP	3.13	0.50	0.250	0.250	91.25	280.0	AS, CH, PB	Golf Course Irrigation Groundwater Recharge	Circle R GC Valley Center MWD	Operating

TREATMENT PROCESS: AQ=aquaculture, AS=activated sludge, CH=chlorination, EA=extended aeration, F=filtration, MS=microscreen, OD=oxidation ditch, OF=ocean outfall, OP=oxidation pond, PB=percolation pond or bed, PS=primary sedimentation, RBC=rotating biological contactor, RO=reverse osmosis, TF=trickling filter

Summary of San Diego Region Water Reclamation Projects as of March 1993

COUNTY SUBTOTALS	PERMIT FLOW	AVERAGE EFFLUENT FLOW		ANNUAL VOLUME REUSED	
	(MGD)	GENERATED (MGD)	REUSED (MGD)	(MG)	(AC-FT)
Orange	41.81	14.70	4.41	1,609.37	4,938.94
Riverside	35.20	25.532	1.997	728.91	2,236.9
San Diego	98.05	38.94	10.20	3,721.65	11,421.24
REGION TOTALS	175.06	79.171	16.603	6,059.9	18,597

- (9) The Regional Board will seek funding for studies to evaluate the potential of water reclamation in various areas of the Region including streams and coastal lagoons.
- (10) The Regional Board will take appropriate actions, recommend legislation, and recommend actions by other planning agencies (county, federal, etc.) in the areas of (1) planning, (2) project funding, (3) regulation and enforcement, (4) research and demonstration, and (5) public involvement and information.
- (11) The Regional Board will encourage and support measures which conserve the water resources of the San Diego Region.
- (12) The Regional Board will encourage other agencies to assist in implementing this policy.
- (13) As mitigation against potential nuisance odors and health hazards resulting from reclaimed water use, the Regional Board will continue to adopt and enforce waste discharge requirements containing prohibitions against nuisance odors and implementing the State ~~DHS Department of Health Services'~~ Wastewater Reclamation Criteria.
- (14) The Regional Board will prepare Basin Plan amendments necessary for implementation of water reclamation projects in compliance with state policy for water quality control and, to the extent surface waters will be affected, with Environmental Protection Agency water quality standards regulations. Site specific environmental impacts will be evaluated in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for specific Basin Plan amendments.

FACTORING WATER SUPPLY CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE REGIONAL BOARD REGULATION OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Conventional reclamation facilities are not designed to reduce mineral constituents. Consequently, the mineral effluent quality is dependent on the composition of the water supply plus the mineral pickup during its use. Historically, water supply ~~Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)~~ concentrations have varied significantly. For example, concentrations of TDS of the blended water stored in Lake Skinner ranged from below 400 milligrams per liter (mg/l) to above 700 mg/l between 1985 and 1995.

Residential wastewater discharges will typically be 250 to 300 mg/l higher in TDS than their water supply source. Self-regenerating water softeners, brine from industrial dischargers, and ground water infiltration can further increase TDS concentrations in wastewater effluent. Many wastewater management agencies within the region are implementing programs to minimize the incremental pickup of minerals from these sources. These programs have had varying degrees of success.

Effective water conservation measures that are being implemented within the region may result in higher mineral and other constituent concentrations in wastewater effluent. Although the volume of wastewater is reduced by water conservation, the mineral and organic loading from its use remains nearly constant. As a result, the strength of the wastewater influent becomes stronger. In some cases, the characteristics of the wastewater influent may range briefly above the design parameters of the treatment plant.

In recognition of the variables in wastewater quality that are beyond the control of the discharger, the Regional Board authorizes the Executive Officer to suspend formal enforcement action, when a discharger submits an initial technical report with subsequent quarterly updates, that demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer, compliance with the following conditions:

1. The discharge is not subject to regulation by means of a ~~National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)~~ Permit; and
2. The enforcement action is only for violations of discharge specifications for mineral constituents, total suspended solids (TSS), biological oxygen demand (BOD) or

carbonaceous biological oxygen demand (CBOD); and

3. The effluent violations are due solely to changes in the quality of the imported water supply and/or to water conservation measures being implemented within the service area tributary to the treatment plant; and
4. The discharge does not result in a mass loading of TSS, BOD and CBOD that exceeds the loading prior to implementation of water conservation measures; and
5. The discharge will not cause Basin Plan water quality objectives to be exceeded, in the long term; and
6. The discharge will not cause a violation of any applicable section from Title 22 of the ~~CCR California Code of Regulations~~ or any requirement specified by either the State ~~DHS Department of Health Services~~ or the appropriate county health officer for the protection of public health; and
7. The discharge does not contain a concentration of ~~total dissolved solids (TDS)~~ exceeding 1,500 ~~milligrams per liter (mg/l)~~, or the concentration in the water supply plus 500 mg/l, whichever is less, with comparable adjustments for other mineral constituents; and
8. The discharger implements a program to identify major sources of the mineral constituents of concern in the discharge, including but not limited to water softener regeneration brine; and to determine the average contribution of each major source and the best available options for reducing levels in the discharge; and to identify any negative effects on the potential for water reclamation caused by the failure to control the constituents of concern in the discharge. The program should include a time schedule to reduce mineral constituents in the discharge as necessary to assure that the potential for water reclamation will be realized to the maximum extent practicable.

RECLAIMED WATER CONFORMANCE WITH WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

The Regional Board has established various policies concerning the compliance of reclaimed water discharges with applicable Basin Plan water quality objectives. These policies are described below:

DISCHARGES TO COASTAL LAGOONS FROM PILOT WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Regional Board may grant an exception to the "*Biostimulatory Substances*" water quality objective described in Chapter 3 to provide for discharges to coastal lagoons from pilot water reclamation projects. The project proponent must demonstrate that the pilot water reclamation project is consistent with the conditions described in the *Principles of the State Water Resources Control Board's Policy and Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California*. The *Policy and Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California* was adopted by the State Board in January 1977 and is summarized below. In addition, the proponent must demonstrate that the threat of eutrophication as a result of the addition of nitrogen and/or phosphorus is reduced as a consequence of one or more of the following factors:

- Waters of the coastal lagoon are highly laden with natural silts or colors which reduce the penetration of sunlight needed for photosynthesis;
- The coastal lagoon is characterized by morphometric features of steep banks, great depths, and substantial flows which have contributed to a history of no plant problems;
- The coastal lagoon is managed primarily for waterfowl or other wildlife;
- An identified element other than nitrogen or phosphorus is limiting to plant growth in the coastal lagoon, and the level and nature of the limiting element would not be expected to increase to an extent that would influence eutrophication; or

- Control of nitrogen and/or phosphorus in the coastal lagoon cannot be sufficiently effective under present technology to make phosphorus or nitrogen the limiting nutrient.

The Principles of the *Policy and Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California* provide, in part, that water reclamation projects shall be encouraged which do not adversely impact vested water rights or unreasonably impair instream beneficial uses or place an unreasonable burden on present water supply systems, and which meet the following additional conditions:

- Beneficial use will be made of wastewaters that would otherwise be discharged to marine or brackish receiving waters or evaporation ponds;
- Reclaimed water will replace or supplement the use of fresh water or better quality water; or
- Reclaimed water will be used to preserve, restore, or enhance instream beneficial uses which include, but are not limited to, fish, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetics associated with any surface water or wetlands.

Exceptions to the numerical water quality objectives will be made only when a pilot reclamation project meets the following criteria:

- Need for the reclaimed water is demonstrated;
- Alternative disposal facilities are available in the event discharge to a coastal lagoon proves unfeasible;
- Conformance with the State—~~Water Resources—Control~~ Board's *Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* is demonstrated;
- Data will be generated that will be useful and timely for Regional Board review of water quality objectives for nutrients; and
- The project will include a lagoon management plan addressing the proposed methods of identifying and eliminating any pollution, contamination, or nuisance problems resulting from the proposed discharge and clearly identifying management responsibilities and capabilities.

DISCHARGES TO INLAND SURFACE WATERS

Regional Board Resolutions Nos. 90-53 and 91-23 established an alternate method of conformance with the biostimulatory substances water quality objectives for portions of the San Diego River and Santa Margarita River. The Policy presented below supersedes Resolutions Nos. 90-53 and 91-23 and is applicable to all inland surface waters of the San Diego Region at a point downstream of lakes or reservoirs used for municipal water supply.

The Regional Board has developed an alternate method of showing compliance with the biostimulatory substances water quality objective contained in Chapter 3 to:

- Promote water reclamation;
- Enhance opportunities for reclaimed water discharges to inland surface waters; and
- Protect and enhance existing inland surface water beneficial uses through the greater use of reclaimed water.

The alternate method of compliance described below is applicable to reclaimed water discharges to inland surface waters at a point downstream of lakes or reservoirs used for municipal water supply. The alternate method of compliance is meant to encourage reclaimed water discharges into inland surface waters without degradation of the ambient water quality or adverse effects on beneficial uses.

Compliance Methods

The Regional Board will establish appropriate effluent limitations for nitrogen and phosphorus in waste discharge requirements for discharges of reclaimed water to surface waters using one of the following methodologies:

The Regional Board may use the goal for phosphorus concentration in flowing water contained in the Biostimulatory Substances objective as guidance in establishing appropriate effluent limitations; or

-
- Alternatively, the Regional Board may determine compliance with the narrative

objective based upon the following four factors:

- ✓ measurement of ambient concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus;
- ✓ the dissolved oxygen requirements of downstream beneficial uses;
- ✓ use of best available technology (BAT) economically feasible for the removal of nutrients; and
- ✓ the development and implementation of a watercourse monitoring and management plan.

Best available technology for the removal of nutrients includes biological and chemical removal. The extent to which the Regional Board may require additional removal of nutrients through chemical addition processes will be based upon an evaluation of the economic feasibility of this additional treatment in concert with an evaluation of the effectiveness of the watercourse monitoring management plan.

The watercourse monitoring and management plan shall include:

- A comprehensive program for chemical monitoring in receiving waters and effluent that will generate adequate data on ammonia nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, nitrite nitrogen, organic nitrogen, total phosphate, ortho phosphate, dissolved oxygen (including vertical and diurnal dissolved oxygen profiles), pH, turbidity, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and other appropriate constituents and properties which may contribute to, or result from, nutrient related problems and impact beneficial uses.
- A comprehensive program for physical and biological monitoring in the receiving waters that will generate adequate data on chlorophyll 'a', corrected chlorophyll 'a', pheophyton 'a'; temperature (including diurnal and vertical temperature profiles); acute and chronic toxicity; the diversity and numbers of microinvertebrates, macroinvertebrates, and fish; the dynamics of the aquatic flora (macroalgae, phytoplankton, and emergent vegetation) and the related dissolved oxygen regime; substrate composition; frequency of nuisance

conditions; flow rate; and other appropriate constituents and properties which may contribute to nutrient related problems and impact beneficial uses.

- A comprehensive program for physical and biological monitoring of the effluent that will generate adequate data on flow, temperature, chronic and acute toxicity, and other appropriate constituents which may contribute to nutrient related problems and impact beneficial uses.
- A procedure for evaluating the data collected under items (1), (2), and (3) above and determining the potential for nutrient related problems that may impact beneficial uses.
- Development and implementation of preventive and corrective actions that will ensure that a discharge containing nutrients will not adversely impact beneficial uses. These preventative and corrective actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - ✓ Achievement of more stringent effluent limits for nutrient constituents discharged to the watercourse, through additional chemical treatment methods at the treatment facility, to further reduce nutrient loading to the river,
 - ✓ Maintenance of minimum reclaimed water flows discharged to the watercourse to prevent stagnant areas subject to nutrient related problems and to maintain the aquatic and riparian habitat beneficial uses that have been enhanced and/or created by such a discharge,
 - ✓ Effective measures for the instream chemical treatment of surface waters to prevent nutrient and stagnant water related nuisance problems that can adversely impact aquatic habitat beneficial uses, where this instream treatment will not adversely impact beneficial uses,
 - ✓ Effective measures for the physical management of the watercourse channel and vegetation,

- ✓ Effective source control measures to reduce the amount of nutrient constituents in the reclaimed water, and
- ✓ Other measures deemed appropriate and necessary by the Regional Board to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan narrative objective for nutrients and for the protection of beneficial uses.

Additional Mitigation

As mitigation against adverse impacts of nuisance odors and health hazards resulting from use of reclaimed water, the Regional Board will continue to adopt and enforce waste discharge requirements containing prohibitions against creation of nuisance odors and implementing the State ~~DHS Department of Health Services~~ Water Reclamation Criteria.

Additionally, as mitigation measures against degradation of ground and surface water quality resulting from an inland reclaimed water discharge, the Regional Board will require well head treatment or treatment at the point of use, or other appropriate measures acceptable to the Board, adequate to maintain the existing quality of ground and surface waters and the beneficial uses for all ground and surface waters adversely impacted by a discharge. The Regional Board will require monitoring of all ground water wells and legal direct diversions of surface water prior to permitting a discharge in order to establish the baseline quality that must be maintained.

As mitigation against any adverse effects to instream or downstream surface or ground water quality and the environment resulting from the discharge of reclaimed water, the Regional Board will require the discharger to establish and implement a comprehensive river monitoring and management program. The implementation of the watercourse monitoring and management plan will often require close coordination between many different public and private entities. The Regional Board shall recognize an agency to implement the watercourse monitoring and

management plan and such recognition shall be made part of the provisions of appropriate waste discharge requirements for the discharge.

The watercourse monitoring and management plan, and all the associated requirements, shall apply to all downstream waters, including rivers, lagoons, estuaries, and bays, which may be impacted by the reclaimed water discharge. The Regional Board will regulate the volume of reclaimed water discharged into all inland surface waters to those levels which do not significantly and adversely alter the salinity regimes of downstream lagoons, estuaries, or bays. This regulation of flows will include a prohibition of fresh water flows that could result in the conversion of a lagoon, estuary, or bay from a saline environment to a fresh water environment. Salt marsh habitats are to be considered an integral part of the lagoon, estuary, or bay to which they are associated, and therefore shall be fully protected from conversion.

Implementation of Ground Water Quality Objectives for Reclaimed Water Discharges

In order to facilitate water reclamation in the Region, the Regional Board, adopted Resolution No. 90-61 on November 5, 1990. Resolution No. 90-61 established a methodology for determining reclaimed water effluent limits. The policy described below updates and supersedes Resolution No. 90-61.

The Regional Board shall regulate discharges of reclaimed water by establishing effluent limitations designed to protect beneficial uses and ensure compliance with State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board Resolution No. 68-16. Use of adequately treated reclaimed water for irrigation or ground water recharge shall be encouraged in basins where reuse is clearly beneficial. Regulation of discharges of reclaimed water, where the reclaimed water displaces the use of imported water, or ground water having a quality exceeding the ground water quality objective, shall be in the following manner:

- For discharges upgradient of municipal water supply reservoirs the Regional Board shall adopt numerical effluent limitations for constituents at levels no lower than the quality of the basin's water supply but no higher than the Basin Plan ground water quality objective.

- In ground water basins not upgradient of municipal water supply reservoirs the Regional Board shall adopt numerical effluent limitations for constituents at levels no lower than the quality of the basin's water supply concentration plus an incremental increase equal to the typical incremental increase added to the water supply as a result of domestic use. The effluent limitations shall be no higher than the Basin Plan ground water quality objective.
- For discharges where the discharger has demonstrated sufficient assimilative capacity exists and ground water quality objectives will not be exceeded, the Regional Board may consider adoption of numerical effluent limitations for constituents based on the discharge quality and assimilative capacity analysis results.
- The Regional Board shall also require the implementation of effective salinity source control measures to ensure a reclaimed water quality that is suitable for long-term agricultural and landscape irrigation.

WATER RECLAMATION UNDER RESOLUTION NO. 81-16

On March 23, 1981 the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 81-16 which modified the water quality standards by relaxing the ground water objectives and modifying the beneficial use designations for portions of the Aliso Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) 1.13, Carlsbad HSA 4.21, Agua Hedionda HSA 4.31, Batiquitos HSA 4.51, and Telegraph HSA 9.11. These areas are described in Table 3-3. The terms and conditions of Resolution No. 81-16 are incorporated in this Basin Plan; accordingly Resolution No. 81-16 is superseded. The use of reclaimed water in these areas is subject to the following provisions:

- Notwithstanding the water quality objectives, the Regional Board will regulate waste discharges in the affected portions of Hydrologic Subareas 4.21 and 4.31 in a manner that will protect the waters produced by the existing operating wells. A presently existing ground water use will be considered terminated when the well has been abandoned pursuant to County of San Diego Water Well Standards.

- In applying the modified standards, the Regional Board will condition waste discharge requirements for discharges of domestic and municipal wastewater to require that the wastewater be reclaimed and reused in a manner that will displace the need for approximately equal volumes of imported potable water.

WATER RECLAMATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO OCEAN DISPOSAL

The State Board in Order No. WQ 84-7 concluded that water reclamation should be carefully considered by persons proposing to discharge substantial quantities of once-used wastewater to the ocean particularly in a water short area where water is imported. Order No. WQ 84-7 directs the regional boards to require persons applying for permits to discharge once-used wastewater to the ocean in water-short areas to justify as part of each report of waste discharge why the wastewater is not being reclaimed.

The San Diego Region water supply is primarily imported water and the Region is clearly a water short area. Pursuant to State Board Order No. 84-7, the Regional Board will require persons proposing a discharge of once-used wastewater into the ocean to:

- Carefully analyze as an alternative, or partial alternative, the feasibility of reclaiming the wastewater for a beneficial use in lieu of ocean disposal.
- Submit, with the report of waste discharge in application for waste discharge requirements, sufficient information to justify why any wastewater proposed for discharge to the ocean after a single use is not being reclaimed for a beneficial use.

Reports of waste discharge which do not contain the water reclamation feasibility analysis described above, to the satisfaction of the Regional Board Executive Officer, will be considered incomplete and the Regional Board will not issue waste discharge requirements for the proposed discharge.

RECLAIMED WATER STORAGE REQUIREMENTS

During the winter season, wet weather, and other periods when there is little or no demand, treatment plants continue to operate at normal flows and the excess treated effluent must either be: (1) discharged to storage facilities until such time as the irrigation demand requires the use of the stored water; (2) discharged through a fail-safe land outfall connection to an ocean outfall under the terms of an NPDES permit; or (3) discharged to inland surface waters for ground water recharge and/or stream replenishment under the terms of an NPDES permit. Theoretical water balance calculations for disposal of reclaimed water at golf courses and other reuse sites in the Region indicate that storage facilities should be sized for 84-days of storage. (1975 Comprehensive Water Quality Control Plan Report, Page II-16-32). In situations where reclaimed water storage ponds are necessary, the Regional Board will require reclaimed water producers to:

- Provide 84-days of storage capacity; or
- Provide storage capacity based upon water balance calculation procedures such as described in:

USEPA. 1981. Process Design Manual for Land Treatment of Municipal Wastewater. Center for Environmental Research Information. Cincinnati, OH. EPA 625/1-81-013 (COE EM1110-1-501).

INDUSTRIAL WASTE

PRETREATMENT PROGRAM FOR INDUSTRIES

It is generally recognized that the discharge of industrial pollutants can be controlled most economically at their source. This is particularly true for industries discharging waste to municipal wastewater treatment plants (commonly called "POTWs" for "*publicly owned treatment works*"). On that basis USEPA has developed pretreatment requirements (40 CFR 403) for many industries and has developed minimum standards for POTW pretreatment programs. A POTW is required to implement a pretreatment program as a condition of its ~~National Pollutant Discharge Elimination~~

~~System~~ (NPDES) permit if its design flow is greater than five ~~million gallons per day~~ (MGD) or there are significant industrial users discharging to the POTW. POTWs with design flows less than 5 MGD may also be required to establish a pretreatment program if nondomestic waste causes upsets, sludge contamination, or violations of NPDES permit conditions, or if industrial users are subject to national pretreatment standards.

The goal of the USEPA's National Pretreatment Program is to protect municipal treatment plants and the environment from the adverse impact that may occur when hazardous or toxic wastes are discharged into a sewer system. This protection is achieved mainly by regulating nondomestic users of POTWs that discharge toxic wastes or unusually strong conventional wastes. Local pretreatment programs are required to fulfill the following objectives:

- Prevent the introduction of pollutants into POTWs which will interfere with the operation of a POTW, including interference with its use or disposal of municipal sludge;
- Prevent the introduction of pollutants into POTWs which will pass through the treatment works or otherwise be incompatible with such works;
- Improve opportunities to recycle and reclaim municipal and industrial wastewaters and sludges; and
- Prevent exposure of POTW personnel from chemical hazards and poisonous gases.

The general pretreatment regulations establish industrial pretreatment standards to control industrial pollutant discharges into wastewater collection systems and treatment plants. The discharge standards apply to all industrial and commercial establishments discharging waste to wastewater collection systems tributary to POTWs. The standards prohibit the discharge of pollutants that may damage the POTW's facilities, disrupt operations or expose workers to hazards. Categorical pretreatment standards are numerical effluent limits which apply to industrial and commercial discharges in 25 specific industrial categories determined to be the most significant sources of toxic pollutants. All firms regulated by a particular pretreatment standard are required to comply with these standards.

One hundred and twenty-six toxic pollutants are regulated in the 25 categorical standards. Prohibited discharges into POTW plants, besides toxic substances, include:

- Substances that create a fire or explosion hazard in the plant or sewer system;
- Discharges that are corrosive (have a pH < 5.0);
- Discharges that obstruct flow in the sewer system or interfere with plant operation;
- Discharges that upset the treatment process or cause a violation of the POTW's permit;
- Discharges that increase the temperature of the wastewater entering the treatment plant to above 104° F (40° C);
- Oil based products in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;
- Substances which cause toxic gases, vapors or fumes in a quantity which may cause worker health or safety problem(s); and
- Trucked or hauled pollutants, except at discharge points designated by the POTW.

Municipalities are required to use and enforce these standards as well as locally developed standards, to control nondomestic users discharging to their wastewater collection and treatment systems. The federal regulations require all states that administer NPDES programs to POTW operators to develop local pretreatment programs. The California pretreatment program includes the same general elements which parallel the pretreatment compliance schedule activities specified in most POTWs' NPDES permits. Pretreatment programs are required to contain the following elements:

- Identification and evaluation of the nondomestic discharges to a treatment system.
- The POTW must operate under a legal authority that will enable it to apply and enforce the requirements of pretreatment regulations and other state and local rules needed to control nondomestic discharges.

- The POTW must establish local industrial effluent limits to protect treatment plant operation, receiving water quality and sludge quality.
- The POTW must develop procedures for monitoring its industrial users to determine compliance and non-compliance.
- The POTW must develop administrative procedures to implement its pretreatment program.
- The POTW must have sufficient resources (funds, equipment, personnel) to operate an effective and ongoing program.

STEAM ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS

The Region has five steam electric power plants, four are operated by San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E) and one by Southern California Edison (SCE). Each of the SDG&E plants has one cooling water intake and one outfall structure. A separate NPDES permit has been issued for each SDG&E plant. The SCE plant, called the San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station (SONGS) has three power generating units, each with its own cooling water intake and outfall structure, and a separate NPDES permit has been issued for each of the three power generating units. All of these plants obtain cooling water from the ocean or San Diego Bay.

The SDG&E power plants are conventional fossil-fuel burning electrical generating facilities. The SDG&E plants are located in San Diego County, three of them are adjacent to San Diego Bay and one is adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. The San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean in northern San Diego County and consists of three nuclear fueled electrical generating units.

The cooling water discharges from the power plants are regulated under the provisions of the Thermal Plan, which incorporates provisions of Section 316(a) of the Clean Water Act. All of the plants employ a once-through cooling water system. Seawater is pumped into the facility and used to cool the condensers, which results in an increase in the cooling water temperature of

approximately 20 degrees Fahrenheit above the ambient seawater temperature. The cooling water is then discharged to marine waters, where the heat accumulated in the cooling water is dissipated.

The power plant NPDES permits establish effluent limitations for the discharge of cooling water and other wastes generated at the facilities. The effluent limitations are based upon applicable state water quality objectives and USEPA effluent guidelines and standards for steam electric power plants contained in 40 CFR 423. Each facility has a unique arrangement and thus a unique set of waste streams. Other wastewater discharges regulated by power plant NPDES permits, in addition to the cooling water discharge, include boiler blowdown, evaporator blowdown, floor drain discharges, chemical cleaning wastes and boiler wash.

Each power plant is required under the terms and conditions of its NPDES permit to comply with federal Clean Water Act sections 316(a) and (b). Section 316(a) addresses the control of the thermal component of a discharge and its effects on fish population and wildlife. Section 316(b) requires that the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best available technology for minimizing adverse impacts to the environment.

SUBSURFACE DISPOSAL FROM CAMPGROUNDS AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLE—(RV) PARKS

Since the early 1970's, the Regional Board has been issuing waste discharge requirements to campgrounds and/or recreational vehicle (RV) parks that discharge wastewater to subsurface disposal systems. Chemical preservatives in RV ~~recreational vehicle~~ holding tanks increase the threat to ground water quality from these facilities. At one time, the WDRs ~~waste discharge requirements~~ specified that wastes other than domestic sewage shall be excluded from the discharge. Consequently, the requirements prohibited the discharge of water softener regeneration brine and RV holding tank waste to the septic tank and leach line systems and required the discharger to provide impervious storage tanks for RV holding tank wastes. In order to comply with the WDRs ~~waste~~

~~discharge requirements~~ adopted by the Regional Board prior to 1978, the RV campground managers required RVs to empty their holding tank wastes into the campground's dump station if the RV would be provided with sewer hookups. WDRs ~~Waste Discharge Requirements~~ adopted after 1978 do not require the installation of impervious holding tanks at RV parks nor are RVs required to dispose of RV holding tank wastes to impervious tanks. Currently, most campgrounds and/or RV parks in the Region do not have impervious storage tanks for RV holding tank wastes.

In 1978, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 78-24, suspending all ground water monitoring requirements at the campgrounds until such time as a study by the State Board on RV waste disposal was completed and reviewed by the Regional Board staff. In June 1980, the Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory at University of California, Berkeley published a report for the State Board entitled, "*Recreational Vehicle Waste Disposal in Roadside Rest Septic Tank Systems*". This report however, did not address the requirements for ground water monitoring.

The Regional Board "*Waiver Policy*" described earlier in this Chapter provides for waivers of WDR ~~waste discharge requirement~~ adoption for campgrounds where no facilities are provided for recreational vehicles to connect to the campground sewerage system. Consequently, the Regional Board has deferred to the county health departments regulation of campgrounds and/or RV parks that do not provide sewer connections for recreational vehicles. The policy also waives WDRs ~~Waste Discharge Requirements~~ for residential, commercial, industrial, and individual subsurface disposal systems subject to the conditions set forth in the Guidelines for New Community and Individual Sewerage Facilities described earlier in this Chapter.

A common problem with community systems is that individual property owners and homeowners associations often deny responsibility for system failure and necessary repairs. Additional problems result when private entities operate community systems and do not have sufficient funds available to correct problems. Consequently, prior to approval of projects proposing community subsurface disposal systems, the Regional Board requires as part of the Report of Waste Discharge, documentation

from the proponent that demonstrates that adequate funding is available to operate and maintain the disposal systems.

VESSELS (RECREATIONAL, COMMERCIAL, AND NAVAL) AND MARINAS

Vessels of all types and sizes including recreational, commercial, and Naval craft, and the marinas (or other facilities) in which they berth can have serious impacts on water quality. This section will describe the most important waste categories, pollutants, and other water quality problems associated with vessels and marinas. A description of [BMPs](#)~~best management practices~~ and applicable regulations is also included. Although presented below, it should be noted that vessels and marinas are typically considered a nonpoint source category.



San Diego Bay
sailboat

VESSELS AND MARINAS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

There are approximately 8,400 boat slips in San Diego Bay, 2,400 in Mission Bay, over 1,000 in Oceanside Harbor, and over 1,500 in Dana Point Harbor.— In addition to boats with assigned slips, there are several hundred additional boats moored at a variety of "free" anchorages. In San Diego Bay, the San Diego Unified Port District has organized two of its free anchorages into formal anchorages which have shoreside showers, —rest rooms, and docking facilities. Boat owners are required to pay fees for these services. —In 1986, the San Diego Unified Port District —was granted permission by the Coast Guard to establish additional formal anchorages in San Diego Bay. Because of the reluctance of some boat owners to pay fees for mooring in the bay, many have elected to move their boats to new free anchorages. Such anchorages can be especially important sources of human pathogens from vessel sewage releases. In addition to the vessels normally maintained in the water, there are several thousand additional "trailer" boats using San Diego's boat harbors. In total, approximately 55,000 vessels are registered in San Diego County.

NAVY VESSELS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

Home port to approximately one hundred US Navy vessels, San Diego Bay is one of the largest Naval ports on the west coast of the United States. As described above, Navy vessels are responsible for the same types of water quality impacts as other vessels. They are also subject to the same regulations and requirements as other vessels except that discharges from Naval vessels under certain circumstances are not subject to NPDES permits. A description of this exclusion (as found in Title 40, [CFR Code of Federal Regulations](#), Part 122.3) was discussed earlier in this Chapter.

If enforcement action is necessary, operators of Naval vessels are subject to all of the same enforcement mechanisms outlined previously in this Chapter with one exception; the Navy is not subject to Administrative Civil Liability.

VESSEL WASTES

The most significant waste categories associated with vessels include:

- hull maintenance related wastes;
- sewage;
- marine engine related wastes; and
- trash.

Of these categories, hull maintenance related wastes, and particularly antifouling paint, is believed to pose the greatest potential threat to water quality. This is because of its high degree of toxicity. Antifouling paint, which is applied to vessel hulls, is specifically designed to prevent the growth and attachment of marine organisms by continuously releasing toxic substances into the surrounding water. Cuprous oxide and tributyltin fluoride or tributyltin oxide are the principal toxicants in copper-based and organotin-based paints, respectively. Although the use of TBT is now significantly limited, leaching pollutants from antifouling paints remains a widespread and serious concern especially in areas of high vessel density and low hydrologic flushing.

Antifouling paint may pose an even greater water quality threat during and after its removal from vessel hulls since the pollutants in the paint chip wastes may continue to leach into receiving

waters. In most cases, because paint removal activities on ships are conducted in ship repair yards, responsibility for the paint chip wastes is transferred from the vessel owner to the shipyard. (See shipyards and boatyards discussion). The same is generally true for recreational craft serviced at boatyards. However small craft can also obtain some hull maintenance services directly in the water by underwater hull cleaners. In addition to paint, other examples of hull maintenance wastes include strippers, cleaners, and cathodic protection products. Although a variety of pollutants can be released during hull maintenance activities, metals are the pollutants of greatest concern.

Sewage is often intentionally discharged directly into receiving waters due to the lack of pumpout stations, inconvenience or inoperation of pumpout stations, or the irresponsibility or ignorance of vessel operators. Human pathogens present in sewage include a variety of fecal bacteria and viruses. Today sewage discharges in recreational marinas are believed to be more significant than at Naval berthing areas. This is because all US Navy vessels are currently equipped to connect to pumpout facilities while in port.

Marine engine related wastes such as fuels, oils, lubricants, antifreeze, solvents, and polluted bilge water are commonly released from vessels into receiving waters. The pollutants of greatest concern for marine engine wastes are metals and petroleum hydrocarbons. ~~hydrocarbons~~ (PAHs are a particular concern because they tend to accumulate and persist in aquatic sediments for years, poisoning benthic organisms. Garbage and trash are also discharged from vessels.

Each of the above waste categories can be, and frequently are, washed, spilled, scraped, dumped, and pumped directly into receiving waters. As a result, each of the wastes can take a major toll on water quality and beneficial uses. The marine habitat and shellfish harvesting beneficial uses are particularly sensitive to vessel wastes.

Furthermore each of the waste categories is relevant to all vessel types and sizes including recreational boats as well as commercial and Naval ships. However, because of a ship's greater size and corresponding greater

magnitude, variety, and toxicity of wastes generated, ships (particularly Navy ships) are generally believed to pose a greater threat to water quality than boats. For example, Navy vessels are typically drydocked for hull maintenance only once every five or more years and spend more time in port or at anchor than underway. Fouling organisms attach more readily when a ship is stationary. For these reasons, Navy coating systems are required to be effective for longer periods of time than those applied to commercial and recreational vessels. Accordingly, Navy vessels are blasted to "white metal" meaning all paint is removed to bare metal and the surface is abraded in preparation for adherence of a complete new coating system. Additionally antifouling paints used on Navy vessels contain higher levels of toxicants than those used on commercial and recreational vessels.

Nevertheless, there is a formidable set of water quality impacts associated with small craft and small craft marinas as described below.



Oceanside Harbor
Copyright © 2002-2004 Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman,
California Coastal Records Project www.californiacoastline.org

MARINAS

Marinas and other boat berthing facilities typically have high boat densities and low hydrologic flushing. As a consequence of these characteristics, the following significant water quality problems often result within marinas:

- increased pollutants in the water column;
- decreased dissolved oxygen in the water column;
- increased pollutants in aquatic sediment;
- increased toxicity in the water column and sediments;
- increased pollutants in the tissues of aquatic organisms; and
- physical alteration or destruction of aquatic habitat.

The physical disruption, or destruction of wetlands, sediment, and other aquatic habitat is an especially troublesome impact. It is a result of both the original construction of the marina, ramps, and related facilities, as well as their ongoing use, operation, and maintenance.

Although most of the water quality problems listed above arise from the direct discharge of wastes by vessels, pollutants can also be transported into marina waters by way of storm water runoff from parking lots, docks, and other impervious surfaces.

CZARA(G) GUIDANCE FOR MARINAS

Most of the impacts listed above can be mitigated by utilizing best possible siting and design criteria for each marina. Construction and operation and maintenance practices are also crucial to protecting water quality. Recognizing the importance of this, USEPA developed fifteen specific management measures (~~BMPs best management practices~~) to protect coastal waters from nonpoint pollution from marinas and recreational boating.

The management measures for marinas which are grouped into two broad headings, (1) siting and design; and (2) operation and maintenance, were developed pursuant to section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (~~CZARA~~) and are incorporated into the (g) guidance. As with all nonpoint source pollution protection measures, the key to protecting water quality in marinas is pollution prevention.

REGULATION OF VESSELS AND MARINAS

Management measures related to preventing pollutants, such as sewage, fuel and oil leaks, toxics, fish wastes, and hull scrapings from entering coastal waters are primarily the responsibility of the Regional Board. The Regional Board prohibits the discharge of these wastes through a variety of Basin Plan discharge prohibitions. The Board also encourages and participates in public education/awareness campaigns. The Harbors and Navigation Code section 151 prohibits the intentional or negligent discharge of oil to the waters of the state. Penal Code section 374(e) as amended in 1970 provides that any person who litters or places waste matter into any bay, lagoon, channel, river, creek, slough, canal or reservoir or body of water is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Local governments have significant authority to carry out these CZARA management measures through their zoning ordinances, and by using their police, fire, or building departments to ensure implementation.

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation regulates the application of antifouling paints. Regulations for organotin-based paints have been established which limit the TBT release rate, require application by certified

commercial applicators, and allow application only on vessels at least 25 meters in length and/or aluminum hulls and parts. As described earlier, tributyltin fluoride or tributyltin oxide are the principal toxicants in organotin-based paints.

The Health and Safety Code section 4425 prohibits a vessel with a toilet from operating upon the waters of any lake, reservoir, or fresh water impoundment of this State unless the toilet is designed so that no human sewage can be discharged in such waters. This code section does not apply to rivers, estuaries or saltwater areas of California. Section 312 of the Clean Water Act provides that marine sanitation devices on board new or existing vessels must be designed to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage into or upon the navigable waters of the United States (see discussion below on "*No Discharge Zone*"). The Marine Sanitation (section 775) of the Harbors and Navigation Code declares that every vessel terminal shall be equipped with vessel pumpout facilities for the transfer and disposal of sewage from marine sanitation devices in order to protect water quality.

NO DISCHARGE ZONE

Division 7 of the ~~California~~ Water Code authorizes the Regional Board to regulate any discharge of waste, including sewage, to waters of the state. The federal Clean Water Act however partially preempts the state's authority to regulate vessel sewage discharges. Section 312 of the Clean Water Act provides that no state or local entity may adopt or enforce any laws regarding the design, manufacture, installation or use of marine sanitation devices (MSDs). Instead, USEPA must adopt federal standards of performance for MSDs which must be enforced and implemented through regulations adopted by the United States Coast Guard (USCG).

Marine sanitation devices either retain sewage or discharge treated sewage. If sewage is discharged, the effluent must meet USCG specified effluent standards described in 33 CFR 159, Coast Guard Regulations on Marine Sanitation Devices. Types I and II MSDs are flow-through systems which treat and discharge sewage. Type I MSDs produce an effluent having a fecal coliform bacteria count not greater than 1,000 per 100 ~~ml milliliters~~ and no visible floating solids. Type II MSDs produce

an effluent having a fecal coliform bacteria count not greater than 200 per 100 ~~ml~~ ~~milliliters~~ and suspended solids not greater than 150 ~~mg/l~~ ~~milligrams per liter~~. Type III MSDs are holding tanks only and prevent the overboard discharge of treated or untreated sewage.

There is one significant exception to the federal preemption of a state's regulation of vessel sewage discharges. Clean Water Act section 312 (f) allows states to completely prohibit vessel sewage discharges into waters requiring greater water quality protection, provided that USEPA determines that adequate vessel sewage pumpout facilities are available for these waters.

In 1976 the State of California petitioned USEPA, pursuant to section 312 (f)(3) of the Clean Water Act, for a determination that adequate pump-out facilities were reasonably available for that portion of San Diego Bay that is less than 30 feet deep at ~~mean lower low water~~ ~~(MLLW)~~; and for all of Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, and Dana Point Harbor (41 Federal Register 21516 May 26, 1976). On August 6, 1976, USEPA made the requested determination (41 Federal Register 34453 August 6, 1976).

As a result, the discharge of all sewage, treated or untreated, from all vessels is completely prohibited in all portions of Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, and Dana Point Harbor (regardless of vessel size or water depth). Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, and Dana Point Harbor are, in their entirety, "*No Discharge Zones*". (Note that this prohibition includes discharges from a properly functioning USCG certified MSD).

The discharge of all sewage, treated or untreated, from all vessels is completely prohibited in all portions of San Diego Bay that are less than 30 feet deep at ~~mean lower low water~~ ~~(MLLW)~~. The No Discharge Zone in San Diego Bay is defined as all portions of the bay having a depth of less than 30 feet MLLW. In the absence of the no discharge zone (i.e., in those portions of San Diego Bay having a depth of 30 feet or greater), discharge of treated sewage through a properly functioning ~~USCG~~ ~~United States Coast Guard~~ certified Type I or II marine sanitation device is allowed. (USCG certification provides that the specified effluent limitations will be met). The discharge of untreated sewage

from a Type III holding tank is not allowed under any condition in any portion of San Diego Bay (regardless of depth).

Because of dilution and circulation in San Diego Bay, it is assumed that the discharge of treated sewage into waters deeper than 30 feet from a properly functioning USCG certified Type I or II MSD will not degrade the bay's beneficial uses. Additionally, with the exception of a few recent uses (such as jet skiing and sail boarding), the REC I designated beneficial use occurs in shallow waters (i.e., in waters less than 30 feet). This supports the need for a complete prohibition in such shallow waters.

Furthermore, as a practical matter, it is not possible to regulate sewage discharges from all vessels in San Diego Bay. For example, some foreign vessels may not be equipped to use the existing pump-out facilities. Since the no discharge designation is conditioned upon the existence of adequate pump-out facilities, it was necessary to make an allowance in the prohibition for such vessels. These vessels require berthing accommodations outside of the designated area. (All US Navy vessels are equipped to connect to pump-out barges or pier-side sewage facilities).

Most small pleasure craft are equipped with either a Type I or II flow-through treatment device or a Type III holding tank, but rarely both. Those vessels equipped with only a flow-through treatment device must secure their device while in a No Discharge Zone in order to prevent overboard sewage discharges. Those vessels equipped with only a holding tank are required to utilize pump-out facilities at all times and may not discharge into any portion of any bay. In other words, a vessel in San Diego Bay with a holding tank may not move into water greater than 30 feet and discharge sewage from its holding tank.

A study of the levels of coliform and *Enterococcus* bacteria caused by vessel discharges is needed to allow the Regional Board to make decisions based on measured levels. The Regional Board could then advise the county health officer, the Port District, and the Coast Guard so appropriate actions could be taken to abate the effects of sewage discharges from vessels.

SHIPYARDS

This section contains a general discussion of shipyards, their threat to water quality, and regulatory complexity. A discussion specific to San Diego Bay shipyards is included near the end of this section.

Shipyard activities may result in the discharge of wastes to receiving waters. The presence of elevated concentrations of pollutants, primarily heavy metals, in the sediment adjacent to shipyards nationwide is well documented in the literature (see references). Although there are numerous other potential threats, the single most significant threat to water quality posed by shipyards is the potential discharge of abrasive blast waste to receiving waters.

SHIPYARD THREAT TO WATER QUALITY

From the perspective of protecting beneficial uses, a discharger's threat to water quality is critically important and plays a role in virtually all regulatory decisions. By definition, the basis of a discharger's threat to water quality is the effect the discharger would have on the receiving water if discharges occurred in violation of its NPDES permit. In other words, a discharger's threat to water quality is its potential for degrading water quality. The following six characteristics are relevant in evaluating a shipyard's threat to water quality: (1) primary activities; (2) facilities; (3) industrial processes; (4) materials used; (5) wastes generated; and (6) waste discharges to receiving waters (actual and potential). A discussion of each follows.

PRIMARY ACTIVITIES AS SHIPYARDS

The shipbuilding and repair industry is engaged in the construction, conversion, alteration, repair, and maintenance of all types of military and commercial ships and vessels. Shipbuilding and repair encompasses a large number and variety of activities and industrial processes including, but not limited to, formation and assembly of steel hulls; application of paint (coating) systems; installation and repair of a large variety of mechanical, electrical, and hydraulic systems and equipment; repair of damaged vessels; removal and replacement of expended or failed paint (coating) systems; and provision of entire

utility/support systems to ships (and crew) during repair.

The list of occupations required to conduct these activities is also extensive, including sandblasters, painters, shipfitters, machinists, metalsmiths, welders/burners, blacksmiths, boilermakers, chemists, carpenters, coppersmiths, electricians, electronic technicians, joiners and patternmakers, laborers, riggers, pipefitters, and foundrymen. Not all occupations are present at all shipyards.

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

There are four major types of building/repair facilities at shipyards, which together with cranes, enable ships to be assembled, launched, or repaired. These facilities are graving docks/shipbuilding ways, floating drydocks, marine railways, and berths/piers. With the exception of berths and piers, the basic purpose of each facility is to separate the vessel from the bay and provide access to parts of the ship normally underwater.

Each facility type presents its own unique set of environmental concerns. Depending on size and capabilities, a single shipyard will generally have a combination of two or more of these facilities.

In addition to these facilities, shipyards must also conduct the wide range of support or complementary activities previously described. Many of these activities require their own facility, space, or shop; for example concrete platens (for steel fabrication), machine shop, pipe shop, electroplating shop, weld shop, sheet metal shop, electrical shop, coppersmith shop, blacksmith shop, carpentry shop, and boiler shop, etc. Not all facilities are present at all shipyards.

SHIPYARD INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES

The primary activities described above involve a multitude of industrial processes, many of which must be conducted over water or very close to the waterfront. Because they typically represent the greatest threat to water quality, the following discussion will focus primarily on the industrial processes conducted inside graving docks or floating drydocks.

Surface Preparation and Paint Removal: Methods of surface preparation and paint removal include dry abrasive blasting, wet abrasive or slurry blasting, hydroblasting, and chemical paint stripping. Each paint removal method has a unique purpose and poses its own set of water quality risks.

Dry abrasive blasting is the preferred method of preparing steel surfaces for application of a new paint (coating) system for saltwater immersion. It is used for most exterior hull work and virtually all interior tank work (e.g., fuel, bilge, ballast tanks etc). Dry abrasive blasting is the process in which blasting abrasive is conveyed in a medium of high pressure air, through a nozzle at velocities up to 450 feet per second resulting in very large quantities of solid waste and airborne particulates (dust). Although the most efficient of the paint removal methods, dry blasting produces the largest quantity of airborne particulates.

Wet abrasive or slurry blasting is the process in which water replaces air as the abrasive propellant. The use of water significantly reduces airborne particulate emissions but generates large quantities of wet residue and wastewater.

Hydroblasting is a process in which water under very high pressure is used instead of abrasive. Hydroblasting produces large amounts of wastewater and is primarily used at shipyards to remove marine growth, not to remove existing coatings. Chemical paint stripping is uncommon in drydocks and used primarily for removable parts.

Paint (coating) Application: After preparation, surfaces are painted. Most painting occurring in a drydock involves the ship hull and internal tanks. Painting is also conducted in other locations throughout a shipyard including piers and berths. Paint application is accomplished by way of air or airless spraying equipment.

Tank Cleaning: Tank cleaning operations utilize steam to remove dirt and sludge from internal tanks, particularly fuel tanks and bilges. Detergents, cleaners, and hot water may be injected into the steam supply hoses. Wastewater is generated.

Other Industrial Processes (graving docks/drydocks): Other industrial processes conducted inside graving docks or floating drydocks include mechanical repair,

maintenance, installation; structural repair, alteration, assembly; and integrity/ hydrostatic testing. Hydrostatic or strength testing (flushing) is conducted on hull, tanks, or pipe repairs and on new systems during ship construction phases. Hydrostatic testing generates significant water flow.

Other Industrial Processes (elsewhere): Numerous other industrial processes take place at numerous other locations throughout a typical shipyard, including activities at a variety of repair and specialty shops. Examples include paint equipment cleaning; engine repair/ maintenance/ installation; pipe fitting; steel fabrication and machining; electrical repair/ maintenance/ installation; hydraulic repair/ maintenance/ installation; tank emptying; fueling; patternmaking; shipfitting; boiler cleaning; carpentry; refurbishing/ modernization/ cleaning; air conditioning/ refrigeration repair; sheet metal fabrication; fiberglass repair; electroplating/ metal finishing; blacksmithing; zinc primer application; printing; and photo processing. As a result of these processes, an assortment of wastes are generated, many of which are hazardous.

MATERIALS USED AT SHIPYARDS

Materials commonly used at shipyards are described below beginning with those utilized during graving dock or floating drydock operations.

Abrasive Grit: Abrasive grit is typically slag from the smelting of copper ore and consists principally of iron. Trace elements such as copper, zinc and titanium may also be present in the slag. Sand, cast iron, or steel shot are also used as abrasives. Very large amounts of abrasive are needed to remove paint to bare metal. For example, removing paint from a 15,000 square foot hull can take up to 6 days and consume 87 tons of grit. Grit is needed in all dry and wet (slurry) abrasive blasting.



Fresh Paints: Fresh paints contain copper, zinc, chromium, and lead (all priority pollutants) as well as numerous hydrocarbons. The two major types of paints used on ship hulls are anticorrosive paints and antifouling paints. Anticorrosive paint (primers) include vinyl, vinyl-lead, or epoxy based coatings. Others contain zinc chromate and lead oxide. (Although newer paint formulations no longer include chromium and lead, such constituents may be present in shipyard wastes due to the removal of older coating systems).

Antifouling paints are designed to prevent growth and attachment of marine organisms by continuously releasing toxic substances into the water. Cuprous oxide and tributyltin fluoride or tributyltin oxide are the principal toxicants in copper-based and organotin-based paints, respectively.

Other Materials: Other materials used include oils (engine, cutting, and hydraulic); lubricants, grease; fuels; weld rod; detergents, cleaners; rust inhibitors; paint thinners; hydrocarbon and chlorinated solvents; degreasers; acids; caustics; resins; adhesives/ cement/ sealants; cyanide; zinc (e.g., zinc dust); chlorine; and mercury.

WASTES GENERATED AT SHIPYARDS

The major categories of wastes commonly generated by shipyard industrial processes are discussed below. Wastes resulting from graving or floating drydock operations are presented first.

Abrasive Blast Waste: Abrasive blast waste, consisting of spent grit, spent paint, marine organisms, and rust is generated in very large quantities during all dry or wet abrasive blasting procedures. The constituent of greatest concern with regard to toxicity is the spent paint,

particularly the copper and tributyltin antifouling components, which are designed to be toxic and designed to continuously leach into the water column. Other priority pollutants in paint include zinc, chromium, and lead. Although the grit itself is not highly toxic, it is a major component in the large solid waste load and is settleable. As a result, its deposition can degrade the benthic community and increase the need for dredging. Abrasive blast waste can be conveyed by water flows, become airborne (especially during dry blasting), or fall directly into receiving waters. Wet abrasive blasting of a Naval DDG class destroyer (437-536 feet long; 47-67 feet wide; 15-20 feet draft) can generate up to 180 tons of solid wet abrasive waste.

Paint Losses: Paint losses, or paint which ends up somewhere other than its intended location (e.g., drydock floor, bay, worker's clothing), results from spills, drips, and overspray. Typical overspray losses are estimated at approximately 5% for air spraying and 1-2% for airless spraying.

Bilge Waste/Other Oily Wastewater: This is generated during tank emptying, leakages, and cleaning operations (bilge, ballast, fuel tanks). In addition to petroleum products (fuel, oil), tank washwater may also contain detergents or cleaners (nitrogen and phosphorus compounds) and can be generated in large quantities.

Blast Wastewater: Wet abrasive (slurry) blasting and hydroblasting generates large quantities of wastewater. Wet abrasive blasting of a Naval DDG class destroyer can generate up to 500,000 gallons of contaminated water. In addition to suspended and settleable solids (spent abrasive, paint, rust, and marine organisms) and water, blast wastewater may also contain rust inhibitors such as diammonium phosphate and sodium nitrite.

Other Wastes: These include oils (engine, cutting, and hydraulic); lubricants, grease; fuels; waste paints/ sludge/ solvents/ thinners; construction/ repair wastes and trash; asbestos (from ship refurbishing/ modernization); sewage (black and grey water from vessels or docks); boiler blowdown, condensate, discard; spent hydrocarbon or chlorinated solvents; electroplating/ metal finishing wastes; acid wastes; caustic wastes; and aqueous wastes (with and without metals).

SHIPYARD WASTE DISCHARGES TO RECEIVING WATERS

Actual and potential waste discharges to receiving waters from typical shipyard operations are discussed below. Most are either the direct result of an industrial process (drydock, marine railway, or berth operations) or, more commonly, the result of water coming into contact with wastes, typically spent abrasive blast waste. There are numerous sources of water at a shipyard including: industrial processes; building or repair facilities (e.g., drydock); vessels under repair (e.g., cooling water); bay water (e.g., due to tidal influence or wave action); storm water; or other sources.

Actual and potential waste discharges to receiving waters include: floating drydock deballasting (tanks); floating drydock submergence/ emergence (platform); floating drydock operations; graving dock dewatering; gate leakage; hydrostatic relief flows; shipbuilding ways dewatering/ gate leakage/ relief flows; marine railway operations; berth and pier operations; storm water; integrity/ hydrostatic testing discharge (new vessels); boiler and cogeneration feedwater; fire protection system discharge; cooling water; and miscellaneous water flows.

SHIPYARD COMPLEXITY

From a regulatory and environmental control standpoint, shipyards present a unique and difficult problem. Traditional NPDES dischargers generate or intake wastewater, treat it to specified effluent limits, and discharge treated effluent, often by way of a single pipe. Unlike traditional dischargers, shipyards are significantly more complex in all respects: numerous and diverse industrial processes; numerous discharge mechanisms, waste streams, and discharge points; and Best Management Practices Plan ~~(BMP)~~ based permits. Each is discussed below.

Numerous and Diverse Industrial Processes

As described previously, shipyards conduct a large number and broad range of industrial processes which require a wide range of facilities and substantial workforce.

Numerous Discharge Mechanisms, Waste Streams, and Discharge Points

Shipyards are complex to regulate because they have numerous discharge mechanisms, discharge points, and waste streams. A less complex discharger will typically have a single or small number of each. A discussion of abrasive blast waste with respect to discharge mechanisms, discharge points, and waste streams follows. Abrasive blast waste is discharged primarily as a result of graving dock flooding, drydock immersion, drainage, or runoff. In other words, at shipyards, the principle mechanism by which wastes are conveyed to receiving waters is via the contact of wastes with water, both of which occur in large quantities. For this reason, storm water and storm drain inlets are of particular concern at shipyards. Abrasive blast waste can also become subject to tidal or wave action. Airborne releases represent another important discharge mechanism. Because abrasive blast waste is generated in part as airborne particulates, such releases to receiving waters pose a significant threat to water quality. Furthermore, and because of their proximity to receiving waters, a third discharge mechanism exists at shipyards. Direct discharges from shipyards occur when wastes are allowed to fall directly into receiving waters (off the end drydock, edge of pier, between gratings, etc).

In summary, because abrasive blast waste can be washed, hosed, pushed, blown, become subject to tidal/wave action, and be directly or otherwise discharged, the potential for abrasive blast waste from shipyards to enter receiving waters is great. In addition to multiple discharge mechanisms, numerous waste streams, and discharge points also exist at shipyards. The discharges described above can potentially enter receiving waters from numerous shipyard worksites including graving docks, drydocks, marine railways, piers, repair/ specialty shops, as well as via storm drains and sheet flow runoff.

Best Management Practices—~~(BMP)~~ Based Permits

Unlike traditional NPDES discharges which are regulated by numerical effluent limits, the control of waste discharges from shipyards is accomplished by the implementation of

~~Best Management Practices (BMP)~~ plans. The purpose of a BMP plan is to prevent, reduce, or eliminate the spillage or illicit discharge of pollutants into receiving waters and can include any number of preventive controls or measures. Due to the types of activities and multiple discharge pathways, numerical effluent limitations are not practical at shipyards. The evaluation of the effectiveness of BMP Plans from a regulatory standpoint is more complicated and resource intensive than comparison of end-of-pipe monitoring results to numerical effluent limitations.

LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF SHIPYARD DISCHARGES ON WATER QUALITY AND BENEFICIAL USES

Unlike short lived pollutants (e.g., BOD and bacteria) the type of pollutants present in shipyard discharges are typically long-lasting. Shipyard pollutants, such as heavy metals and PAHs are persistent in the marine environment, in part, because they can become attached to sediment particles and can accumulate to high concentrations in both sediments and in marine organisms. Once incorporated into sediment and tissues, these pollutants are very difficult to remove and may recycle in the marine system indefinitely. Because sediment cleanup projects are difficult, expensive, and lengthy, contaminated sediment can remain in place, adversely affecting beneficial uses and water quality, for many years.

SAN DIEGO BAY SHIPYARDS

The following discussion is specific to San Diego Bay shipyards.

NPDES Permits

There are currently four commercial shipyards in the San Diego Region, all of which are located adjacent to San Diego Bay. All of the shipyards are currently regulated under individual NPDES permits which are BMP based, rather than based on effluent limits. The shipyard permits also include standard receiving water limitations and discharge prohibitions. Additionally, all of the shipyards are also subject to the statewide General Industrial Storm Water Permit.

Threat to Water Quality and Best Management Practices ~~BMPs~~

Although the discussion above was intended as a general description of the shipyard industry as a whole, the majority of the information is applicable to the San Diego Bay shipyards. One notable exception is that wet abrasive or slurry blasting and chemical paint stripping are currently not conducted at San Diego Bay shipyards.

By definition a discharger's threat to water quality is its potential to cause damage to water quality and beneficial uses under worst case conditions, i.e., assuming all BMPs and treatment measures fail. For this reason, the general shipyard discussion on threat to water quality focuses on potential risks rather than on BMPs. As described, a shipyard's potential risks to water quality are significant in many respects. BMPs are specifically designed to reduce those risks and are therefore extremely important for shipyards. Hence, the second reason to focus on potential risks is to emphasize the need for effective BMPs at shipyards.

San Diego shipyards report strict adherence to a large number of BMPs to control water and airborne wastes during a variety of industrial processes. Such BMPs include physical and procedural controls. Physical controls isolate runoff pathways from contact with abrasive blast wastes through the use of shrouding, sealing of drains, and diversion of sump discharge pathways. Procedural control methods include dock sweeping and elimination of sources of runoff during blasting operations. The shipyards also report the effective management of their wastes including treatment, recycling, and disposal in compliance with the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division, their San Diego Metropolitan Industrial Waste Program permits, and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District.

Contaminated San Diego Bay Sediment and Mussels

Regional Board staff has reviewed the results of sediment samples collected adjacent to the shipyards in San Diego Bay. Elevated concentrations of copper, tributyltin, and zinc exist in these sediments. Copper, tributyltin and zinc are contained in both the materials used by

San Diego Bay shipyards as well as in the wastes which they generate. Furthermore elevated concentrations of copper, tributyltin, and zinc have also been measured in the tissues of mussels collected from stations located adjacent to San Diego Bay shipyards.

Although this data may suggest that the BMPs employed by San Diego Bay shipyards are not effective, it may also represent historical discharges which occurred at a time when BMPs were not carefully implemented. Regional Board staff plans to investigate the matter further. The existence of contaminated sediment adjacent to the shipyards serves to further underscore the importance of shipyard BMPs.

SHIPYARDS – GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In summary, shipyards typically pose a significant threat to water quality for the following reasons. Relative to other regulated dischargers, shipyards conduct a large number and wide variety of activities and industrial processes. The conduct of these industrial processes requires numerous physical facilities and a large number, amount, and variety of materials. As a result, a large number, amount, and variety of wastes are generated and are, or may be, discharged to receiving waters. Shipyard discharges have the potential to cause the long-term loss of a designated beneficial use in receiving waters.

From a regulatory perspective, shipyards are complex. Toxic pollutants are, or could be, present in wastes discharged to receiving waters from shipyards. They have numerous discharge points and are regulated by permits which do not contain numeric effluent limits. Shipyards are typically "major" NPDES dischargers and require a high level of regulatory effort.

In conclusion, because shipyards pose a significant threat to water quality and are complex to regulate, the BMPs which they employ (to reduce or eliminate the discharge of wastes to receiving waters) are extremely important. It is critical that shipyard BMPs are effective and diligently implemented.

BOATYARDS

There are currently 12 boat building and boat repair facilities (commonly called boatyards) adjacent to receiving waters in the San Diego

Region. Most of the boatyards are located adjacent to San Diego Bay, while Mission Bay, Oceanside Harbor, and Dana Point Harbor are serviced each by a single boatyard. Additional boatyards are located in inland areas of the Region. Seven of the boatyards located adjacent to receiving waters are currently regulated under an individual NPDES permit. Eventually all of the waterfront boatyards will be regulated under an individual NPDES permit. Additionally, all of the boatyards in the Region are currently subject to the statewide General Industrial Storm Water Permit. Like the shipyard permits, boatyard permits do not contain numeric effluent limits but are based instead on ~~best management practices (BMPs)~~.

The most significant waste categories associated with boatyards include hull maintenance related wastes and marine engine related wastes. Hull maintenance related wastes, and particularly antifouling paints, are believed to pose the greatest threat to water quality from boatyard operations. Cuprous oxide (copper) and ~~TBT~~tributyltin fluoride or ~~TBT~~tributyltin oxide (~~TBT~~) are the principle toxicants in antifouling paint used at boatyards. Marine engine related wastes include fuels, oils, lubricants, antifreeze, solvents, and bilge water. The pollutants of concern from marine engine wastes are metals and petroleum hydrocarbons. ~~Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)~~ are of particular concern because they persist in the marine environment. Implementation of BMPs is the key to controlling boatyard waste discharges to receiving waters.

GROUND WATER DEWATERING

A number of dewatering operations are associated with construction projects for foundations, bridges, roads, etc. Other dewatering operations are ground water remediation projects which are required under Cleanup and Abatement Orders issued by the Regional Board. Many of the proposed dewatering operations are located where petroleum or other pollutants plumes exist. Petroleum or other pollutants may be pumped from the ground water and discharged to a storm drain and subsequently to a water of the United States.

Since the mid-1980's, the Regional Board has regulated dewatering operations under the NPDES permit process. Two general NPDES permits have been adopted by the Regional Board which regulate discharges from ground water remediation projects and discharges from ground water dewatering operations to surface waters of the United States. ~~New permanent dewatering discharges are prohibited in both permits.~~

~~The first permit, Order No. 91-10, NPDES CA0108804, regulates ground water remediation and dewatering waste discharges to surface waters except San Diego Bay. Order No. 91-10 was adopted January 28, 1991.~~

~~The second permit, Order No. 90-31, NPDES CA0108707, regulates ground water dewatering discharges to San Diego Bay and storm drains or other conveyance systems tributary thereto. Order No. 90-31 was adopted April 23, 1990.~~

~~The Regional Board's Order No. 90-31 was subsequently modified by the State Water Resource Control Board Order No. WQ 91-10 on September 26, 1991. State Board Order WQ 91-10 amended certain discharge specifications, reporting requirements and ground water monitoring requirements in Order No. 90-31.~~

The first permit, Order No. 2000-90, NPDES No. CAG919001 regulates temporary ground water extraction and similar waste discharges to San Diego Bay and storm drains or other conveyance systems tributary thereto. This Order prohibits groundwater extraction waste discharges to San Diego Bay from new permanent groundwater extraction operations.

The second permit, Order No. 2001-96, NPDES No. CAG919002 regulates groundwater extraction waste discharges from construction, remediation, and permanent groundwater extraction projects to surface waters within the San Diego Region except for San Diego Bay.

In addition, the Waiver Policy described earlier in this Chapter waives WDRs for short-term construction dewatering operations where there is no discharge to surface waters.

DREDGING AND DISPOSAL OF DREDGE SPOIL

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL

FEDERAL STATUTES AND REGULATION

The regulation of dredged material disposal in waters of the United States (US) on a federal level is a responsibility shared by the USEPA and the ~~US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE)~~. The Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, also called the Ocean Dumping Act, is the primary federal environmental statute governing the discharge of dredged material to the ocean. The Clean Water Act is the primary federal statute governing the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into US waters. Material dredged from waters of the US and disposed in the territorial sea is evaluated under the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act unless the material discharged is for the primary purpose of fill (e.g., beach replenishment, island creation, or underwater berms), in which case the disposal is evaluated under the Clean Water Act [33 CFR 336.0(b)]. Other applicable federal statutes and regulations include:

- ***The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899:*** The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 401 et. seq.) requires a USACOE permit for any work or structure, including fill material discharges, in navigable waters of the United States. The primary purpose of section 10 of this act is to ensure that structures (i.e., disposal berms, piers, pipelines, bridges, wharfs) constructed in navigable waters do not adversely affect federal interstate navigation.
- ***The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958:*** The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act requires that, for any proposed federal project or permit that may affect a stream or other body of water, the USACOE must first consult with federal and state fish and wildlife agencies. This consultation addresses the prevention of damages to wildlife resources and provides for the development and improvement of wildlife resources.

- **The Endangered Species Act of 1973:** Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), as amended (16 USC- 1531 et seq.) requires federal agencies, in consultation with the Secretaries of Interior (represented by the US Fish and Wildlife Service) and Commerce (represented by the National Marine Fisheries Service), to insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species.

- **The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972:** The Coastal Zone Management Act (16 [United States Code \(USC\)](#)- 1451 et. seq.) authorizes a federal program for the effective management, beneficial use, protection and development of the coastal zone. The act requires the [USACOE](#) to coordinate permit review and federal projects with all state level coastal zone review agencies. Under this act, coastal states are required to formulate a management program for the land and water resources of its coastal zone, which extends out to the seaward limit of the territorial sea, and submit it for approval to the Secretary of Commerce. In 1977, the California Coastal Management Program was approved.



California tree frog

Overview of the Clean Water Act

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires the USEPA, in conjunction with the [USACOE](#), to promulgate guidelines for the discharge of dredged or other fill material to ensure that such proposed discharge will not result in unacceptable adverse environmental impacts to waters of the United States. Section 404 assigns to the [USACOE](#) the responsibility for authorizing all such proposed discharges, and requires application of the guidelines in assessing the environmental acceptability of the proposed action. The [USACOE](#) and the USEPA also have authority under section 230.80 to specify, in advance, sites that are either suitable or unsuitable for the discharge of dredged or fill material in US waters. In addition, Clean Water Act section 401 provides the States

a certification role as to project compliance with applicable water quality standards.

Clean Water Act, Section 401 Certification State of California

The Clean Water Act, section 401 gives the states authority to grant, deny, or waive certification for a federally permitted or licensed activity that may result in a discharge to waters of the United States. Any applicant for a federal permit which conducts any activity which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters of the State must present to the permitting agency a certification (or waiver of certification) from the State that any such discharge will comply with the applicable Clean Water Act provisions of section 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307. The certification issued by the State should establish relevant effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and standards or performance which become conditions of the federal permit. In California, the responsibility for section 401 certification is assigned to the State Board and regional boards. After review of data submitted by an applicant, and any other information available as to whether the proposed activity will comply with all applicable water quality standards, limitations and restrictions, the Regional Board may:

- Waive water quality certification;
- Issue waste discharge requirements; or,
- Recommend approval with or without conditions, or denial of water quality certification, to the State Board.

In order to grant section 401 certification, the State Board must certify that the proposed discharge will not result in unacceptable adverse environmental impacts to waters of the United States.

For a project to proceed, a waiver of certification or waste discharge requirements must be obtained from the Regional Board or a certification with or without conditions must be obtained from the State Board, indicating the Board's concurrence with the decision that the proposed action is not expected to cause a violation of the State's water quality standards.



STATE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

The State of California has several programs that parallel or overlap many of the listed federal Acts. Relevant state statutes and regulations include the following:

- ~~California~~—Water Code, Division 7 (Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act);
- State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board and Regional Water Quality Control Board Plans and Policies;
- ~~California~~—Water Code, Division 4 (California Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Act);
- California Fish and Game Code;
- California Environmental Quality Act; and
- California Coastal Zone Management Act.

The primary statutory state law pertaining to the regulation of water quality and sediment control issues is the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act which is contained in Division 7 of the ~~California~~-Water Code.

California Water Code, Division 7 (Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act)

Dredging and dredged material disposal is an ongoing activity at harbors within the San Diego Region. The discharge of dredged or fill material which comes within the purview of section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act is not subject to regulation under the ~~National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System~~ (NPDES) permit program (Clean Water Act section 402). However, if the project involves the discharge or potential discharge of waste (e.g. dredge spoils, dredge spoil return water, etc.) which may adversely impact water quality, then the discharge may be regulated through the issuance of ~~waste discharge requirements~~ (WDRs). WDRs are issued by the Regional Board pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The Regional Board is concerned with turbidity, dissolved oxygen depletion, and other physical, chemical, and biological parameters in the receiving waters which are impacted by dredge/fill projects. In recent years, there has also been concern about the concentrations of

chemicals in the material to be dredged. Harbor areas may contain high levels of contaminants in bottom sediments due to navigational use, and due to wastes from urban, industrial, and riverine sources. The Regional Board Waiver Policy described earlier in this chapter waives establishing WDRs for projects which involve dredging 5,000 cubic yards or less of material and are not expected to have any adverse impact on the environment. For projects involving dredging of more than 5,000 cy of material, or dredging of potentially or known contaminated material, the proponent is required to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) in application for WDRs. The RWD must include a characterization of the material to be removed to determine whether the proposed project is expected to meet all applicable water quality standards, limitations, restrictions and discharge prohibitions. The decision to issue or waive WDRs for dredging projects is made on a case-by-case basis regardless of dredge spoil volume. Disposal of dredge material at authorized open-ocean disposal sites (e.g., LA-5 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site) fall under the jurisdiction of the ~~federal Environmental Protection Agency~~ (USEPA) and the USACOE. However, because of the potential threat to water quality due to dredging operations, the Regional Board may still issue a WDR for the actual dredging portion of the project.

Adopted WDRs typically require monitoring for dissolved oxygen, turbidity and, where concentrations of chemicals in the sediments are high, monitoring for chemical constituents. Monitoring may be required of the receiving water at the dredge site or at the disposal site(s), and of the dredge spoil return water if applicable.

Enforcement Process for Contaminated Sediment

Dredging is often part of the remediation process for contaminated sediments in marine waters. The Regional Board under the authority of the ~~California~~-Water Code section 13304 may issue a cleanup and abatement order to require an identified responsible party which caused the discharge of chemical constituent(s) present in a contaminated sediment to remediate or effect cleanup of the contaminated sediment.

Specific directives of cleanup and abatement orders issued for remediation or cleanup of

contaminated sediments typically direct the responsible party to:

- Quantify the lateral and vertical extent of the contaminated sediment;
- Examine the engineering feasibility of the following alternative sediment cleanup/remediation strategies;
 - ✓ Complete removal of all contaminated sediment;
 - ✓ Removal or remediation of contaminated sediment to a level that will conform with water quality objectives and protect/restore beneficial uses; and
 - ✓ No action alternative level - The "no action" alternative level involves reliance upon natural processes for the remediation of contaminated sediment sites;
- Examine the cost of sediment cleanup/remediation to various cleanup/ remediation levels; and
- Examine the environmental consequences of sediment cleanup/ remediation to various cleanup/remediation levels.

State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Resources Control Board Plans and Policies

State plans and policies which affect dredging and disposal of dredge spoil include the Ocean Plan, the (Resolution No. 74-43), the Basin Plan, and any other applicable plans or policies.

Ocean Plan: The Ocean Plan establishes general requirements for waste discharges which could affect state ocean waters. For dredge/fill projects, this may include discharges associated with dredging operations, dredge spoils disposal including beach replenishment, or discharge of dredge spoil return water. The Ocean Plan requirements are incorporated into WDRs issued by the Regional Board for dredge/fill projects.

Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California: This policy requires that dredge spoils to be disposed of in bay and estuarine waters must comply with federal criteria for determining the

acceptability of dredged spoils to marine waters, and must be certified by the State Board or Regional Board as in compliance with state plans and policies. Dredging must also comply with applicable discharge prohibitions contained in the policy (i.e., the policy prohibits the direct or indirect discharge of silt, sand, soil, clay, or other earthen materials from onshore operations including mining, construction, agriculture, and lumbering, in quantities which unreasonably affect or threaten to affect beneficial uses).

California Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Act

The California Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Act (~~California~~—Water Code, Division 4, Chapter 5.6, sections 13390-13396) requires the Regional Board to identify and characterize toxic hot spots in bays and estuaries and ocean waters of the state and plan for cleanup or remediation of the sites. Furthermore, CWC section 13396 states that no person shall dredge or otherwise disturb a toxic hot spot without first obtaining Clean Water Act section 401 certification or WDRs. Dredging projects involving removal or disturbances of sediments at toxic hot spots must meet the following conditions to the satisfaction of the Regional Board:

- The polluted sediment will be removed in a manner that prevents or minimizes water quality degradation.
- Polluted dredge spoils will not be deposited in a location that may cause significant adverse effects to aquatic life, fish, shellfish, or wildlife or may harm the beneficial uses of the receiving waters, or does not create maximum benefit to the people of the state.
- The project or activity will not cause significant adverse impacts upon a federal sanctuary, recreational area, or other waters of significant national importance.

California Coastal Zone Management Act

The California Coastal Zone Management Act requires that the dredging of coastal waters and estuaries be limited where feasible to maintaining navigational depths [section 30233(a)(2)]. Section 30233(b) further encourages the transportation of dredged material so generated and determined to be suitable for beach

replenishment to appropriate beaches or into suitable long shore current systems.

California Fish and Game Code

Dredging operations and the disposal of dredge spoil and dredge spoil return water are subject to applicable sections of the California Fish and Game Code, especially those pertaining to:

- Water pollution (Division 6, Chapter 2, §5650);
- Endangered species (Division 3, Chapter 1.5, [sections §2050 - §2098](#)); and/ or the
- Alteration of any river, stream or lake (Division 2, Chapter 6, §1601 and §1603).

California Environmental Quality Act of 1973

The Regional Board may not adopt WDRs for a dredge/fill project until the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; P.R.C. 21000-21177) requirements have been satisfied. CEQA requires full public disclosure of a project and the assurance that environmental factors are considered in the decision making process. CEQA requires one of the following:

- an Environmental Impact Report;
- a Categorical Exemption; or
- a Negative Declaration.



San Diego Bay bridge

HISTORY OF DREDGE AND FILL PROJECTS

SAN DIEGO BAY

Dredging of San Diego Bay has occurred for a variety of reasons. San Diego Bay is a major port for commercial and military vessels. In order to provide adequate water depths for navigation and berthing of vessels, dredging projects are required from time-to-time to maintain existing water depths or to increase depths to accommodate these vessels. Significant dredging first occurred within San Diego Bay in the early 1900's.

The volume of material dredged from San Diego Bay over the years is estimated to be between

180 and 190 million cubic yards (mcy) (Smith, 1977 from US Navy, Sept. 1992). About 5 to 8 mcy was disposed at ocean dumping sites, about 35 mcy was placed along Silver Strand beach, and about 147 mcy was used around the Bay as fill. Most of this material was placed prior to 1970. During 1992 and 1993, there were a total of fifteen recent, ongoing, and future dredge and fill projects in San Diego Bay for a total volume of about 3.7 mcy. The US Navy anticipates dredging an additional 13 mcy through 1998.



Mission Bay and San Diego River
Copyright © 2002- 2004 Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman.
California Coastal Records Project www.californiacoastline.org

OTHER AREAS

There is on-going maintenance dredging in other areas throughout the San Diego region.

These areas include:

- Agua Hedionda Lagoon;
- Mission Bay; and
- Oceanside Harbor.

Additional areas which have dredging projects scheduled include the following:

- Batiquitos Lagoon;
- Murrieta Creek;
- San Marcos Creek; and
- Santa Margarita River.

DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL

Disposal of dredged material is a necessity whenever a dredging project is undertaken. There are alternatives for disposal available within the San Diego Region, including several which can

yield significant environmental benefits. However, disposal of dredged material can be a significant problem when there is toxic contamination of the dredged materials. Prior to dredging, physical, chemical, and biological testing of the sediment have been required in order to determine the appropriate alternative for disposal of the dredged material. Potential alternatives for the disposal of dredged material from San Diego Bay include:

- Beach replenishment;
- Habitat restoration/ enhancement;
- Ocean disposal;
- Incineration;
- Upland disposal without treatment;
- Upland disposal with treatment;
- Confined aquatic disposal; and
- Reuse sites such as capping.

Physical Characteristics of Dredged Material

Evaluation of the physical characteristics of sediments proposed for discharge is necessary to determine potential environmental impacts of disposal, the need for additional chemical or biological testing, as well as potential beneficial use of the dredged material. The physical characteristics of the dredged material include: particle-size distribution, water content or percent solids, specific gravity of solids, and plasticity characteristics. The sediment physical characteristics should also be evaluated from the standpoint of compatibility with different kinds of biological communities likely to develop for the disposal environments under consideration.

Chemical Characteristics of Dredged Material

The initial screening for contamination is designed to determine, based on available information, if the sediments to be dredged contain any contaminants in forms and concentrations that are likely to cause unacceptable impacts to the environment. During this screening procedure, specific contaminants of concern are identified in a site-specific sediment so that any subsequent evaluation is focused on the most pertinent contaminants.

Physical behavior of the material at the disposal site

Physical testing and assessment should focus on both the short-term and long-term physical behavior of the material. For open-water

alternatives, these assessments might include an analysis of water-column dispersion, mound development, and long-term mound stability or dispersion. For confined alternatives, these assessments might include an analysis of solids retention and storage requirements during disposal and long-term consolidation behavior in the confined disposal facility.

Any contaminant testing should focus on those contaminant pathways where contaminants may be of environmental concern, and the testing should be tailored to the available disposal site. For open-water alternatives, contaminant problems may be related to either the water column or benthic environment, and the appropriate testing and assessments would include required Clean Water Act or MPRSA testing. For confined sites, potential contaminant problems may be either water quality related (return water effluent, surface runoff, and groundwater leachate), contaminant uptake related (plant or animal), or air related (gaseous release).

Traditional locations for disposal of non-contaminated dredged material have included nearshore ocean waters along Silver Strand, in-bay waters of the Naval Amphibious Base Coronado, and the LA-5 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (LA-5).

Dredging permits issued during the past twenty years have allowed about 10 ~~million~~-cy of material to be disposed either on Silver Strand beaches or LA-5. Chemical testing data for projected future US Navy projects suggest that 92 percent of the material planned to be dredged from San Diego Bay will qualify for placement at either habitat enhancement sites, Silver Strand beaches or at LA-5.

Material which is not physically compatible with the receiving disposal site may qualify to be disposed of at LA-5. Material which cannot meet either the 404(b)(1) Guidelines or the USEPA ocean dumping criteria must be disposed in a different manner.

Beach Replenishment

Shore erosion is a major concern along the coast of the San Diego Region. Beach replenishment is usually accomplished by dredging sand from inshore or offshore locations and transporting the sand by truck, by split-hull hopper dredge, or by

hydraulic pipeline to an eroding beach (e.g., Silver Strand beach). These operations may result in displacement of the substrate, changes in the topography or bathymetry of the borrow and replenishment areas, and destruction of nonmotile benthic communities. However, a well-planned beach nourishment operation can minimize these effects by taking advantage of the resiliency of the beach and nearshore environment and its associated biota, and by avoiding sensitive resources. When dredged material is used for beach replenishment it should closely match the sediment composition of the eroding beach and be low in fine sediments, organic material, and pollutants. The [USACOE](#) requires that dredged sediments proposed for placement on a beach must be:

- Particles mostly greater than 74 microns (i.e., sand, gravel or rock);
- Compatible with sediments on the receiving beach; and
- Substantially the same as the disposal site.

Generally, the disposal of clean, sandy material on beaches poses no present problem in terms of sediment quality, quantity, or feasibility. In fact, to be consistent with the California Coastal Management Plan, every effort must be made to beneficially use sandy material for beach nourishment or habitat restoration/ enhancement.

Habitat Restoration/ Enhancement

Restoration/ enhancement of wetlands is an alternative that can benefit the environment. In general, restoration of a former wetland is more likely to be successful than creation of a new wetland where none had existed previously. In selecting a site, alteration of substrate and changes in circulation and sedimentation patterns should be considered. In general, the material used for wetland restoration should remain water-saturated, reduced, and near neutral in pH. These characteristics have a great influence on the environmental activity of any chemical contaminants which may be present.

Ocean Disposal

The ocean water disposal technique involves placing the dredged sediment in open ocean waters at an USEPA approved site. The suitability of dredged sediment for open-water

disposal is evaluated by effects-based testing as there are no sediment criteria.

In situations where the contaminated sediment will not meet USEPA's or the Corps of Engineers' criteria for ocean disposal, the sediment must be treated to meet those criteria by physical, chemical, biological, or thermal treatment methods.

LA-5 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site: LA-5 received final designation from the USEPA in 1991. This site has been used for the disposal of dredged material since the 1970's and has no capacity or dumping rate restrictions. About 4 ~~million~~-cy were disposed there by the [USACOE](#) between 1977 and 1987. About 2.5 ~~million~~-cy were deposited by the US Navy, the National Steel and Shipbuilding Corporation, and

Southwest Marine, Inc. during that same period (USEPA, 1988). The LA-5 site is a non-dispersive open water disposal site. Most of the material placed here is intended to remain on the bottom following placement. This site is located 11 km (5.4 nm) southwest of Point Loma on the continental shelf in 147 to 200 m (80 to 110 fm) of water. The center coordinates of the site are 32° 36' 83" North latitude and 117° 20' 67" West longitude, with a radius of 910 m (1,000 yd).

Upland (Landfill) Disposal without treatment

Upland disposal is the process of placing dredged material into or onto a designated solid waste disposal facility or landfill, or into a structure specifically designed to accept dredged material. This upland disposal alternative is used when the dredged material does not qualify for any aquatic disposal alternative.

Upland (Landfill) Disposal with treatment

The landfill disposal with treatment technique refers to situations where the contaminated sediment will not meet state criteria for landfill disposal without the employment of physical, chemical, biological or thermal treatment methods.

Confined disposal

Confined disposal is placement of dredged material within diked nearshore or upland confined disposal facilities via pipeline or other means. Confined disposal facilities are designed and operated to provide adequate storage capacity for meeting dredging requirements and to maximize efficiency in retaining the solids. If contaminants are present in the dredged material, then control of contaminant releases is important in the design and operation of the confined disposal facility. In most cases confined disposal facilities must be used over a period of many years, storing material dredged periodically over the design life. Long-term storage capacity of these confined disposal facilities is therefore a major factor in design and management. Once water is drained from the confined disposal facility following active disposal operations, natural drying forces begin to dewater the dredged material, adding additional storage capacity.

Reuse Sites - Capping

Capping can be done in place or through the controlled accurate placement of contaminated material at an open water disposal site. Capping in place is a type of non-removal action and refers to the placement of a clean cover material over the contaminated sediment. Capping can also be done by the accurate placement of contaminated material at an open water disposal site followed by a covering or cap of clean isolating material.

In both cases, the purpose of the cover material is to minimize or prevent the migration of contaminants from the sediment to the water column. In remedial actions involving capping, monitoring is needed to ensure that the integrity of the cap is maintained. The key elements of the monitoring program may include the monitoring of:

- Changes in cap thickness;
- Erosion around cap boundaries; and/ or
- Possible leakage of contaminants from the cap.

PROBLEMS POSED BY DREDGING SEDIMENT/CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT

Many chemical substances discharged into marine waters tend to become attached to sediment particles and thus accumulate to high concentrations in benthic sediments. The dredging process can disturb bottom sediments leading to the release of pollutants into the water column by resuspension of contaminated sediment particles; dispersal of interstitial water in the sediment pores; and desorption of chemicals from the contaminated sediment. Common toxic constituents of many sediments include ammonia, low dissolved oxygen and hydrogen sulfide.

ENVIRONMENTAL THREAT ASSOCIATED WITH CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS

Benthic marine sediments support biological communities which reside there (e.g., clams, worms, bottom feeding fish), and provide spawning habitat for many pelagic species (e.g.,

invertebrates and fish). Elevated concentrations of chemicals in the sediment may cause acute mortality or affect the reproductive behavior, egg hatching characteristics, and early life development of these organisms. In addition to causing acute mortality and abnormal development, contaminated sediments can also lead to the accumulation of contaminants in organisms due to the effects of bioaccumulation. In addition, biomagnification of the contaminants can occur in the food chain when small contaminated organisms are consumed by higher trophic level species including man.

The threat to the public health from contaminated sediments centers around three principal pathways of exposure:

- Consumption of fish and shellfish contaminated by chemicals in the sediment through the processes of bioaccumulation and biomagnification;
- Direct contact with contaminated sediments by people; and
- Incidental ingestion of contaminated sediment or associated waters by people.

DISPOSAL OF CONTAMINATED MATERIAL DREDGE SPOIL RETURN WATER

After removal of the contaminated material from the water, the contaminated material must be separated from the slurry to attain two distinct waste streams, the concentrated contaminated material and the dredge spoil return water. The methods for separating the material solids from the water include the use of settling basins, clarifiers, impoundment basins, screens and cyclones. The dredge spoil return water consists of a substantially liquid waste stream that may need to be subsequently treated by physical, chemical or biological methods for removal of dissolved and suspended pollutants.



Waste

DISCHARGES OF WASTE TO LAND

Discharges of solid, semi-solid, and liquid wastes to landfills, waste piles, surface impoundments, pits, trenches, tailings ponds, natural depressions and land treatment facilities (collectively called

"waste management units") have potential to create significant pollution sources affecting water quality. Unlike surface waters, which often have capacity to assimilate waste discharges, ground waters have little or no assimilative capacity. This is due to slow contaminant migration rates, lack of aeration, minimal biological activity, and laminar flow patterns. Waste containing elevated pollutant concentrations can require containment in waste management units or active treatment for extended periods to prevent waste migration and impairment of the underlying ground water quality. The pollutants may continue to affect water quality long after the discharge has ceased, either because of continued leachate or gas discharges from the unit, or because pollutants have accumulated in underlying soils from which they are gradually released to ground water.

Landfills for disposal of municipal or industrial solid waste (solid waste disposal sites) are the major categories of waste management units in the Region. Surface impoundment are also used for storage or evaporative treatment of liquid wastes, waste piles for the storage of solid wastes, and land treatment units for the biological treatment of semi-solid sludge from wastewater treatment facilities. Sumps, trenches, and soil depressions have been used in the past for liquid waste disposal. The Regional Board issues waste discharge requirements to ensure that these discharges are properly contained to protect the Region's water resources from degradation, and to ensure that dischargers undertake effective monitoring to verify continued compliance with requirements.

Waste Management Units are subject to concurrent regulation by other state and local agencies responsible for land use planning, solid waste management, and hazardous waste management. "Local enforcement agencies" implement the State's solid waste management laws and local ordinances governing the siting, design, and operation of solid waste disposal facilities (usually landfills) with the concurrence of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). The CIWMB also has direct responsibility for review and approval of plans for closure and post-closure maintenance of solid waste landfills. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) issues permits for all hazardous waste management treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (which include

incinerators, tanks, and warehouses where hazardous wastes are stored in drums as well as landfills, waste piles and surface impoundments). The State Board, regional boards, CIWMB, and DTSC have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to coordinate their respective roles in the concurrent regulation of these discharges.

The laws and regulations governing discharges of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes have been revised and strengthened in the last few years. The discharge of municipal solid wastes to land are closely regulated and monitored; however, some water quality problems have been detected and are being addressed. Recent monitoring efforts under the State and Regional Boards' Chapter 15 and SWAT programs have revealed that discharges of municipal solid wastes to unlined landfills have resulted in ground water degradation and pollution by volatile organic constituents (VOCs) and other waste constituents. VOCs are components of many household hazardous wastes and certain industrial wastes that are present within municipal solid waste streams. VOCs can easily migrate from landfills either in leachate or by vapor-phase transport. Clay liners and natural clay formations between discharged wastes and ground waters are largely ineffective in preventing water quality impacts from municipal solid waste constituents. In a recently adopted policy for water quality control, the State Board found that "*research on liner systems for landfills indicates that (a) single clay liners will only delay, rather than preclude, the onset of leachate leakage, and (b) the use of composite liners represents the most effective approach for reliably containing leachate and landfill gas*" (State Board Resolution No. 93-62, *Policy for Regulation of Discharges of Municipal Solid Waste*).

The USEPA has adopted new regulations under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) which require the containment of municipal solid wastes by composite liners and leachate collection systems. Composite liners consist of a flexible synthetic membrane component placed above and in intimate contact with a compacted low-permeability soil component. This liner system enhances the effectiveness of the leachate collection and removal system and provides a barrier to vapor-phase transport of VOCs from the unit. Regional Boards and the CIWMB are

implementing these new regulations in California under a policy described in State Board Resolution No. 93-62 and new regulations from CIWMB. The State Board is in the process of developing revised regulations under 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15, Discharges of Waste to Land, to fully implement water quality-related portions of the RCRA Subtitle D federal regulations. While a single composite liner of the type that can be approved under Subtitle D regulations is a significant improvement over past municipal solid waste containment systems, it should be noted that single composite liners will not necessarily provide complete protection for ground water resources.

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS—(CCR) TITLE 23, CHAPTER 15

Chapter 15 includes regulations governing discharges of waste to land for treatment, storage, or disposal. The regulations cover landfills, surface impoundments, waste piles, land treatment units, mining waste management units and confined animal facilities. In addition, actions to clean up and abate conditions of pollution or nuisance at contaminated sites are covered by relevant portions of the regulations where contaminated materials are taken off-site for treatment, storage, or disposal and, as feasible, where wastes are contained or remain on-site at the completion of cleanup actions. The regulations classify wastes according to their threat to water quality, classify waste management units according to the degree of protection that they provide for water quality, and provide siting, construction, monitoring, corrective action, closure and post closure maintenance criteria. Chapter 15 requirements are minimum standards for proper management of each waste category. These regulations require the complete containment of wastes which, if discharged to land for treatment, storage or disposal, have the potential to degrade the quality of water resources. The Regional Board may impose more stringent requirements to accommodate regional and site-specific conditions.

Some subcategories of Chapter 15 include:

Article 2 - Waste Classification and Management;

Article 3 - Waste Management Unit Classification

and Siting;

Article 4 - Construction Standards;

Article 5 - Water Quality Monitoring for Classified Waste Management Units;

Article 6 - Confined Animal Facilities;

Article 7 - Mining Waste Regulations;

Article 8 - Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance; and

Article 9 - Compliance Procedures.

Chapter 15 defines waste types including hazardous wastes, designated wastes, nonhazardous wastes and inert wastes as shown in Table 4-7.

Chapter 15 requires the review and update of waste discharge requirements for all nonhazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal sites by July 1, 1994. As of 1994 the San Diego Region has no hazardous waste disposal sites. Designated wastes, nonhazardous solid wastes and inert wastes are regulated by the Regional Board.

The regulation of nonhazardous solid waste disposal sites (Class III) has been ongoing by the Regional Board since the early 1960's. Many of the small older sites have closed, and waste is now being disposed at large regional sanitary landfills. The Board's main actions at nonhazardous solid waste facilities are the review and revision of waste discharge requirements for the active sites to assure consistency with the current regulations. These actions include defining the levels of designated wastes, the upgrading of ground water monitoring systems to identify if water quality protection standards are violated, the establishment of corrective action programs where standards are violated, and review and oversight of the development and implementation of facility closure plans.

The criteria for determining whether a nonhazardous waste is a designated waste are based on water quality objectives in the vicinity of the site, the containment features of the solid waste facility, and the solubility/mobility of the waste constituents. Therefore, all owners and operators of active nonhazardous municipal solid waste facilities in the San Diego Region who

wish to receive wastes other than municipal solid waste or inert waste must propose waste constituent concentration criteria above which wastes will be considered designated waste and therefore, not suitable for disposal at their site.

In addition, waste discharge requirements are to be revised to incorporate reclassification and retrofitting requirements and a revised monitoring program. Closed, abandoned and inactive landfills and other nonhazardous solid waste disposal sites are also subject to the provisions of Chapter 15.

Persons responsible for such sites may be required to develop and implement monitoring, to comply with closure and post-closure maintenance requirements, and to comply with reporting, notification, and record keeping requirements.

Waste Classification

Contaminated soil and other material must be treated or properly disposed in order to minimize threat to the quality of surface or ground waters.

Waste is classified in California by two separate California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) agencies with separate regulatory authority. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) classifies waste as hazardous or non-hazardous based on the threat to public health. The State Board, together with the regional boards, classifies non-hazardous waste as "*designated*", "*nonhazardous*", or "*inert*" based on the threat that each poses to the beneficial uses of ground and surface waters, as required by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and regulations, water quality control plans and policies set forth by the Regional Board.

As shown in Figure 4-2, the Chapter 15 regulations divide waste into four categories which in turn, determine the classes of waste management units to which their discharge is permitted for treatment, storage or disposal. Detailed criteria are contained in Title 22 of the [CCR California Code of Regulations](#), Division 4.5, Chapter 11, for determining whether a waste falls into the hazardous category. These criteria fall under the headings of toxicity, ignitability, reactivity, corrosivity, and listing under the

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Hazardous waste may be discharged only to Class I waste management units which provide both natural geologic and engineered containment features to isolate the wastes from the environment, unless a specific variance has been granted by DTSC from California's hazardous waste management requirements.

"*Nonhazardous solid waste*" (see Table 4-7) is the regulatory term for "*municipal solid waste*" or "*refuse*" and is characterized as having a significant proportion of putrescible (degradable) matter, stringent moisture limitations, and prohibitions against inclusion of "*designated*" or "*hazardous*" wastes. "*Nonhazardous solid waste*" may be discharged to Class III landfills that protect beneficial uses of nearby waters, but do not provide complete waste containment. The only threat to water quality posed by wastes in the "*inert*" category is siltation. Paving fragments and non-degradable construction debris are examples of "*inert waste*". Wastes in this category may be discharged to unclassified waste management units that are located and managed to keep the wastes from entering surface waters or drainage courses.

"*Designated waste*" is defined in the Chapter 15 regulations and is described in Table 4-7. The second part of the definition refers to those wastes granted a variance by DTSC from Class I disposal.

Dischargers are required to submit an initial analysis of the material by a state-certified laboratory. If the material is deemed hazardous, the discharger is referred to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. For non-hazardous materials, general WDRs can be issued on a case-by-case basis. All permitted treatment or disposal includes monitoring and reporting requirements.


Remediation treatment includes biodegradation (by a land treatment process) for hydrocarbon contaminated soil found on a site and a fixation process for metals contaminated soils. In-situ disposal (without treatment) can be allowed, on a case-by-case basis, for material that is not considered to be a threat to surface or ground water.

Table 4 - 7. Landfill Classifications

Disposal Site Classification	Definitions of Waste Types (California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15, <u>s</u> Sections 2521 et. seq.)	Examples
Class I Hazardous Waste	<p>(a) Hazardous waste is any waste which, under section 66300 of Title 22, is required to be managed according to Chapter 30 of Division 4 of Title 22.</p> <p>(b) Hazardous waste shall be discharged only at Class I waste management units which comply with the applicable provisions unless wastes qualify for a variance under section 66310 of Title 22.</p> <p>(c) Waste which have been designated as restricted wastes by California Department of Health Services (DHS) pursuant to section 66900, of Title 22 shall not be discharged to waste management units after the restriction dates established by section 66905 of Title 23 unless:</p> <p>(1) Such discharge is for retrievable storage, and</p> <p>(2) DHS has granted a variance from restrictions against land disposal of the waste under section 66930 of Title 22.</p>	Materials that contain high concentrations of pesticides, certain solvents, and PCBs are examples of hazardous wastes.
Class II Designated Waste	<p>(a) Designated waste is defined as:</p> <p>(1) Nonhazardous waste which consists of or contains pollutants which, under ambient environmental conditions at the waste management unit, could be released at concentrations in excess of applicable water quality objectives, or which could cause degradation of waters of the state.</p> <p>(2) Hazardous waste which has been granted a variance from hazardous waste management requirements pursuant to section 66310 of Title 22.</p> <p>(b) Wastes in this category shall be discharged only at Class I waste management units or at Class II waste management units which comply with the applicable provisions of Chapter 15 and have been approved for containment of the particular kind of waste to be discharged. Decomposable wastes in this category may be discharged to Class I or II land treatment waste management units.</p>	Materials with high concentrations of <u>biological oxygen demand (BOD)</u> , hardness, or chloride. Inorganic salts and heavy metals are " <i>manageable</i> " hazardous wastes.
Class III Nonhazardous Solid Waste	<p>(a) Nonhazardous solid waste means all putrescible and nonputrescible solid, semi-solid, and liquid wastes, including garbage, trash, refuse, paper, rubbish, ashes, industrial wastes, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semi-solid wastes and other discarded solid or semi-solid waste: provided that such wastes do not contain wastes which must be managed as hazardous wastes, or wastes which contain soluble pollutants in concentrations which exceed applicable water quality objectives, or could cause degradation of waters of the state (i.e., designated waste).</p>	Garbage, trash, refuse, paper, demolition and construction wastes, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semisolid wastes.

Disposal Site Classification	Definitions of Waste Types (California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15, Sections 2521 et. seq.)	Examples
<p>Class III Nonhazardous Solid Waste</p> <p>(continued)</p>	<p>(b) Except as provided in Subsection 2520(d) of Chapter 15, nonhazardous solid waste may be discarded at any classified landfill which is authorized to accept such waste, provided that:</p> <p>(1) The discharger shall demonstrate that co-disposal of nonhazardous solid waste with other waste shall not create conditions which could impair the integrity of containment features and shall not render designated waste hazardous (e.g., by mobilizing hazardous constituents);</p> <p>(2) A periodic load-checking program approved by DHS and Regional Boards shall be implemented to ensure that hazardous materials are not discharged at Class III landfills.</p> <p>(c) Dewatered sewage or water treatment sludge may be discharged at a Class III landfill under the following conditions, unless DHS determines that the waste must be managed as a hazardous waste:</p> <p>(1) The landfill is equipped with a leachate collection and removal system;</p> <p>(2) The sludge contains at least 20 percent solids by weight if primary sludge, or at least 15 percent solids if secondary sludge, mixtures of primary and secondary sludges, or water treatment sludge; and</p> <p>(3) A minimum solids-to-liquid ration of 5:1 by weight shall be maintained to ensure that the co-disposal will not exceed the initial moisture-holding capacity of the nonhazardous solid wastes. The actual ratio required by the Regional Board shall be based on site-specific conditions.</p> <p>(d) Incinerator ash may be discharged at Class III landfill unless DHS determines that the waste must be managed as hazardous waste.</p>	<p>Garbage, trash, refuse, paper, demolition and construction wastes, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semisolid wastes.</p>
<p>Unclassified /Inert</p>	<p>(a) Inert waste does not contain hazardous waste or soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of applicable water quality objectives. It does not contain significant quantities of decomposable waste.</p> <p>(b) Inert waste do not need to be discharged to classified management units.</p> <p>(c) Regional Boards may prescribe individual or general waste discharge requirements for discharges of inert wastes.</p>	<p>Concrete, rock, asphalt, plaster, brick, vehicle tires, uncontaminated soils.</p>

Figure 4-2. Waste Classification Process



RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1976

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) is the federal law regarding the treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous waste. The State implements RCRA's Subtitle C through the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) and the Regional Boards. In August 1992, the USEPA formally delegated RCRA Subtitle C program implementation authority to DTSC. As described above, regulation of hazardous waste discharges is also included in CCR Title 23, Chapter 15 (Chapter 15). Chapter 15 monitoring requirements were amended in 1991 to be equivalent to RCRA requirements. These monitoring requirements are implemented through the adoption of ~~waste discharge requirements (WDRs)~~ for hazardous waste sites covered by RCRA. The discharge requirements are then a part of a state RCRA permit issued by DTSC.

Federal regulations required by the RCRA's Subtitle D have been adopted for municipal solid waste landfills (40 CFR Parts 257 & 258). The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is the State lead agency for Subtitle D implementation. The State Board and the CIWMB are applying to the USEPA for State program approval. It is important to note that certain federal regulatory requirements will be effective unless and until the State program is approved. Delegation of authority for the State Board to implement Subtitle I (Underground Storage Tanks) will occur after USEPA approves the State's program application.

SOLID WASTE ASSESSMENT TEST (SWAT)

The Regional Board administers the Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) Program in the Region. The SWAT program requires owners of active or inactive non-hazardous solid waste disposal sites to evaluate the possible migration of hazardous waste or leachate to waters of the state. The SWAT program was initiated with the enactment of Water Code section 13273 in 1985. In addition to requiring site evaluations, the SWAT program also:

- Provides deadlines for implementation of water quality monitoring systems at active solid waste disposal sites;
- Requires the State ~~Water Resources Control~~ Board to develop a ranked list of all solid waste disposal sites, on the basis of the threat which they may pose to water quality; and
- Requires operators of active and inactive solid waste disposal sites to implement a water quality monitoring system to verify that the solid waste disposal site has not been affected by leakage, and if there is leakage to take remedial actions under the Chapter 15 program.

Program funding was eliminated in 1991, reducing Regional Board review to SWAT sites under regulation due to higher priority work in other Regional Board programs. All sites eventually will be required to complete a SWAT and more sites will be reviewed if more program funding becomes available.

SLUDGE USE AND DISPOSAL

Sludge is a residual by-product of sewage treatment, water treatment, and certain industrial processes. The higher the degree of wastewater treatment, the larger the residue of sludge that must be handled. The treatment and disposal of sludge can be the single most complex and costly operation in a municipal wastewater treatment system. The sludge is made of materials settled from the wastewater - such as rags, sticks, and organic solids - and of solids generated in the wastewater treatment processes - such as the excess activated sludge created by aeration or the chemical sludge created by a tertiary treatment process.

The quantities of sludge involved are significant. For primary treatment the quantities of sludge may be 2,500 to 3,500 gallons per ~~MGmillion gallons~~ of wastewater treated. When treatment is upgraded to activated sludge, the quantities increase by 15,000 to 20,000 gallons per ~~MGmillion gallons~~ of wastewater treated. Use of chemicals can add another 10,000 gallons. For a typical activated sludge municipal wastewater treatment plant, the amount of sludge to be disposed of is typically about one ton per ~~MGmillion gallons~~ or about 20 pounds per month per home.

Raw sludge usually contains 93 to 99.5 percent water before it is treated further or dewatered. It contains organic solids and dissolved nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorus), making it useful as a supplement to chemical fertilizers and soil conditioners. Other typical constituents are inorganic ions, such as iron and zinc. While trace amounts of these inorganic ions are used by plants and organisms, some heavy metals that may be present in sewage sludge from household or commercial and industrial sources can be toxic to plants, animals, and humans. Untreated sludge also contains disease-causing organisms (e.g., bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and eggs of parasitic worms). In addition, sewage sludge may contain toxic chemicals from household, commercial, and manufacturing activities that use the sewer system to dispose of these liquid wastes.

Most wastewater treatment plants treat the sludge prior to ultimate use or disposal. Normally this treatment consists of some combination of the following processes:

- **Conditioning:** treatment of the sludge with chemicals or heat so that the water may be readily separated.
- **Thickening:** separation of as much water as possible by gravity or flotation process by subjecting the sludge to vacuum pressure, or other drying processes.
- **Stabilization:** stabilization of the organic solids so that they may be handled or used as soil conditioners without causing a nuisance or health hazard through processes referred to as "*digestion*".
- **Reduction:** reduction of solids to a stable form by wet oxidation processes or incineration.

The disposal point alternatives for municipal wastewater sludge in the San Diego Region are limited. Since treated and untreated sludge can contain high concentrations of toxic metals and significant amounts of toxic organic pollutants and pathogens, the USEPA and the Regional Board do not allow the direct discharge of sludge to the ocean or any other surface waters. Air pollution regulations have strict requirements on sludge incineration processes. Sludge disposal to land must be carefully controlled because of

potential impacts on ground and surface water quality.

Sludge handling and disposal is regulated under 40 CFR Part 503 as a self-implementing program enforced by USEPA; the State does not have delegated authority for implementing the sludge program. Uses of sludge or sludge by-products and sludge disposal in the Region include:

- Sludge digester methane gas as fuel in gas boilers to generate electricity;
- Sludge as a soil amendment: composting dewatered sludge (pathogens are killed at composting temperatures);
- Sludge as a nutrient source for non-edible crops: direct application to agricultural crops not meant for direct human consumption (mixing, tilling, or injecting sludge into soil);
- Sludge disposal directly in certain landfills;
- Sludge disposal in-situ; and
- Incineration.

Prior to disposal of sludge, an initial analysis by a state certified laboratory is required to determine if there are any hazardous substances in the sludge. Nonhazardous sludge can be disposed of in the above ways, usually under WDRs. Disposal of nonhazardous sludge at Class III landfills is regulated under WDRs and must meet criteria listed in Table 4-7. Landfills are required to report the quantity and chemical composition of all accepted sludge as part of their individual WDRs.

Currently, the Regional Board can regulate handling and disposal of sludge pursuant to Chapter 15 and Department of Health Services standards. The USEPA has promulgated a policy of promoting those municipal sludge management practices that provide for the beneficial use of sludge while maintaining or improving environmental quality and protecting public health. USEPA is currently developing sludge use and disposal criteria. The USEPA has also proposed a rule which requires states to develop a program to assure compliance with the Federal criteria. The State Board will be developing a state sludge management program consistent with the USEPA policy and criteria.

AUTO SHREDDER WASTE

There is a significant volume of auto shredder waste generated in California every year. In 1985, 166,500 tons of auto shredder waste was produced. There was one producer of auto shredder waste in the San Diego Region as of February, 1994. Auto shredder waste is the material that remains after articles such as auto bodies, appliances and sheet metal are shredded and have had their metals removed. The majority of auto shredder waste is being treated to nonhazardous levels, but a significant portion of the waste must be disposed of in a hazardous waste landfill. Eight metal compounds, which include cadmium, total and hexavalent chromium, lead, copper, mercury, nickel and zinc, plus PCBs may cause auto shredder waste to be classified as hazardous. Senate Bill 976 was passed in 1985 which required Regional Boards to prepare a list of Class III, nonhazardous waste landfills as authorized to accept and dispose of auto shredder waste. There are only four landfills which currently accept auto shredder waste in California. They are West Contra Costa, Altamont, BKK landfill and Prima Deshecha.

SHREDDER WASTE POLICY (RESOLUTION NO. 85-92)

The Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 85-92, the Designation of Class III Landfills within the San Diego Region to Accept Shredder Wastes as Required by section 25143.6 of the Health and Safety Code (Shredder Waste Policy) on December 16, 1985. The Shredder Waste Policy, required by section 25143.6 of the Health and Safety Code, designates three landfills, the City of San Diego's West Miramar Solid Waste Disposal Facility, the County of San Diego's Otay Annex Sanitary Landfill, and the County of Orange's Prima Deshecha Canada Sanitary Landfill, as being authorized to dispose of shredder wastes as required by section 25143.6 of the Health and Safety Code. These three landfills are subject to the following conditions:

The appropriate agency of the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego, and the County of Orange shall, prior to the start of such an operation, submit a report of waste discharge and obtain revised waste discharge requirements for the disposal of shredder wastes. The report

of waste discharge shall contain sufficient information demonstrating conformance with Item "i" or, alternatively, Item "ii" listed below to their satisfaction of the Regional Board.

- i. The report of waste discharge shall demonstrate that shredder waste will be discharged to a Class I or Class II waste management unit in accordance with the criteria stated in Chapter 15, Title 23 of the [CCR California Code of Regulations](#).
- ii. The report of waste discharge shall demonstrate that under section 2520 (a)(I), Chapter 15, Title 23, [CCR California Code of Regulations](#), the shredder waste contains a particular waste constituent or combination of constituents which present a lower risk of water quality degradation than indicated by its classification as a designated waste.

Upon application for modification of waste discharge requirements, other landfills within the San Diego Region may be authorized by the Regional Board to accept and dispose of shredder wastes, subject to the restrictions discussed above.

CONTROL OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION

CHRONOLOGY OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION CONTROL MEASURES

To implement nonpoint source pollution control, several regulatory measures have been taken by federal, state, regional and local government. The following chronology shows the applicable regulatory measure, responsible governmental agency, and year when each measure was enacted or adopted. These regulatory measures will be discussed in the pages that follow.

Regulatory Measure	Responsible Agency	Year
RB Resolution No. 79-25	RB	1979

Regulatory Measure	Responsible Agency	Year
RB Resolution No. 87-91	RB	1987
CWA, section 201(g)(1)(b)	USEPA	1987
CWA, section 205(j)(5)	USEPA	1987
CWA, section 319(h)	USEPA	1987
CWA, section 402(p)	USEPA	1987
CWA, section 603(c)(2)	USEPA	1987
CZARA Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments , section 6217	USEPA	1990
RB Resolution No. 92-21	RB	1992

THE NEED FOR NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION CONTROL

Efforts to improve water quality under the NPDES program have traditionally focused on reducing pollutants from the major point sources, namely municipal sewage and industrial process wastewater. Point sources are defined as discrete conveyances, from which pollutants are, or may be discharged. These point sources received early emphasis because they were obvious sources of pollution and easily linked to degraded water quality conditions. However, as the permitting effort proceeded and control measures for municipal sewage and industrial wastewater were implemented, it became increasingly clear that control and reduction of nonpoint source pollution was also needed in order to restore and protect the nation's waters.

DEFINITION OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION

In contrast to point sources, nonpoint sources of water pollution are generally defined as sources which are diffuse in nature, usually associated with man's uses of land, and are not subject to the federal NPDES permitting program. Diffuse sources originate over a wide area rather than from a definable point. They often enter receiving waters in the form of surface runoff but are not

conveyed by way of pipes or discrete conveyances. By definition, nonpoint sources (like discharges to ground water) are exempt from the federal NPDES permitting program which regulates point sources to surface waters.

CATEGORIES OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION

Nonpoint source pollution is primarily the result of man's uses of land such as urbanization, roads and highways, vehicles, agriculture, construction, industry, mineral extraction, physical habitat alteration (dredging/ filling), hydromodification (diversion, impoundment, channelization), silviculture (logging), and other activities which disturb land. Additional categories of nonpoint sources include agricultural return water, marinas and recreational boating, confined animal facilities, resource extraction, channel erosion, resuspension of pollutants from contaminated aquatic sediments, waste disposal sites, septic systems (onsite or subsurface disposal), atmospheric deposition, acid precipitation, seawater intrusion, and geothermal development.

OVERLAPS BETWEEN NONPOINT & POINT SOURCES

The distinction between point source and nonpoint sources is not always clear. As a result, there have always been overlaps and ambiguities between programs designed to control nonpoint sources and those designed to control point sources of pollution. The most important example of such an overlap involves urban runoff and storm water which are clearly diffuse and nonpoint in origin, but become channelized and are ultimately discharged through discrete point source conveyance systems to receiving waters. Because it becomes channelized, urban runoff is legally considered a point source discharge. However, because it originates as nonpoint source, urban runoff and storm water are discussed in the Nonpoint Source section.

SEVERITY OF NONPOINT SOURCE PROBLEM

According to the 1988 National Water Quality Inventory, nonpoint source pollution has become the largest single factor preventing the attainment of water quality standards. The

inventory reported over 40% of the nation's rivers and streams are impaired due to siltation and 25% are impaired due to nutrients (such as phosphorus and nitrogen) from nonpoint sources. Agricultural runoff was reported as the major nonpoint pollution source affecting over 50% of impaired rivers. Also, over half of the states reported threats to ground water from nonpoint pollution sources.

NONPOINT SOURCE FUNDING

Innovative ways of financing and implementing nonpoint source projects have been developed. Prior to the 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act, states used section 106 and 205(j) monies to fund limited nonpoint source activities. The primary federal funding for current nonpoint source program development and implementation includes section 104(b)(3), 205(j)(5), 319(h), 201(g)(1)(b), 603(c)(2), and 604(b) monies as described below.

Section 104(b)(3): This section established grants for state water pollution control agencies and others for the purpose of conducting and promoting research and investigations related to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of pollution. Such research and investigations are to be carried out in cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies.

Section 205(j)(5): This section established a set-aside of construction grants for the purposes of carrying out activities under section 319, including program development and the preparation of state assessment reports and management plans. These funds were used for assessment and development activities for California's program through fiscal year 1989.

Section 319(h): Grant funds authorized by this section can be used for the implementation of nonpoint source management programs but cannot be used for assessment activities. States must have an USEPA approved Assessment and Management Plan before qualifying for these monies. This grant program funds both State and Regional Board programs and provides competitive grants for other agencies to use in implementing nonpoint source measures around the state. These grants include a "non-federal" match of 40 percent which illustrates the intent of Congress and USEPA to have the states make

a financial commitment to implementing nonpoint source programs.

Section 201(g)(1)(b): The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act added this section that established a new purpose for which 201 funds could be used - "...any purpose for which a grant can be made under section 310(h) and (i)". These funds can be used for either nonpoint source development or implementation projects.

Section 603(c)(2): The 1987 amendments added Title VI to the Clean Water Act establishing a State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Program (SRF). This program provides funding in the form of loans, refinancing, and bond insurance which can be used for (1) construction of publicly owned treatment works, (2) the implementation of state nonpoint source management programs, and (3) the development and implementation of state estuary conservation and management plans. The State and Regional Boards encourage local agencies to apply for these low-interest loans to implement nonpoint source demonstration projects and programs in the Region.

Section 604(b): States must set aside one percent of their Title VI allotments or \$100,000, whichever is greater, to carry out planning programs under 205(j) and 303(e) of the Clean Water Act. These funds can be used under 205(j) planning for nonpoint source related activities. This can become an important source of funding for nonpoint source planning and assessment tasks since these types of activities cannot be carried out under section 319.

SECTION 319 NONPOINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

To address the nonpoint source pollution problem, Congress added section 319 to the Clean Water Act in 1987. Section 319 requires each state to develop and implement a Nonpoint Source Management Program and to conduct an inventory of the waterbodies in the State which are impaired due to nonpoint source pollution. To fulfill these requirements, the State Board adopted the Nonpoint Source Management Plan (NPSMP) in 1988 which is discussed in Chapter 5 and the Water Quality Assessment in 1990 which is discussed later in this chapter.

The NPSMP established a statewide policy for managing nonpoint source inputs to California's

waters and is incorporated by reference into this Basin Plan. The objective of the Nonpoint Source

Management Program in California is to measurably improve water quality through the implementation of various ~~Best-Management Practices (BMPs)~~.

Unlike end of pipe treatment for point sources (which is impractical and cost prohibitive for nonpoint sources), the key to managing nonpoint source pollution is pollution prevention. Pollution prevention means stopping the generation of pollution at its source by reducing the use of products containing pollutants. Once pollutants have been generated, pollution control BMPs must be employed to prevent the existing pollution from coming into contact with the waters of the State. BMPs are defined as the schedules of activities, prohibitions, procedures, or other management practices designed to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants into receiving waters.

The State and Regional Board(s) believe that the voluntary and widespread application of BMPs is the most effective means by which nonpoint source pollution can be reduced. Accordingly the following three general management options are adopted in the Nonpoint Source Management Plan to address nonpoint source problems. In general, the least stringent option that successfully protects or restores water quality is employed. More stringent options are only required if water quality improvements are not achieved.

- (1) ***Voluntary implementation of BMPs:***
Voluntary implementation of BMPs is encouraged through financial assistance, education, training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects. Grants and loans provide incentives.
- (2) ***Regulatory based encouragement of BMPs:***
Regional Boards require waste discharge requirements for nonpoint sources but waive the requirement if BMPS are effectively implemented. Regional Boards can also enter into management agency agreements (MAAs) with other agencies which specify acceptable BMPs and their implementation. The MAAs are referenced in Regional Board basin plans and become the primary basis for evaluation of compliance. (The State Board has existing MAAs with the US Forest Service, the California Board of Forestry and Department of Forestry).

In either case, the Regional Board will generally refrain from imposing effluent requirements on dischargers who are implementing BMPs in accordance with a waiver of waste discharge requirements or an approved management agency agreement. In both cases, the BMPs become the primary mechanism for meeting water quality standards.

- (3) **Issuance of permits:** Adopt and enforce waste discharge requirements which set effluent limits on the discharge of specific pollutants.

The State Board has also established four program objectives for its Nonpoint Source Management Program, each of which are being implemented in the San Diego Region as follows:

- (1) Implementation of Nonpoint Source Management Plan: This includes integration of the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (which is required under the [CZARA Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments](#) and is described below) into the NPSMP.
- (2) Outreach Activities: Regional Board outreach activities primarily center around the industrial, construction, and municipal participants in the NPDES Storm Water Permit Program (described in a later section). Other activities include participation in Resource Conservation District, technical advisory and planning committee, and lagoon foundation meetings.
- (3) Watershed Assessment Projects: San Diego's target watershed is Escondido Creek and San Elijo Lagoon.
- (4) Project Tracking and Participation: The Regional Board has two nonpoint source program contracts. The first contract is entitled the Chollas Creek Watershed Protection Plan project. The Chollas Creek contract has been completed. However, the watershed remains a high priority for the toxic substances monitoring program and for chronic and acute toxicity monitoring. These monitoring programs may identify changes in the water quality due to the education program funded by this contract.

The second project involves a nitrate contamination project in the Rainbow Creek watershed. Although the USEPA funded study has not been formally initiated, the Flynn-Rainbow Nursery has converted to a complete tailwater recovery and reuse system. This conversion resulted in a reduction of nitrate loads to the creek. The Rainbow Creek contract will be modified to study other nurseries and sources of nutrients.

ALL NONPOINT SOURCE DISCHARGES ARE CURRENTLY REGULATED

Despite the overlaps between point and nonpoint sources, all nonpoint source discharges are currently regulated under one of two relatively new statutory requirements. These requirements are the NPDES Storm Water Permitting Program required under section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act and the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program required under section 6217 of the ~~Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA)~~.

Although the two programs are complementary and exclusive of each other (i.e., one program applies to any discharge that the other does not), their recent implementation has heightened the confusion about point source versus nonpoint source program applicability.

Both the programs are fully discussed in later sections, and a brief overview is included here. In its simplest form, the Clean Water Act section 402(p) program, which is an NPDES permitting program, is designed to regulate storm water and urban runoff (i.e., the nonpoint source discharges that become point sources). Virtually all other nonpoint sources are subject to the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program under CZARA. Although there are a few minor complications which are also discussed later, the essential concept is that all nonpoint source discharges are currently subject to regulation under either the NPDES Storm Water Program or the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program.

NPDES STORM WATER PROGRAM



SECTION 402(P) CLEAN WATER ACT

Pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act, many municipalities and most industries in the United States are now required to obtain coverage under an NPDES permit for discharges of storm water runoff. NPDES storm water permits authorize only the discharge of storm water into storm water conveyance systems and prohibit all non-storm water discharges.

DEFINITION OF STORM WATER

The federal regulations (40 CFR 122, 123, 124, November 1990) define storm water as surface runoff from rain or snow melt, including sheet flow. This is a narrow definition which is meant to include the runoff of precipitation only. Storm water does not include water which originates from any source other than precipitation such as process wastewater, cooling waters, and wash waters. These are examples of non-storm water discharges and are not allowed in the storm water conveyance system. A non-storm water discharge is any discharge that is not composed entirely of storm water. Also unacceptable for discharge into the storm water conveyance system is precipitation runoff which has come in contact with pollutants.

THE PROBLEM

Although storm water runoff is part of the natural hydrologic cycle, human activities, particularly urbanization, can result in significant and problematic changes to the natural hydrology of an area. Under conditions of minimal urbanization, water is percolated through pervious surfaces in which soil filtration and biological action remove pollutants. During urbanization, pervious surfaces (i.e., vegetated and natural ground cover) are converted to impervious surfaces (i.e., rooftops and roads) decreasing the infiltration capacity of the soil for both water and pollutants.

As a result, when rain falls on and drains through urban freeways, industries, construction sites, and neighborhoods it picks up a multitude of

pollutants. The pollutants can be dissolved in the runoff and quickly transported by gravity flow through a vast network of concrete channels and underground pipes referred to as storm water conveyance systems.

Such systems ultimately discharge the polluted runoff, without treatment, into the nation's creeks, rivers, estuaries, bays, and oceans. In short, urbanization results in a dramatic increase in the volume, velocity, and especially in the pollutant load carried by storm water runoff to receiving waters.

Pollutants typically found in urban runoff include sediment, nutrients (e.g., fertilizers), oxygen-demanding substances (e.g., decaying vegetation), bacteria, viruses, heavy metals, synthetic organics (e.g., fuels, oils, solvents, lubricants), pesticides, and other toxics. These pollutants severely degrade the beneficial uses of surface waters, and threaten the health of both humans and aquatic organisms.

In addition to the pollutants contributed by precipitation runoff, dry weather flows also cause serious degradation of receiving water quality. Dry weather flows, which can be substantial, consist of flows from illicit connections and illegal discharges to the storm water conveyance system. Common examples of the latter include illegally disposed used motor oil and antifreeze.

Studies, most notably the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program (NURP), found pollutants in urban runoff to be similar to those found in sewage and industrial wastewater discharges. Similar concentrations were also observed. Thirty-eight states report urban runoff as a major cause of impaired water quality. Locally, the closure of Southern California beaches following major storm events due to high bacteriological levels in ocean waters is a common occurrence. Clearly urban runoff is a significant water quality problem which deserves attention.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

To address the storm water/urban runoff problem, Congress added section 402(p) to the Clean Water Act in 1987. This section, and the federal regulations which implement it (40 CFR 122, 123, and 124; November 1990), require NPDES permits for storm water/ urban

runoff discharges from municipalities and industries, including construction.

The distinction between point source and nonpoint sources of pollution begins to fade with the requirement for NPDES permits for storm water discharges. Although storm water is clearly diffuse and nonpoint source in origin, it is quickly channelized and ultimately discharged through discrete point source conveyance systems to receiving waters. Because of this, storm water is legally considered a point source discharge and as such is subject to the NPDES permitting program under section 402(p).

MUNICIPAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND CONSTRUCTION PERMITS -- COMMON CHARACTERISTICS

As a result of the 1987 Clean Water Act amendments, there are currently three types of storm water permits in California: municipal, industrial, and construction. The municipal permits are areawide permits which were issued by the Regional Board. The industrial and construction permits are statewide general permits which were issued by the State Board. There are three important characteristics which all storm water permits have in common.

Permit Objective

The overall objective of the entire storm water program and all three types of permits is to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants into the storm water conveyance system. Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act does however establish different performance standards for municipal and industrial discharges. Municipalities must reduce pollutant discharges to the maximum extent practicable, or MEP (see discussion below). Industries (including construction) must implement Best Available Technology (BAT) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants.



Best Management Practices

Pollution Prevention

The permit objective is achieved by way of pollution prevention. To eliminate pollutants in storm water, one can either clean it up by removing pollutants or prevent it from becoming polluted in the first

place. Because of the overwhelming volume of storm water and the enormous costs associated with pollutant removal, pollution prevention is the only approach that makes sense. Pollution prevention which means stopping the generation of pollution at its source by reducing the use of products containing pollutants, is in fact, the basis of the entire storm water program. Once pollutants have been generated, pollution control BMPs must be employed to prevent the existing pollution from coming into contact with the water of the State. It is important to point out that this approach is distinctly different from the conventional end-of-pipe treatment approach commonly used in water quality regulation.

Pollution prevention is accomplished by way of ~~Best Management Practices (BMPs)~~ which are defined as schedules of activities, prohibitions, procedures, or other management practices designed to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to storm water.

Source control BMPs include practices that eliminate or reduce pollutants at their point of generation, or source, so that they can not come into contact with storm water. Source controls are non-structural, inexpensive, and can be extremely effective. Because source control BMPs are site specific, they vary widely depending on the application. For example, regulatory powers and land use planning are important BMPs for municipalities. Berming and covering storage areas are excellent BMPs at industrial facilities; reduced vegetation removal and phased development planning are effective at construction sites.

Two source control BMPs are common to all three applications (municipalities, industries, and construction), namely good housekeeping practices (cleaning up and immediately disposing of wastes properly) and most importantly, education (employee and public). Education, which ultimately results in a change in behavior and increased public awareness, is the key to pollution prevention. Many people think that street gutters are plumbed to the sanitary sewage treatment plant and do not realize that they flow instead directly to the bays and ocean without treatment. Education should be conducted in two directions: (1) prevent the discharge of pollutants and (2) reduce the use of materials which are the sources of pollution.

No Numeric Effluent Limits

None of the three types of storm water permits contain numeric effluent limits at this time. The permits are intended to be BMP based and instead contain narrative receiving water limitations.

AREAWIDE MUNICIPAL STORM WATER PERMITS

Under section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act and the federal regulations implementing it, operators of large and medium sized municipal storm water conveyance systems are required to obtain NPDES permits for their storm water conveyance systems at this time. Large and medium sized municipal storm water conveyance systems are defined as those serving populations greater than 250,000 and 100,000, respectively. Smaller municipalities (those under serving populations less than 100,000) have until late 1994 to obtain coverage but may be required to do so earlier if it is determined that (1) they are significant contributors of pollutants to receiving waters or (2) if their storm water conveyance systems are "interrelated" to larger municipal systems. In the municipal permits the Regional Board made a finding that all of the smaller municipalities in the San Diego Region meet both of these criteria (Order No. 90-42). All the municipalities contribute to the condition of water quality impairment (see Table 4-8) and the storm water discharges are "*interrelated*" in that they jointly and cumulatively contribute significant pollutants to the near coastal waters of San Diego County. Consequently, in July 1990, the Regional Board adopted an areawide Municipal Storm Water Permit for each of the three counties in the Region, San Diego, Riverside, and Orange as follows:

- (1) Order No. 90-42 (NPDES Permit No. CA 0108758), Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water and Urban Runoff from the County of San Diego and Incorporated Cities of San Diego County and the San Diego Unified Port District.
- (2) Order No. 90-46 (NPDES Permit No. CA 0108766), Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water and Urban Runoff from the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the County of Riverside and the Incorporated

Cities of Riverside County within the San Diego Region.

- (3) Order No. 90-38 (NPDES Permit No. CA 0108740), Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water and Urban Runoff from the County of Orange, the Orange County Flood Control District and the Incorporated Cities of Orange County within the San Diego Region.

Included as co-permittees in the above permits are all of the land use regulatory agencies; the county, all incorporated cities within the county, and special districts. For this reason, the municipal permits are referred to as "areawide" permits. As it moves from inland to coastal areas, storm water does not recognize jurisdictional boundaries. Since all municipalities contribute to the cumulative storm water pollution problem, a coordinated, "areawide" approach to managing it is essential, more effective, and far less expensive than numerous individual efforts.

Objective

The objective of an areawide municipal storm water permit is to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). This is a standard used by USEPA for municipal discharges of storm water. Although not specifically defined in the federal regulations, the intent of MEP is to reduce as much as possible the discharge of pollutants. Thus, the municipal dischargers are required to employ whatever BMPs are feasible (i.e., are likely to be effective and are not cost prohibitive). Where a choice is made between two BMPs which provide generally comparative effectiveness, the discharger may choose the least expensive alternative and exclude the more expensive BMP. However, it would not be acceptable either to reject all BMPs which address a pollutant source or to pick a BMP based solely on cost, which would be clearly less effective. In order to reduce pollutants to the MEP many factors including technical feasibility and effectiveness, as well as economic factors, must be taken into consideration.

Permit Requirements

Municipal Storm Water Permits contain the following two major requirements:

- (1) Prohibit non-storm water discharges; and
- (2) Develop/implement a comprehensive storm water management program. The comprehensive storm water management program must include the following five components:
 - BMP program;
 - Monitoring and reporting program;
 - Illicit connection/ illegal discharge detection program;
 - Storm water ordinance or code; and a funding source.

Ultimate Responsibility for Quality of Storm Water Discharges (Municipal Regulation of Industry)

Under an areawide municipal storm water permit, municipalities are ultimately held responsible for the quality of discharges from their storm water conveyance systems, including contributions from industrial and construction activities. This provides important incentive for municipalities to regulate these activities occurring within their jurisdiction.

As called for in the federal storm water regulations, the regulation of industrial storm water discharges (including construction) into municipal storm water conveyance systems should be accomplished by a cooperative effort between the Regional Board and the local municipality. Under a municipal storm water permit, municipalities are required to adopt and enforce ordinances (including ordinances for erosion control) which prohibit the discharge of pollutants to storm water conveyance systems. In order for the municipalities to be in compliance with their municipal permit, it is essential that the municipalities rigorously enforce their ordinances and grading permits and conduct inspections for compliance with both. They are further authorized to impose additional requirements on industry as necessary to ensure compliance with their municipal permit.

Table 4 - 8. Receiving Waters Impacted by Pollution from Stormwater and Urban Runoff (Order No. 90-42)

IMPACTED RECEIVING WATER	REFERENCES	PARAMETERS	MUNICIPALITIES / JURISDICTION
San Diego Bay	WQLS, NPSI	PET, TRA, SYN, COL, DEB, MET	City of San Diego, Coronado, National City, Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, County of San Diego, San Diego Unified Port District
Mission Bay	WQLS, NPSI	COL, MET	City of San Diego
Santa Margarita Lagoon	WQLS, NPSI	NUT	Camp Pendleton, County of San Diego, County of Riverside, Temecula
Oceanside Harbor	NPSI	TRA, SYN	Camp Pendleton, Oceanside
Buena Vista Lagoon	NPSI	NUT, SED	Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, County of San Diego
Agua Hedionda Lagoon	SD O HSR	COL	Carlsbad, San Marcos
Batiquitos Lagoon	WQLS, NPSI	NUT, SED	Carlsbad, Encinitas, San Marcos, County of San Diego
San Elijo Lagoon	WQLS, NPSI	NUT, SED	Encinitas, Escondido, Solana Beach, County of San Diego
San Dieguito Lagoon	NPSI, TSMP	SED, TRA	City of San Diego, Del Mar, Solana Beach, County of San Diego, Escondido
Los Penasquitos Lagoon	WQLS, NPSI	NUT, SED	City of San Diego, Del Mar, Poway, County of San Diego
Tijuana River Estuary	WQLS, NPSI	TRA, SYN, DOX, NUT	Tijuana, Mexico, City of San Diego, Imperial Beach
San Diego River	NPSI	SYN, PES, SED	City of San Diego, La Mesa, El Cajon, Santee, County of San Diego
Forester Creek	NPSI	TRA	El Cajon, Santee
Tijuana River	WQLS, NPSI	NUT, DEB, COL, DOX, SYN, PES, TRA	Tijuana, City of San Diego
Lake Hodges	NPSI	NUT, DIS	City of San Diego, Escondido, Poway

*** Abbreviations for Table 4-8:**

REFERENCES

- WQLS** Water Quality Limited Segment
- NPSI** Nonpoint Source Inventory Report
- SD~~O~~HSR** State ~~DHS~~Department of Health Services Report on Shellfish Contamination in Agua Hedionda Lagoon
- TSMP** Toxic Substances Monitoring Program elevated values

PARAMETERS

- COL** Coliform bacteria or other microbes
- DEB** Debris
- DIS** Dissolved Solids
- DOX** Low dissolved oxygen, except when associated with algal blooms caused by nutrients
- MET** Metals, except trace elements
- NUT** Nutrients, macro- and micro-nutrients, including algal bloom-low dissolved oxygen syndrome
- PES** Pesticides, except trace elements, including insecticides, nematocides, herbicides, and fungicides
- PET** Petroleum distillates
- SED** Sedimentation/turbidity, including habitat alteration due to sedimentation
- SYN** Synthetic organics, except herbicides and pesticides
- TRA** Trace elements: aluminum, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, selenium, silver, titanium, and zinc.

GENERAL INDUSTRIAL STORM WATER PERMIT

To reduce the administrative burden of issuing individual permits to the overwhelming number of industries now subject to NPDES storm water permitting, USEPA has initiated a four-tiered strategy for regulating industries. The first tier involves the use of a small number of "general" permits. A general permit is a single permit under which many facilities can obtain coverage (for example, all of the industries in a given type). Under the tiered strategy, the permitting process begins general and becomes increasingly more specific and rigorous over time. Subsequent tiers target specific watersheds, industry types, and finally individual facilities.

Consistent with the tiered approach, the statewide General Industrial Storm Water Permit entitled, "*Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities excluding Construction Activities, Order No. 91-13 (General Permit No. CAS 000001)*" was adopted by the State Board on November 19, 1991.

Industries Requiring Coverage

As shown below, the federal regulations identify eleven categories of industrial facilities which are required to obtain coverage under an NPDES storm water permit. Ten of the eleven categories are covered under the statewide General Industrial Storm Water Permit. Category x, construction activities, is covered under a separate permit, which will be discussed in a later section. Categories i through ix are considered "*mandatory industries*" and are required to obtain coverage under the General Industrial Storm Water Permit whether or not they have materials and activities exposed to storm water. Category xi, "*conditional industries*," are only required to obtain coverage under the general permit if they have materials, equipment, or activities exposed to storm water. Six of the categories are defined by narrative descriptions of the industrial activity. The remaining five categories are defined by Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes.

- (i) Facilities Listed Under 40 CFR Subchapter N
- (ii) (Heavy) Manufacturing Facilities
- (iii) Oil and Gas/ Mining Facilities
- (iv) Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities
- (v) Landfill, Land Application sites and Open Dumps
- (vi) Recycling Facilities
- (vii) Steam Electric Power Generation Facilities
- (viii) Transportation Facilities
- (ix) Sewage or Wastewater Treatment Works
- (x) Construction Activities
- (xi) (Light) Manufacturing Facilities (with exposure)

In addition to private industry, industrial facilities owned or operated by governmental entities (including federal, state, and municipal facilities) are also required to obtain permit coverage.

When Is Coverage Not Needed

If a facility discharges all of its storm water to a municipal sanitary sewer system or to evaporation ponds, percolation ponds, or dry wells, and if there is no discharge to surface water under any circumstances, coverage under the general permit may not be required.

Permit Requirements

The General Industrial Storm Water Permit and General Construction Storm Water Permit both contain the following three major requirements:

- (1) Eliminate non-storm water discharges;
- (2) Develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is a site specific plan consisting of all **Best Management Practices (BMPs)** which will be implemented at a facility to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants to storm water. (It is the most important requirement and the key to source controls); and
- (3) Develop and implement Monitoring and Reporting program (in accordance with the general permit).

GENERAL CONSTRUCTION STORM WATER PERMIT

Although it is one of eleven industrial categories specified in the federal regulations, construction activities are regulated under a separate general permit in California. The statewide General Construction Storm Water Permit entitled, "*Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity, Order No. 92-08-DWQ (General Permit No. CAS 000002)*," was adopted by the State Board on August 20, 1992.

Definition of Construction

Construction activity includes, but is not limited to clearing, grading, and excavation, as well as building and reconstruction. Construction activity does not include routine maintenance to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, or original purpose of the facility.

Who Needs Coverage?

In California at this time, discharges of storm water associated with construction activities that result in the disturbance of five acres or more of total land are required to obtain coverage under the general permit. Construction activities disturbing less than five acres are also required to obtain coverage under the permit if they are part of a larger common plan of development or sale. Because of a recent court ruling, it is important to note that the current five acre exemption is subject to change.

Erosion - The Major Construction Concern

Natural erosion processes are greatly accelerated when protective ground cover is removed during construction activities. Studies reveal that the rate of erosion on land where construction activities are occurring is approximately 2,000 times greater than on timber land that has not been logged.

Erosion results in not only the loss of productive soil, which is essentially irreplaceable, but also in severe impacts to water quality. Twenty-one states, including California, report construction site runoff as a major cause of water quality impairment. "*Clean sediment*" alone is by definition, a pollutant because of its ability to degrade water quality. Although there are many

water quality impacts associated with clean sediment, the two most important ones include: (1) increased turbidity and corresponding decreased light transmittance (resulting in reduced biological productivity and adverse effects on aesthetic value); and (2) direct suffocation of benthic (bottom dwelling) communities due to excessive sediment deposition. In addition to these problems, sediment also provides a major transport mechanism for countless other pollutants. First priority should be placed on soil stabilization and erosion prevention, not sediment interception.

Permit Requirements

The General Construction Storm Water Permit contains the same three requirements as the General Industrial Storm Water Permit (see discussion above).

Industries/Construction Are Subject To Municipal Regulation

There is a "double" system of regulation for industrial storm water which is discharged through municipal conveyance systems. Such discharges are regulated by both the statewide general permit (industrial or construction) issued to the discharger and by the municipality subject to the areawide Municipal Storm Water Permit. It is the Regional Board's responsibility to enforce the general permits and the areawide Municipal Storm Water Permit. It is the responsibility of the municipality to enforce its own ordinances. The statewide general permits (industrial and construction) specifically require dischargers to comply with the lawful requirements of local agencies regarding discharges to storm water conveyance systems within their jurisdiction.



Highway

HIGHWAY RUNOFF CONTROL PROGRAM

Cars, trucks, and other vehicles are the major contributors to highway runoff pollution. Landscaping, highway maintenance, and highway construction also contribute to highway runoff pollution (see Table 4-9). An essential component of the NPDES storm water program is the implementation of practices for maintaining

public highways that reduce impacts on receiving waters from highway runoff.

However, cities and counties (permittees) do not have jurisdiction over public highways controlled by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). To comply with the requirements of the NPDES storm water program, Caltrans must either actively participate as an entity in the Area Wide storm water program, or obtain a separate NPDES permit for storm water discharges for highways under its jurisdiction. Such a program for Caltrans shall include a Storm Water Management Plan which addresses the design, construction, and maintenance of highway facilities relative to reducing pollutants in highway discharges to the maximum extent practicable. The Plan shall include:

- a characterization of Caltrans highway systems, including pollutants, highway layout, and drainage control system in the area;

- a description of existing highway runoff control measures;
- a description of additional highway runoff control measures to enhance pollutant removal; and
- a plan for monitoring the effectiveness of control measures and highway runoff water quality and pollutant loads.

The highway runoff management plan shall specifically address litter control, proper pesticide/ herbicide management, reduction of direct discharges, reduction of runoff velocity, landscape over-watering, use of grassed channels, curb elimination, catch basin maintenance, appropriate street cleaning, establishing and maintaining vegetation, infiltration practices, and detention/ retention practices. Caltrans shall coordinate its urban runoff program with local agencies and existing programs related to the reduction of pollutants in highway runoff.

Table 4-9. Highway Runoff Constituents and their Primary Sources

CONSTITUENT	PRIMARY SOURCES
Particulates	Pavement wear, vehicles, maintenance
Nitrogen, Phosphorus	Atmosphere, roadside fertilizer application
Lead	Tire wear (lead oxide filler material, lubricating oil and grease, bearing wear)
Zinc	Tire wear (filler material), motor oil (stabilizing additive), grease
Iron	Auto body rust, steel highway structures (guard rails, bridges, etc.), moving engine parts
Copper	Metal plating, bearing and bushing wear, moving engine parts, brake lining wear, fungicides and insecticides
Cadmium	Tire wear (filler material), insecticide application
Chromium	Metal plating, moving engine parts, brake lining wear
Nickel	Diesel fuel and gasoline (exhaust), lubricating oil, metal plating, bushing wear, brake lining wear, asphalt paving
Manganese	Moving engine parts
Cyanide	Anticake compound used to keep deicing salt granular (ferric ferrocyanide, sodium ferrocyanide, yellow prussiate of soda)
Sodium, Calcium, Chloride	Deicing salts
Sulphate	Roadway beds, fuel, deicing salts
Petroleum	Spills, leaks or blow-by of motor lubricants, antifreeze and hydraulic fluids, asphalt surface leachate

COASTAL NONPOINT POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

COASTAL ZONE ACT REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS ~~(CZARA)~~



Imperial Beach

In 1990, Congress amended the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). The amendments are referred to as the Coastal Zone Act

Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA). Section 6217, "*Protecting Coastal Waters*", of CZARA established the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program. Section 6217 of CZARA requires USEPA to develop, and states to implement, enforceable "*management measures*" (i.e., BMPs) to control nonpoint source pollution in coastal waters. The definition of the "*coastal zone*" in California was expanded to encompass the entire state.

Like the NPDES storm water permitting program, implementation of the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program is still evolving. As of the 1994 Basin Plan update, USEPA has published management measures, which are collectively referred to as the "(g) guidance", pursuant to section 6217(g) of the CZARA. There are six major categories of nonpoint sources addressed by the (g) guidance, including: agriculture sources, forestry, urban areas, marinas, hydromodification projects and wetlands.

The storm water NPDES permitting program under the Clean Water Act and the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program section under CZARA are intended to be complimentary but exclusive of each other. In other words, the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program applies only to nonpoint sources that are not currently regulated under an NPDES storm water permit. This includes all of the traditional non-urban nonpoint sources such as agriculture and silviculture and those urban sources which are not currently subject to the NPDES storm water

permitting program. Examples of the latter in 1994 include some municipalities with populations under 100,000; construction sites disturbing less than 5 acres; and storm water discharges from wholesale, retail, service, or commercial activities.

The key concept is that all nonpoint pollution sources, both urban and non-urban (including those that become point sources), are currently subject to regulation under either the NPDES Storm Water Permitting Program required under section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act or the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program required under section 6217 of the ~~Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA)~~.

AGRICULTURE

In the San Diego Region, agriculture ranks as the fourth largest industry in the economy and accounts for 1.7 percent of the Region's economy. The coastal and inland valley areas of the county possess a moderate and virtually frost-free climate able to support a variety of sub-tropical crops, making the San Diego area a unique agricultural region. The primary crops being grown for the national and international markets are avocados, citrus, cut flowers, and nursery products. To a lesser extent, local fresh market crops and livestock are produced in the area.

The San Diego County Water Authority (Authority) is the largest agricultural water consuming agency within Metropolitan Water District (MWD), requiring approximately 50 percent of MWD's total agricultural water supply each year. Agricultural water use within the Authority is concentrated mainly in north county agencies such as Rainbow MWD, Valley Center MWD, Fallbrook PUD and Yuima MWD.

Pursuant to the ~~Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA)~~ section 6217 (g), USEPA has identified management measures to protect coastal waters from sources of nonpoint pollution from agriculture. Specifically, the (g) Guidance for agriculture contains management measures to address erosion from cropland, applying nutrients to cropland, applying pesticides to cropland, confined animal facilities, land used for grazing, and cropland irrigation.

The three most significant water quality impacts from agriculture in the San Diego Region are:

- erosion of agricultural soils;
- agricultural irrigation return water (salt loading and applied chemicals); and
- confined animal facilities.

Basic information on each impact is summarized below.

EROSION CONTROL

Erosion is a problem, not only in terms of the loss of agricultural production, but also because it degrades important aquatic habitat. Eroded soils can bury benthic communities, cover spawning grounds, destabilize channel banks and fill sensitive wetland areas. Furthermore, other pollutants are often bound to eroded soils. Under certain conditions, these pollutants may be remobilized into the water column causing problems for human health, wildlife, and aquatic resources.

The State and Regional Boards have adopted narrative standards that prohibit the impairment of aquatic habitat from erosion. However, no specific numeric standard limiting sediment loads has been established. Implementation of effective management practices to control erosion is typically accomplished through the combined efforts of several agencies working with landowners. Local Resource Conservation Districts, with technical assistance from the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, help landowners prevent erosion problems. The University of California, Agricultural Extension Service also assists in developing management practices and informing growers of optimum strategies for soil fertility and stabilization. Additionally, the U.S. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service provides grants and low interest loans to farmers for improvements which retain valuable topsoil in cultivated areas.

AGRICULTURAL IRRIGATION RETURN WATER

Agricultural irrigation return water is the wastewater which runs off or leaches through an irrigated area. The two major concerns with agricultural irrigation return water are salt loading and the release of applied chemicals.

SALT LOADING

Since the water supply in the San Diego Region is generally quite high in salts and the climate is dry, irrigation with this relatively saline water causes salt accumulation in the soil. Crop roots absorb only essentially pure water while leaving dissolved salts behind. If these salts are not leached out by regularly applying more irrigation water than is needed for evapotranspiration, salts accumulate in the root zone and the land eventually becomes too salty for agriculture. However, the saline soils may be reclaimed by leaching. The percolation of the water used to leach salts from the soil can be a serious source of ground water degradation.

The actual effect of irrigation return water on ground water quality in the Region is difficult to determine without further study. The construction of irrigation return water drain tiles to collect and transport return flows is a possible remedial measure that could be implemented in certain portions of the Region. This has not been considered necessary to date and no plans for such construction are presently pending.

APPLIED CHEMICALS

Modern agriculture is based on the extensive use of applied chemicals such as fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides to obtain high crop yields. The improper use of these applied chemicals may lead to serious degradation of both ground water and surface water quality. Some of the chemicals applied to farm land move down with deep-percolation water from crop root zones and can contaminate underlying ground water. Surface waters are primarily contaminated by the runoff of irrigated agriculture containing sediments, nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen, pesticides, and other pollutants.

The release of applied chemicals, into surface and ground waters can have adverse effects on the quality of those waters and the beneficial uses supported by them. Aquatic toxicity, as measured by toxicity bioassay tests, has been found in many waters within the State. The application of agricultural chemicals, in some cases, has been linked directly to this toxicity and is suspect in many other impaired water bodies. In addition to degradation of the aquatic environment, the contamination of ground and surface waters by pesticides and fertilizers is

believed to also pose a threat to human health. Pesticides for example are known to bioaccumulate.

The Basin Plan contains a water quality objective requiring that all waters be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. The Basin Plan also contains a water quality objective for pesticides requiring that no individual pesticide or combination of pesticides be present in the water column, sediments, or biota at concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Although the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) controls the application and use of agricultural pesticides, regulation of the quality of agricultural runoff waters is the responsibility of the State and regional boards. The regional boards have adopted water quality standards that apply to all surface waters of the State. Although standards for certain metals and some older pesticides have been adopted, standards for the majority of currently used agricultural chemicals do not exist. Generally, narrative standards which prohibit toxicity and degradation of water-bodies apply to agricultural discharges as do specific toxicity standards. To implement these standards, the regional boards have relied on a number of voluntary efforts and a concerted effort to educate growers on the need to protect water-bodies from the adverse effects of farm chemicals. The State Board also uses grant funds to support implementation of projects which demonstrate improved management practices.

In coordination with DPR, the regional boards have begun to put restrictions on the use of certain agricultural chemicals to address water quality problems. DPR has the responsibility to condition the use of any agricultural chemical to ensure its safe use. Where DPR has been convinced of the significant potential to cause environmental problems, it has established restrictions on the application, release, or timing of pesticide applications. DPR also encourages changes in formulations or in the combinations of pesticides applied in order to minimize water quality problems. An overall integrated pest management program for each agricultural site, rather than sole reliance on pesticides is needed.

There are other reasons to be concerned with the judicious use of agricultural chemicals


(in addition to environmental issues). These interests are often concerned with questions of production and profit. To the extent that the application of agricultural chemicals are limited for cost control reasons, these concerns often result in benefits for water quality as well.

The narrative and/or numeric nutrient objectives presented in this Basin Plan are also applicable to irrigation return water. The State Board may require the use of pollutant control techniques to implement irrigation water management in its water rights permits or through Nonpoint Source Management Plan.

Irrigation water management may be implemented through reducing the use of fertilizers and pesticides to levels which minimize their presence in irrigation return water, as well as through the implementation of irrigation systems which reduce the volume of return water.

IRRIGATION WATER

In 1992, two laws were passed which require agricultural water suppliers delivering more than 50,000 ~~AF/Y acre-foot of water per year~~ to prepare water management plans (CWC, [sections §10800](#) and [§10904](#)). The plans are to focus on water conservation measures, improved irrigation efficiency, and environmental enhancement. The Department of Water Resources has established an advisory committee to review and study irrigation practices for these purposes. The implementation of conservation plans will likely have a side benefit of reduced erosion as irrigation efficiency improves.



Dairy

DAIRIES – CONFINED ANIMAL FACILITIES

Problems associated with dairy operations in the San Diego Region include ground water mineralization, the addition of nitrates to ground water, surface runoff of biodegradable and suspended material, nuisance odors, the addition of nutrients to adjacent surface water streams and other miscellaneous problems. All dairies in the Region are regulated under waste discharge requirements. These waste discharge requirements implement the regulations for confined animal facilities contained in CCR,

Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15, Article 6, sections 2560-2565.

The major requirements contained in waste discharge requirements for dairies are as follows:

- (1) Dairies must be designed and constructed to retain all facility wastewater generated, together with all precipitation on, and drainage through manured areas during a 25-year, 24-hour storm.
- (2) All precipitation and surface drainage outside of manured areas, including that collected from roofed areas, and runoff from tributary areas during the storm events described in subsection (1) of this section, shall be diverted away from manured areas, unless such drainage is fully retained.
- (3) Retention ponds and manured areas at dairies must be protected from inundation or washout by overflow from any stream channel during 20-year peak stream flows. Existing facilities that are protected against 100-year peak stream flows must continue to provide such protection.
- (4) New facilities shall be protected against 100-year peak stream flows.
- (5) Retention ponds shall be lined with or underlain by soils which contain at least 10 percent clay and not more than 10 percent gravel or artificial materials of equivalent impermeability.
- (6) Facility wastewater, collected precipitation and drainage may be discharged to properly operated use or disposal fields or to wastewater treatment facilities approved by the Regional Board.

Regional Board Dairy Waste Management Policy (Resolution No. 87-71)

The Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 87-71, "A Resolution Adopting Amendments to the Comprehensive Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Region" (Regional Board Dairy Waste Management Policy) on November 16, 1987. On March 17, 1988, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 88-35 approving the Regional Board Dairy Waste Management Policy with a few minor changes.

The Regional Board Dairy policy contained in Resolution No. 87-71 is incorporated below; accordingly Resolution No. 87-71 is superseded.

The Regional Board regulatory program on dairy waste disposal is designed to be a part of the Basin Plan. The program is based upon the following principles to ensure that the goals of the Basin Plan are implemented:

- (1) The Regional Board is committed to the reasonable protection of present and future beneficial uses of ground water.
- (2) Coordination among state, federal, and local agricultural and regulatory agencies, the dairy industry, local planning and land-use agencies is necessary to resolve potential water quality problems associated with dairies.
- (3) Cooperation between this Regional Board and the dairy industry is required when developing and implementing measures to achieve conformance with the Basin Plan ground water objectives.
- (4) Comprehensive assessments of salt loading on the ground water basins in the San Diego Region are necessary to develop reasonable and cost effective water quality protection measures for all nonpoint and point sources of waste.
- (5) An interim dairy wasteload regulatory program is necessary until the assessment studies noted in Principle 4 are completed. The interim program should provide a simple, region-wide approach to controlling dairy wasteloads, that may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis if necessary. The program should be easy to understand, easy to implement and enforce and provide greater protection of water quality than present practices.

As part of an overall program of dairy waste management, the following measures shall be implemented:

- (1) The Regional Board shall continue to enforce all State and Federal water quality laws, and regulations regarding dairy waste treatment and disposal, including Chapter 15, Title 23 [CCR](#)~~California Code of~~

Regulations and USEPA Effluent Guidelines and Standards for feedlots point source category (40 CFR 412).

- (2) The Regional Board shall continue to seek funding to conduct the necessary studies and develop computer models to provide an accurate assessment of existing and projected wasteloads in the various ground water basins.
- (3) Based upon the results of the studies described in item 2, the Regional Board will revise Basin Plan ground water objectives if warranted and specify or revise wasteload limits that will be appropriate for the point and nonpoint sources of waste, including dairies if necessary.
- (4) For an interim period, until the necessary ground water assimilative capacity and wasteload assessment studies are completed, the Regional Board shall limit the disposal of corral manure to dairy disposal land to no more than 3 tons dry weight or 10 cubic yards per acre per year, and to cropland where crops are grown and harvested twice annually, to no more than 12 tons dry weight per acre per year. The Regional Board shall consider manure application higher than the 12 tons per acre per year limit upon demonstration that the crops require the increased manure loadings.
- (5) The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, University of California at Riverside, the State and County Departments of Agriculture and other governmental and educational institutions are encouraged to provide dairy operators with the latest technical information regarding waste disposal practices that would result in additional water quality protection.
- (6) The local land use and planning agencies are encouraged to conduct long-term planning for addressing water quality issues of new and expanded dairies in the region. The dairy industry is encouraged to provide accurate five-year projections of dairy herds at existing dairies and potential locations for new dairies to the planning agencies and to the Regional Board, so that the Board may include the required

Basin Plan studies as part of the Board's triennial review process.


- (7) The Regional Board will continue to obtain and review technical information regarding the hydrologic basins and to recommend the update of Basin Plan standards if warranted.
- (8) The Regional Board encourages the implementation of water conservation measures at dairies, and the beneficial reuse of dairy farm wastewater that would replace the use of imported water.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

Currently erosion and sediment control is accomplished primarily by way of the municipal and construction storm water permits (see previous discussion).

In 1987, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board implemented a policy for the control of human induced erosion and sedimentation. This policy is presented below. The Regional Board deferred the implementation of regulatory programs for erosion and sedimentation control to local government agencies. The local Resource Conservation Districts have agreements with the Regional Board regarding erosion and sediment control.

Soil erosion resulting from a wide variety of causes, including construction, hillside cultivation and other agricultural activities, non-maintained roads, and off road vehicles may



Santa Margarita River

result in serious water quality impacts. The goal of the policy is the protection of water quality through the reduction and prevention of accelerated (man-caused) erosion to the level necessary to restore and protect beneficial uses of receiving waters now significantly impaired or threatened by impairment due to sedimentation through the implementation of

the Best Soil Management Practices (BMPs). Construction sites can contribute runoff into storm drains at rates 100 to 2,000 times greater than non-developed sites, due to the large amounts of soil that are usually uncovered. Property owners are held responsible for all activities and practices that may cause an adverse impact on water quality due to waste discharges and surface runoff from their lands.

Sediment and erosion control is particularly important in areas with, or that drain into, delicate habitats such as lagoons, floodplains and some waterways. Lagoons are particularly sensitive to influx of silts and nutrients, which may cause severe turbidity and eutrophication problems. Severe amounts of silt may cause a lagoon to eventually become infilled. Siltation also damages tributaries and riparian corridors leading to the lagoons.

Poor agricultural grading practices may cause significant erosion of the soil, causing heavy sediment, nutrient and possibly herbicide and pesticide runoff loads to be discharged into nearby surface waters.

In most cases, the adverse results of man's activities can be reduced and in some instances eliminated through the use of both structural and non-structural measures of various types that are properly employed at the appropriate time. The high cost of lost resources, resource replenishment and after-the-fact repair and maintenance make both pre-project erosion control planning and preventive maintenance necessary.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PROGRAM (RESOLUTION NO. 87-91)

Regional Board Resolution No. 87-91 entitled, "A Resolution Adopting Amendments to the Comprehensive Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Region" (Erosion and Sediment Control Program) was adopted on December 21, 1987. The Regional Board Erosion and Sediment Control Program contained in Resolution No. 87-91 is incorporated below; accordingly Resolution No. 87-91 is superseded.

GOAL OF PROGRAM

The goal of the Regional Board's erosion control program is the protection of water quality through the reduction and prevention of accelerated (man-caused) erosion to the level necessary to restore and protect beneficial uses of receiving waters now significantly impaired, or threatened by impairment, by sediment.

MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

- (1) Property owners are considered ultimately responsible for all activities and practices that could result in adverse affects on water quality from waste discharges and from surface runoff.
- (2) Local units of government should have the lead role in controlling land use and construction activities that cause erosion and may, as necessary, impose further conditions, restrictions, or limitations on waste disposal and other activities that might degrade the quality of waters of the State.
- (3) ~~Best Management Practices~~ (BMPs) should be implemented to reduce erosion and sedimentation and minimize adverse affects on water quality.

REGIONAL BOARD IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

- (1) Local governments shall be encouraged to develop effective erosion and sedimentation control ordinances and regulatory programs that are at least equivalent to the model ordinance in the "Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook" published by the California Department of Conservation, May 1981.
- (2) If necessary, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Management Agreement could be adopted to more clearly define the cooperative roles between the local units of government and the Regional Board.
- (3) The Regional Board may participate with other concerned agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Game, the Resource Conservation Districts, the various lagoon foundations, etc., to identify

watersheds, coastal lagoons and estuaries with critical erosion and sediment problems. The Regional Board may assist in the assessment of such problems and causes, and assist in the development of alternative measures to prevent future problems.

- (4) As time and resources permit, the Regional Board will review existing local grading ordinances to determine the adequacy of the ordinances to provide effective erosion control. The Regional Board may then recommend specific improvements to the ordinances for consideration by the local agencies. If necessary, the Regional Board may request a report on the implementation of the Board's recommendation.
- (5) If necessary, the Regional Board may request periodic status reports of construction and grading activities from local agencies to determine the effectiveness and potential problems with the implementation of local erosion and sediment control program.
- (6) The Regional Board shall encourage the Resource Conservation Districts to review and update if necessary, their erosion control ordinances in order to develop more effective programs for erosion and sediment control for agricultural activities. Local units of government are encouraged to take a more active role in addressing erosion problems from agricultural activities.

THE ELSINORE-MURRIETA-ANZA RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT SEDIMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE (RESOLUTION NO. 79-25) AND THE RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL POLICY (RESOLUTION NO. 92-21)

The Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza Resource Conservation District and the Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs) of San Diego County were established to provide for the

conservation of soil and water resources and for the prevention and control of soil erosion and sediment damage due to agricultural and other land use activities.

The RCDs establish guidelines for land management programs by adopting ~~Best Management Practices (BMPs)~~ such as those presented in the Soil Conservation Service Technical Guide covering San Diego County. Currently, farmers and other land owners contact the RCDs on a voluntary basis for assistance in developing individual erosion and sediment control programs which conform to the BMPs.

In order to assure that all farmers and other land owners operate under the Resource Conservation Districts BMP guidelines, and to better address the existing and potential water pollution problems caused by agriculture and other land uses, the RCDs have adopted sediment control ordinances and policies (e.g., Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza Resource Conservation District Sediment Control Ordinance and the Resource Conservation Districts of San Diego County Erosion and Sediment Control Policy). These documents formally adopt the Soil Conservation Service's BMPs and define the existing and expanded functions and responsibilities of the RCDs. These documents also suggest means by which the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, can assist the RCDs in implementation of the policy.

The Resource Conservation District Sediment Control Ordinance, and the Erosion and Sediment Control Policy establish the duties of the Regional Board and the RCD's as outlined below. The Resource Conservation Districts will implement these documents as follows:

- (1) Continue to assist farmers and other land owners in establishing management programs which comply with BMPs.
- (2) Authorize any of its directors to file a formal complaint against any person who is causing or permitting any accelerated erosion and sediment damage.
- (3) Take action against any person causing or permitting any accelerated erosion and sediment damage.
 - (A) Receive complaints from RCD directors, land occupiers, or city, state and county

officials responsible for the maintenance of water quality in the jurisdictions.

(B) Conduct hearings of the Resource Conservation District Board of Directors on complaints. If the complaint is valid, the "land disturber" is allowed two months to develop and implement a voluntary conservation plan.

(C) Request action by the Regional Board if compliance schedules are not followed or if further noncompliance occurs, when such noncompliance results in the intentional or negligent discharge or deposition of any waste where it is, or probably will be discharged into the waters of the state or creates or threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance.

The Regional Board will assist the Resource Conservation Districts in implementing the Erosion and Sediment Control Policy by doing the following:

- (1) Inform the appropriate RCD of instances when the staff of the Regional Board finds that accelerated erosion damage has occurred or is likely to occur as a result of violations of the BMP guidelines.
- (2) Receive requests for action on complaints from the RCDs when compliance schedules have not been met or when further noncompliance has occurred, and consider appropriate enforcement action pursuant to section 13304 (a) of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

RESOURCE EXTRACTION

SAND, GRAVEL AND RELATED OPERATIONS

The sand and gravel related processing industry represents one of the largest single classes of industry in the San Diego Region. Construction activities in the Region will require a continuing need for sand and gravel products. The industry can generally be classified as follows:

- Sand and gravel processing (including rock crushing);

- Concrete batching;
- Asphalt batching;
- Asphalt product manufacturing;
- Concrete product manufacturing; and
- Clay and clay product processing.

The largest volume of waste from sand and gravel processing operations results from product washing. Many of the sedimentary deposits mined for sand and gravel in the San Diego Region contain a high percentage of silt and clay. Extensive washing is required to remove the fine material. Other waste includes cement truck wash water, sediment separated from the wash water, and rejected product (broken brick, block, pipe etc).

Recycled wash waters are discharged to storage ponds and can contain high concentrations of total dissolved solids because of evaporation and leaching from product materials. The percolation of these recycled waters can adversely affect ground water quality. It is recognized that the permeability of the ponds receiving the wash waters is low because of the sealing effects of silts and clay sediments in the wash water. Sediment and wash water discharged to surface waters can adversely affect aquatic life through sediment deposition and increases in turbidity.

Many sand and gravel operations are regulated with waste discharge requirements (WDR). The waste discharge requirements prohibit the discharge of sand and gravel wash water to surface waters. The requirements also require that waste holding ponds have 100-year frequency flood protection. Resolution No. 83-21 entitled, "A Resolution Conditionally Waiving Adoption of Waste Discharge Requirements for Certain Specific Types of Discharges" conditionally waives WDRs for sand and gravel mining operations not conducted in flowing streams. Sand and gravel mining operations are subject to regulation under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Before a section 404 permit can be obtained, the discharger must obtain water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act. See previous discussion of Water Quality Certification (section 401).

Many mining operations are subject to California's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 and the federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) of 1977. These laws, which have similar provisions, require reclamation of mined lands in order to protect public health and safety and to prevent or minimize adverse environmental effects such as water quality degradation, flooding, erosion, and sedimentation. Additionally, SMCRA requires mine operators to establish baseline hydrologic conditions; in the event that adjacent waters are contaminated, diminished, or interrupted, SMCRA further requires mine operators to replace the water supply.

Under SMARA regulations (California Public Resources Code (section 3505, Article 1), mining operators must:

- Control soil erosion by minimizing removal of vegetation and overburden, managing stockpiles, and constructing erosion control facilities;
- Control water quality by constructing settling ponds and basins and conducting operations in such a way as to prevent siltation of ground water recharge areas;
- Protect fish and wildlife habitat by taking "*reasonable measures*";
- Protect natural drainage ways by proper placement and control of mine waste rock and overburden piles or dumps; and
- Control erosion and drainage by grading and revegetation, and construction of basins to impound surface runoff, and protection of spillways from erosion.

FLOOD CONTROL

In a natural setting, the dynamic nature of water creates an ever changing stream channel within the floodplain. In the San Diego Region, where rainfall is extremely variable, flood plains which appear to be dry one year, may contain tremendous torrents the following year. Sometimes the dry appearance of the flood plain has made people mistakenly think flood waters do not occur there. The dry appearance of a portion of the flood plain is deceptive. Floods are a natural part of any flood plain. Flood plains cannot be fully protected against floods.

In the past, developments clustered near or within the flood plain. Flood control channels were constructed to protect these properties. Flood control channels were built to constrict the flood plain and to allow maximum development on adjacent lands. These developments increased the amount of impervious area (roads, buildings, parking lots and other structures) and increased local storm runoff. Storm water, which prior to development would have been absorbed into the soil, instead filled local storm drains. Thus, the precipitation which might at one time have caused local flooding caused intensified downstream flooding.

Today, many flood plains have been channelized to protect property. There are a variety of channel designs which have been built. Channel designs vary in range from completely natural to entirely concrete lined with concrete bottoms. Other channel types include natural channels modified to contain a low-flow channel with or without side filling or riprap or concrete; and with or without encroachment by agriculture and/or urban areas.



Rose Canyon Creek

IMPACTS OF CHANNELIZATION

To the degree that a natural watercourse is channelized, the negative impacts to the watershed are increased. The following impacts occur with channelization:

- (1) Channel modification and channelization of streams induces changes in land use practices. The resulting change in land use practices often results in detrimental changes to surface water quality.

- (2) With future increases in the urbanization of an area, the impervious area increases, contributing additional storm water runoff. Flood channels were built to contain a certain design flow and the design flow can be exceeded by additional storm water runoff.
- (3) As the flood plain is constricted and confined within a channel, the potential damage from storm runoff is increased.
- (4) Channelization reduces ground water recharge.
- (5) Impervious channels designed to remove the runoff quickly also transport pollutants down the flood control system just as quickly. Most of the surface water runoff from urban areas flows into flood control channels without any mechanism to control the input of toxics.
- (6) Channelization results in the direct loss of instream habitat. Fish and other aquatic life are totally dependent upon the surface waters within floodplains.
- (7) Channelization results in the loss of riparian habitat.
- (8) Channelization causes an increase in ambient stream temperatures within and downstream from the channelized section. The rise in stream temperature may degrade the habitat for aquatic life.
- (9) The loss of riparian areas through channelization results in the loss of wildlife. Riparian areas are the most important habitat for the majority of western wildlife species, and are essential for many wildlife species.
- (10) Loss of riparian areas results in a loss of the buffering capacity of the riparian vegetation to moderate flows.
- (11) Loss of the riparian areas results in a loss of the natural filtering capacity that these areas provide. The natural filtering capacity of riparian areas reduces the concentration of potentially toxic constituents in storm water runoff. Riparian areas provide an

improvement in the quality of water produced from the watershed.

- (12) Stream and riparian habitats are needed to provide corridors for fish and wildlife resources. A highly modified concrete channel may not allow for fish or wildlife passage. Even a limited section of concrete channel can disconnect habitats. The separation of habitats reduces the viability of fish and wildlife populations.

CONCLUSION

Channel modifications need to be evaluated for their ultimate consequences for the watershed. In California's past there was inadequate consideration towards the retention of wetlands, riparian systems, and natural flood plains. The economic assessment of flood control alternatives should consider any proposed project in its entirety. Wetlands, riparian systems and natural flood plains accommodate natural stream meandering, aggradation, degradation and overbank flow better than those lands directly encroached upon by development.

Consideration and utilization of methods to reduce storm water runoff and allow infiltration and percolation of storm waters are needed. Methods should include minimizing the further construction of flood control channels, particularly concrete channels, and the retention of riparian areas within floodplains. Riparian areas within flood plains need to be protected in order to allow the natural filtering capacity of the riparian area to improve the quality of storm water produced from the watershed; and to preserve alluvial percolation capacity and aquatic habitat values. When possible riparian areas need to be restored.

Riparian and stream habitats provide natural beauty which is appreciated and valued by people. Riparian and stream habitats, especially in urban areas, are vital to enhancing our quality of life. People are far more likely to respect and be stewards of "*natural*" reaches of streams than channelized or artificially modified reaches. Riparian lands represent a significant value to society.



Noble Canyon Creek

FUTURE DIRECTION: WATERSHED - BASED WATER QUALITY CONTROL

The concept of comprehensive watershed level management of water resources is currently being incorporated into various elements of the State's Nonpoint Source Management Program. The watershed protection approach is an integrated strategy for more effectively protecting and restoring beneficial uses of state waters. By looking at an entire watershed, one can more clearly identify critical areas and practices which need to be targeted for pollution prevention and corrective actions. This approach not only addresses the waterbody itself, but the geographic area which drains to the watercourse. This strategy also integrates both surface and ground waters, inland and coastal waters, and point and nonpoint sources of pollution. Point sources have received most of the regulatory attention in the past, however, significant improvements in point sources, coupled with continued water quality impairments, have necessitated that the water resources community look at a more integrated approach which considers impacts from both point and nonpoint sources of pollutants.

The Watershed Protection Approach is built on the following three main principles:

- The target watersheds should be those where pollution poses the greatest risk to human health, ecological resources, desirable uses of the water, or a combination of these;
- All parties with a stake in the specific local situation should participate in the analysis of the problems and the creation of solutions; and
- The actions undertaken should draw on the full range of methods and tools available, integrating them into a coordinated, multi-organizational attack on the problems.

Many agencies and organizations concerned with water resources have come to recognize that this type of approach can be very effective in realistically assessing cumulative impacts and formulating workable mitigation strategies. The ~~CZARA Coastal Zone Management Act Re-authorization Amendments~~, USEPA guidance, and various legislative proposals clearly state the

need to consider the implications of land use on water quality. USEPA program managers are re-thinking their approach to the allocation of resources (especially within the Nonpoint Source Program) and will be primarily funding studies that are part of a watershed planning and implementation effort.

The traditional approach to managing pollutant discharges into streams, lakes, and the ocean has evolved over time, often with separate programs to address various aspects of the total water quality problem. Some of these programs have different, overlapping, or conflicting priorities. Moving from the more facility-specific controls of the past to management of water quality on a watershed basis, will entail some growing pains. Many of the programs at our disposal will need to be reshaped and integrated at the watershed level. Some programs will need to be reoriented and integrated, while other programs may not be amenable to the watershed approach. Nonetheless, public agencies and private organizations concerned with water resources have come to recognize that a comprehensive evaluation of pollutant contributions on a watershed scale is the only way to realistically assess cumulative impacts and formulate workable strategies to truly protect our water resources. Both water pollution and habitat degradation problems can best be solved by following a basin-wide approach.

REMEDICATION OF POLLUTION



Underground storage tank

The Regional Board allocates substantial resources to the investigation of polluted waters and enforcement of corrective actions needed to restore water quality. Specific remediation programs include:

- Underground Storage Tanks Program including the Local Oversight Program;
- Spills, Leaks, Investigation and Cleanup Program (SLIC);
- Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Program; and

- [DoD](#) ~~Department of Defense~~ Site Investigations.

The Regional Board sets cleanup goals based on the State's Antidegradation Policy set forth in State Board Resolution No. 68-16 and Resolution No. 92-49 Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code section 13304 and the Cleanup and Abatement Policy discussed later in this chapter. Under these policies, whenever the existing quality of water is better than that needed to protect present and potential beneficial uses, such existing quality will be maintained, with certain exceptions (as described in Chapter 5, Plans and Policies). Accordingly, the Regional Board prescribes cleanup goals that are based upon background concentrations. For those cases where dischargers have demonstrated that cleanup goals based on background concentrations cannot be attained due to technological and economic limitations, the Antidegradation Policy sets forth policy for cleanup and abatement based on the protection of beneficial uses. The Regional Board can, on a case-by-case basis, set cleanup goals as close to background as technologically and economically feasible. Such goals must at a minimum, restore and protect all designated beneficial uses of the waters.

Furthermore, such cleanup levels cannot result in water quality less than that prescribed in the Basin Plan and policies adopted by the State and Regional Board, and must be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State.



Naval Base Point Loma (submarine facility)
Copyright © 2002-2004 Kenneth & Gabrielle Adelman
California Coastal Record Project www.californiacoastline.org

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS

The Underground Storage Tank Program was enacted in 1983 and took effect January 1, 1984. The authority for the program is found in the Health and Safety Code,

Division 20, Chapter 6.7, and the regulations for the program are found in the [CCR California Code of Regulations](#), Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16. The regulations are designed to ensure the integrity of all underground storage tanks (UST), and to detect any leaks.

There are approximately 2,000 known cases of leaking underground storage tanks in the Region. Approximately 35 percent of the cases involve instances where only soil contamination is present, 35 percent involve instances where ground water contamination has been confirmed, and the remaining 30 percent are cases which have been closed. The majority of the releases from these underground storage tanks are gasoline and the constituent of most concern is benzene, a known carcinogen. A smaller percentage of the underground storage tank releases involve chlorinated industrial solvents, which are suspected carcinogens. As anticipated, the majority of the sites where these releases have occurred are automotive service stations. Tanks from industrial facilities contribute a smaller but significant minority. To date, these ground water impacts have affected only a few drinking water supply wells. The Regional Board maintains and regularly updates the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System (LUSTIS) database, which identifies all known underground storage tank release sites in the Region.

Implementation of the underground storage tank program includes direct Regional Board oversight of leaking underground storage tank cleanups. It also involves coordination of oversight activities with local agencies under contract with the State Board through the Local Oversight Program. Local agencies have the authority, pursuant to section 25297.1 of the Health and Safety Code to act on behalf of the Regional Board in requiring investigations and cleanup of underground tank cases. The local agencies also implement the permitting, construction, inspections and monitoring portion of the Underground Tank Regulations. The Orange County Health Care Agency, the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health and San Diego County Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Services handle the vast majority of the active cases in the Region.

Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, Article 11 provides that corrective action of releases from

underground storage tanks includes one or more of the following phases:

- Preliminary Site Assessment Phase: This includes, at a minimum, initial site investigation, initial abatement actions and initial site characterization.
- Soil and Water Investigation Phase: This includes the collection and analysis of data necessary to assess the nature and vertical and lateral extent of the unauthorized release to determine a cost-effective method of cleanup.
- Corrective Action Plan Implementation Phase: This consists of carrying out the cost-effective alternative selected during the Soil and Water Investigation Phase for remediation or mitigation of the actual or potential adverse effects of the unauthorized release.
- Verification Monitoring Phase: This includes all activities required to verify implementation of the Corrective Action Plan and evaluate its effectiveness.

Cleanup levels for soil and ground water pollution resulting from leaking underground storage tanks will be established based on the Cleanup and Abatement Policy described later in this chapter.

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK CLEANUP FUND

The State Board, Division of Clean Water Programs, administers the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund. The Cleanup Fund can be used as a mechanism to satisfy federal financial responsibility requirements and pay for corrective action and third party liability costs resulting from a leaking petroleum underground storage tank. The Fund can also pay for direct cleanup (by local agency or regional board) of underground storage tank sites requiring emergency and prompt action on abandoned or recalcitrant sites. This Fund, collected by the Board of Equalization, is supported by a 0.6 cent per gallon fee for gasoline. The Fund has been established to provide reimbursement to tank owners or operators for costs of cleanup of the effects of unauthorized releases of petroleum. Up to one million dollars (\$1,000,000) can be provided per site, with the first ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) being provided by the claimant.

With certain qualifications, expenditures made to remediate an unauthorized petroleum release since January 1, 1988 can be reimbursed and letters of credit can be issued for the funding of ongoing remediation activities.

Owners/ operators of petroleum USTs as defined in section 25281(x) of the California Health and Safety Code and owners of petroleum USTs located on residential property who meet the following requirements are eligible for the fund:

- There has been an unauthorized release of petroleum from the UST reported to and confirmed by the regulatory agency.
- As a result of this unauthorized release, the owner/ operator must take corrective action as required by a regulatory agency.
- The owner/ operator must be in compliance with any applicable financial responsibility requirements and any UST requirements.

Regional boards provide technical support to both applicants who file claims against the underground storage tank Cleanup Fund and State Board staff members who verify the corrective action work that the claims cover. For claims that involve future work, the Regional Board will oversee site investigation and cleanup on cases for which they are the lead agency.

SPILLS, LEAKS, INVESTIGATION AND CLEANUP (SLIC)

Reports of unauthorized discharges, such as spills and leaks from above ground storage tanks are investigated through the Regional Board's Spills, Leaks, Investigation and Cleanup (SLIC) Program. This program is not restricted to particular pollutants or environments; rather, the program covers all types of pollutants (such as solvents, petroleum fuels, and heavy metals) and all environments (including surface and ground water, and the vadose zone). Upon confirming that an unauthorized discharge is polluting or threatens to pollute regional waterbodies, the Regional Board oversees site investigation and corrective action. Statutory authority for the program is derived from the ~~California~~ Water Code, ~~Division~~ 7, section 13304. Guidelines for site investigation and remediation are promulgated in State Board Resolution No. 92-49 as amended on April 21, 1994 entitled "*Policies and Procedures For*

Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304".

Cleanup levels for soil and ground water pollution resulting from sites investigated through the SLIC Program will be established based on the Cleanup and Abatement Policy described later in this chapter.

ABOVEGROUND PETROLEUM STORAGE TANKS

In order to prevent unauthorized discharges from aboveground petroleum storage tanks, the State of California has enacted legislation designed to lower the risk of spills and leaks. The state's Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act was enacted in 1989 and amended in 1991. The Act became effective on January 1, 1990 (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.67, [section §25270 et. seq.](#)) The Act requires owners or operators of above ground petroleum storage tanks to file a storage statement with the State Board and implement spill prevention measures. Examples of such measures include daily visual inspections of any storage tanks containing crude oil or its fractions, the installation of secondary containment for all tanks with sufficient capacity to hold the contents of the largest tank at the facility plus sufficient volume for rainfall to avoid the overflow, and development of a "Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan." In the event of an unauthorized release, the owner or operator must notify the Regional Board officials and undertake appropriate monitoring and corrective action. Additionally, annual fees are levied on tank owners. The Regional Board uses these fees to fund aboveground petroleum tank inspections and enforcement.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES

There are twenty-two major Department of Defense (DoD) facilities in the San Diego Region. The following is a list of DoD facilities and the corresponding lead agency for the facility in the Region.

Department of Defense Facility	Lead Agency
United States Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	USEPA
Coronado Navy Amphibious Base (NAVPHIBASE)	DTSC
Imperial Beach Auxiliary Landing Field	DTSC
Naval Air Station Miramar	DTSC
North Island Naval Aviation Depot	DTSC
Naval Air Station North Island	DTSC
San Diego Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center (FASWTC-PAC)	DTSC
San Diego Fleet Combat Training Center (FCTC-PAC)	DTSC
Marine Corp Recruit Depot, San Diego	DTSC
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC)	DTSC
San Diego Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station (NCTS)	DTSC
San Diego Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center (NESEC)	DTSC
San Diego Naval Hospital	DTSC
32 Street Naval Station, San Diego	DTSC
Naval Submarine Base, San Diego	DTSC
Fleet Industrial Supply Center	DTSC
San Diego Naval Training Center	DTSC
San Diego Public Works Center	DTSC
San Diego Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity	DTSC
Air Force Plant # 19, San Diego	DTSC
Fallbrook Naval Weapons Station	DTSC
Search, Evade, Resist, Escape (SERE) Camp, Warner Springs	DTSC

Significant ground water contamination has been detected at a number of these facilities. Contamination is severe enough at one of these facilities to have it placed on USEPA's National Priorities List (NPL) for remediation under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, commonly referred to as Superfund).

For the National Priority List facility (Camp Pendleton), the USEPA is the lead environmental regulatory agency for oversight of investigation and cleanup. CERCLA requires USEPA to consider applicable or relevant and appropriate state laws and regulations when establishing cleanup standards for remedial activities. To ensure that the state's concerns are properly addressed, two Cal-EPA agencies, the Regional Board and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), also perform a significant oversight role in the investigations and cleanup of these facilities.

The USEPA, DoD, DTSC and the Regional Board have signed Federal Facility Agreements (FFA) for the National Priorities List facility. The intent of the FFA is to ensure that: (1) environmental impacts are investigated; (2) remedial actions are defined; (3) procedural framework or schedules are established; (4) cooperation among agencies is facilitated; (5) adequate assessment is performed; and (6) compromise is reached.

The USEPA is not involved in the investigation and cleanup of DoD facilities that are not on the National Priority List (DoD facilities other than Camp Pendleton). However, many of the facilities potentially have significant contamination. In these cases, the Regional Board and DTSC enter into Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreements (FFSRA) with DoD. Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreements are very similar to the above-mentioned Federal Facility Agreements, with the exception that USEPA is not a party.

In the table above showing the ~~DoD Department of Defense Facilities~~ in the San Diego Region, the DTSC has been identified as the "lead" agency, and the Regional Board is the "support" agency. A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed by the State Board and DTSC which describes the roles of each agency. The Regional Board's oversight role is with regard to the investigation and cleanup of water resources that have been impacted, or are threatened, by waste discharges from the facilities. The Regional Board's responsibility also extends to source areas (landfills, contaminated soil, etc.) that currently, or may in the future, pose a threat to water quality. DTSC's role is to address all other environmental aspects including health risk assessment, air emissions, community relations, etc.

The State Board and DTSC have entered into a two-year cooperative agreement with the ~~DoD Department of Defense~~ for cleanup and oversight reimbursement. All work performed by the State agencies with regard to the investigation and cleanup of environmental problems at these facilities is fully reimbursed by DoD.

Cleanup levels for soil and ground water pollution resulting from ~~DoD Department of Defense~~ facilities will be established based on the Cleanup and Abatement Policy described later in this chapter.

CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT POLICY

I. CONTAMINATED SOIL AND GROUND WATER

The Regional Board has identified numerous sites where unauthorized waste discharges have resulted in soil and ground water pollution. The majority of these sites have been identified as a result of the Regional Board's implementation of the remediation programs described previously in this Chapter. The unauthorized waste discharges at many of these sites have resulted in adverse effects on water quality and beneficial uses. In some cases the polluted sites pose a threat to the public health. It is the responsibility of the Regional Board to establish cleanup and abatement goals and objectives for the protection of water quality and the beneficial uses of waters of the state in this Region which are consistent with applicable state and federal statutes and regulations.

Water Code section 13304 authorizes the Regional Board to require cleanup and abatement of soil and ground water pollution. The *Cleanup and Abatement Policy* described below shall apply to all types of discharges subject to Water Code section 13304.

II. PURPOSE OF POLICY

The purpose of this *Cleanup and Abatement Policy* is to provide:

- A. Guidance to dischargers involved in the investigation, cleanup and abatement of soil and ground water pollution sites to ensure these activities are in conformance with applicable state and federal laws, regulations and policies;

- B. Guidance to dischargers on Regional Board methodology for determining cleanup levels at soil and ground water pollution sites; and
- C. Consistency and uniformity in Regional Board requirements for investigation, cleanup and abatement of analogous discharges that involve similar wastes, site characteristics, and water quality considerations.

III. CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT PRINCIPLES

- A. *The Cleanup and Abatement Policy* is guided on the following principles, which are based on Water Code sections 13000 and 13304, ~~California Code of Regulations (CCR)~~, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15 (hereinafter Chapter 15), ~~CCR~~, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 (hereinafter Chapter 16), and applicable ~~State Water Resources Control Board (State Board)~~ policies. The Regional Board shall require:
 1. Cleanup and abatement actions to conform with the provisions of State Board Resolution No. 68-16 (*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*) provided that under no circumstances shall these provisions be interpreted to require cleanup and abatement which achieves water quality conditions that are better than "natural" background conditions.
 2. Cleanup and abatement actions to conform with the provisions of State Board Resolution No. 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges under Water Code section 13304;
 3. Cleanup and abatement actions to conform with applicable or relevant provisions of Chapter 15 to the extent feasible;
 4. Cleanup and abatement actions to implement the applicable provisions of Chapter 16 for investigations and

cleanup of hazardous substances from underground storage tanks; and

5. Dischargers to cleanup and abate the effects of discharges in a manner that promotes attainment of either background water quality, or the best water quality which is reasonable if background levels of water quality cannot be restored, considering all demands being made and to be made on those waters and the total values involved, beneficial and detrimental, economic and social, tangible and intangible. Any alternative cleanup levels less stringent than background shall apply section 2550.4 of Chapter 15, or, for cleanup and abatement associated with underground storage tanks, apply section 2725 of Chapter 16, provided that the Regional Board considers the conditions set forth in section 2550.4 of Chapter 15 in setting alternative cleanup levels pursuant to section 2725 of Chapter 16. Any such alternative cleanup level shall:

- a. Be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State;
- b. Not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of such water; and
- c. Not result in water quality less than prescribed in the *Water Quality Control Plans and Policies* adopted by the State and this Regional Board.

IV. CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT INVESTIGATIONS

A. The Regional Board shall apply the guidelines described in IV.B. below in overseeing investigations to determine the nature and extent of a discharge and appropriate cleanup and abatement measures. The level and complexity of the investigations, assessments, and feasibility studies of cleanup and abatement alternatives required below shall be determined by the discharge type, the extent of pollution, and

any other applicable site-specific characteristic(s).

B. The Regional Board shall require dischargers to:

1. Investigate the nature and extent of the discharge or threatened discharge to ensure that adequate cleanup plans are proposed. The goal of the investigation shall be to adequately characterize the pollutants in the discharge and determine the vertical and horizontal extent of pollution in soil and ground water. The investigation shall determine where concentrations of pollutants reach background levels. The investigation shall extend off-site to any location necessary to determine the source and assess the vertical and horizontal extent of the discharge.

2. Take immediate action to remove, treat, or contain pollution source(s) to the maximum extent practicable. Sources of pollution may include:

- a. Ongoing sources of discharge from storage or distribution systems for wastes or hazardous materials;
- b. Soils or ground water which are polluted with mobile or immobile concentrations of non-aqueous phase liquids (NAPLs);
- c. Soils which are polluted with leachable concentrations of soluble pollutants;
- d. Polluted soils which are eroded and transported to storm drains, abandoned or active wells, surface waters, or lands beyond the control of the discharger.

3. Submit the following information for consideration in establishing cleanup levels in accordance with the conditions set forth in Chapter 15, section 2550.4:

- a. An assessment of the adverse effects on ground water quality and beneficial uses;
- b. A risk assessment to determine impacts and threats to human health and the environment; and
- c. A feasibility study of cleanup alternatives which compares effectiveness, relative cost, and time to attain the following alternative cleanup levels;

- (1) background levels; levels
- (2) levels which meet all applicable water quality objectives and do not pose significant risks to health or the environment, and
- (3) an alternate cleanup level in between the cleanup levels described in (1) and (2) above which meets the requirements as specified in section III.A.5. of this Cleanup and Abatement Policy.

- 4. Provide documentation that plans and reports are prepared by professionals qualified to prepare such reports, and that all investigative, and cleanup and abatement activities are conducted under the direction of appropriately qualified professionals. Professionals should be qualified, licensed where applicable, and competent and proficient in the fields pertinent to the required activities. A statement of qualifications of the responsible lead professionals shall be included in all plans and reports submitted by the discharger.

V. APPROVAL of CLEANUP LEVELS

- A. The Regional Board shall approve soil and ground water cleanup levels through the adoption or affirmation of cleanup and abatement orders; or
- B. The Executive Officer or a local agency may approve cleanup levels as

appropriately delegated by the Regional Board.

VI. GROUND WATER CLEANUP LEVELS

- A. Ground water cleanup levels shall be based on:

- 1. The provisions of State Board Resolution No. 68-16, *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California*, State Board Resolution No. 88-63, *Sources of Drinking Water*, and State Board Resolution No. 92-49, *Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges under Water Code section 13304*;
- 2. Applicable narrative and numerical water quality objectives and beneficial uses described in Chapters 2 and 3 of this Basin Plan;
- 3. Pollutant concentrations which do not pose a significant threat to human health or the environment. Threat to human health and the environment shall be determined through a risk assessment.
 - a. The Regional Board is not the lead agency for specifying risk assessment procedures. The risk assessment shall be conducted using the most current procedures authorized by the ~~DTSC California Department of Toxic Substances Control~~, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment or the ~~USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency~~. The Regional Board will assist the discharger, as necessary, in obtaining the appropriate, most current, procedures from these agencies.

- b. In the absence of scientifically valid data to the contrary, theoretical risks from chemical constituents shall be considered additive across all media of exposure, and shall be considered additive for all chemicals having

similar toxicological effects or having carcinogenic effects;

c. The Regional Board is not the lead agency for reviewing risk assessments. The Regional Board will rely on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, or appropriately designated regulatory local health agencies to review and evaluate the adequacy of risk assessments.

d. The discharger shall submit the risk assessment to the Regional Board in accordance with section IV.B.3.b. of this policy. The Regional Board will coordinate the review of the risk assessment in accordance with the following hierarchy:

(1) The Regional Board will first seek the assistance of any appropriate supporting health agency currently involved with the cleanup of the site.

(2) If unsuccessful, the Regional Board will seek the assistance of previously uninvolved appropriate health agencies.

(3) If unsuccessful, the Regional Board will seek the assistance of the [DTSC](#) ~~California Department of Toxic Substances Control~~ in accordance with the terms and conditions of the *MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD, THE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARDS FOR THE CLEANUP OF HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES. AUGUST 1, 1990.*

4. Applicable state and federal statutes and regulations;

5. Relevant standards, criteria, and advisories adopted by other state and federal agencies;

6. Technical and economic feasibility of attaining background concentrations and of attaining concentrations lower than defined by 2 and 3 above. Technical and economic feasibility shall be determined in accordance with the following criteria:

a. Technical feasibility shall be determined by assessing the availability of technologies which have been shown to be effective in reducing the pollutant concentrations to the established cleanup levels. Bench-scale and/or pilot-scale studies may be necessary to make this feasibility assessment.

b. Economic feasibility refers to the objective balancing of the incremental benefit of attaining more stringent cleanup levels compared with the incremental cost of achieving those levels. Economic feasibility does not refer to the subjective measurement of the discharger's ability to pay the costs of cleanup.

c. Applicable factors to be considered in the establishment of cleanup levels greater than background are listed in Chapter 15, section 2550.4.

d. The discharger's ability to pay is one factor to be considered in determining whether the cleanup level is reasonable. However, availability of economic resources to the discharger is primarily considered in establishing reasonable schedules for

compliance with cleanup levels.

- B. The Regional Board shall set ground water cleanup levels to attain background water quality, unless the discharger demonstrates that it is either technically or economically infeasible to attain background water quality. If the discharger makes such a demonstration to the satisfaction of the Regional Board, cleanup levels are set between background water quality concentrations and concentrations that meet all criteria in items A.2 and A.3 above. Within this concentration range, cleanup levels will be set at the lowest concentrations that are technically and economically feasible to achieve. In no case will cleanup levels be established below natural background conditions.
- C. Compliance with cleanup levels must occur at all points throughout the plume or area of contamination to protect potential beneficial uses of water resources as required by ~~California~~ Water Code sections 13000 and 13244 and Health and Safety Code section 25356.1 (c).
- D. The Regional Board may consider relaxing ground water cleanup levels that were previously established at levels more stringent than applicable water quality objectives, only when a final remedial action plan has been pursued in good faith and all of the following conditions are met:
 - 1. Modified cleanup levels meet the conditions listed in VI.A.1., VI.A.2., and VI.A.3. above; and
 - 2. An approved cleanup program has been fully implemented and operated for a period of time which is adequate to understand the hydrogeology of the site, pollutant dynamics, and the effectiveness of available cleanup technologies; and
 - 3. Adequate source removal and/or isolation is undertaken to eliminate or significantly reduce future migration of pollutants to ground water; and

- 4. The discharger has demonstrated that no significant pollutant migration will occur to other underlying or adjacent aquifers; and
- 5. Ground water pollutant concentrations have reached asymptotic levels (i.e., pollutant concentration reductions are no longer significant) using appropriate technology; and
- 6. Alternative remediation techniques for achieving cleanup levels have been evaluated and are inappropriate or not economically feasible.

VII. SOIL CLEANUP LEVELS

- A. Soil pollution can present a health risk and a threat to water quality. The Regional Board designates soil cleanup levels for the unsaturated zone based upon threat to water quality and risk to human health or the environment. Guidance from the USEPA, ~~DTSC Department of Toxic Substances Control~~, or the Office of Health Hazard Assessment is considered in determining health and environmental risks. Cleanup levels for contaminated soils which threaten water quality, shall be established in accordance with the following criteria:
 - 1. Concentrations of the residual leachable/mobile pollutants shall be equal to background concentrations unless background levels are technically or economically infeasible to achieve.
 - 2. Where background levels are technically or economically infeasible to achieve, soil cleanup levels shall be established to ensure that residual leachable/mobile pollutants will not cause, or threaten to cause, exceedances of applicable ground water cleanup levels or water quality objectives, and do not pose significant risks to health or the environment.

3. Soil cleanup levels less stringent than background may be based on site specific technical evaluations of pollutant fate and transport processes, human health and environmental risk assessment methods as long as such methods are based on site specific field data, technically sound principles, and the criteria described in VII.A.2. above.

B. Where residual leachable/mobile soil pollutants which threaten water quality remain on site the discharger shall:

1. Implement measures as necessary to ensure that soils with residual pollutants are covered or otherwise managed to minimize pollution of surface waters or exposure to the public; and
2. Implement the applicable provisions of Chapter 15 to the extent that it is technologically or economically feasible to do so as described in State Board Resolution No. 92 - 49. This may include, but is not limited to, subsurface barriers or other containment systems, pollutant immobilization, toxicity reduction, and financial assurances.

C. The Regional Board shall generally require sampling to verify soil cleanup and may also require follow-up ground water monitoring. The degree of monitoring will reflect the amount of uncertainty associated with the soil cleanup level selection process. Follow-up ground water monitoring may be limited where residual concentrations of leachable/mobile pollutants in soils are not expected to adversely affect ground water quality.

VIII. TIME SCHEDULES

The Regional Board shall determine schedules for investigation, and cleanup and abatement, taking into account the following factors:


- A. The degree of threat or impact of the discharge on water quality and beneficial uses;

B. The obligation to achieve timely compliance with cleanup and abatement goals and objectives that implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans and Policies adopted by the State and Regional Board;

C. The financial and technical resources available to the discharger; and

D. Minimizing the likelihood of imposing a burden on the people of the state with the expense of cleanup and abatement, where feasible.

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT ~~(WQA)~~



Crow Creek

The Water Quality Assessment (WQA) is a catalog of the State's major waterbodies and their water quality condition. Each Regional Board prepares and adopts

a Regional WQA identifying and categorizing the major water-bodies in each region. The California WQA is a compilation of the nine Regional WQAs which is adopted by the State Board. The WQA is updated as necessary every two years.

Water-bodies are categorized as Good Quality Waters, Intermediate Quality Waters, Impaired Waters or Unknown Quality Waters. The definition of each of these categories is explained below:

Good Quality Waters: are waters that support and enhance the designated beneficial uses. Water-bodies classified as good may be designated as a high priority by the Regional Board if a threat to water quality is present.

Intermediate Quality Waters: are waters that support designated beneficial uses while there is occasional degradation of water quality. For example, biological data may show minor changes in population densities and distribution; however, direct observation of the water shows

the uses are supported. Intermediate quality waters also include those water-bodies where there is an indication of suspected impairment but available data is inadequate to reach a definitive conclusion on the condition.

Impaired Waters: are water-bodies that cannot reasonably be expected to attain or maintain applicable water quality standards. A water quality standard includes both State and Regional Board numeric and narrative water quality objectives and the beneficial use(s) the objectives are meant to protect. The interpretation that a water-body is "impaired" may be clear when data indicate that adopted objectives are continually exceeded or that beneficial uses are not protected (e.g., health warnings are in effect). In many cases this determination will involve evaluating many sources of data to arrive at a best professional judgment by the Regional Board staff. A more detailed description of impairment for various classes of pollutants can be found in the criteria for the Clean Water Strategy.

Unknown Quality Waters: are water-bodies with unknown water quality where limited or no direct observations are available.

The ~~WQA Water Quality Assessment~~ serves several different purposes. The WQA provides the foundation of the State Board's Clean Water Strategy (CWS). The CWS is a management tool used to identify waterbodies of high concern and is used by the State Board to allocate resources to the highest priority water quality problems.

The WQA also satisfies several federal Clean Water Act requirements for lists and reports including those for section 131.11, section 303(d), section 304(m), section 304(s), section 304(l), section 314 and section 319 lists. These federal lists are described below:

- **Section 131.11:** The 131.11 list describes segments which may be affected by toxic pollutants, or segments with concentrations of toxic pollutants that warrant concern.
- **Section 303(d):** The 303(d) list identifies those waters that do not meet water quality standards after application of technology based controls. Applicable water quality standards include the designated beneficial uses and the adopted water quality objectives.

- **Section 304(m):** The 304(m) list is a "mini-list" of waters not meeting State adopted numeric water quality objectives due to toxic sources after implementation of BAT/BCT.
- **Section 304(s):** The 304(s) list is a "short-list" of waters not achieving water quality standards due to point source discharges of toxic pollutants after implementation of BAT/BCT.
- **Section 304(l):** The 304(l) long list describes waters that are not meeting standards, objectives, or goals of the Clean Water Act due to point and nonpoint source discharges of any pollutants.
- **Section 314:** The 314 list describes lake priorities for restoration.
- **Section 319:** The 319 list describes impaired surface waters from nonpoint source problems due to both toxic and nontoxic pollutants.

The WQA reports to the public on the condition of the state's waterbodies in a highly summarized tabular format. It is organized by region by waterbody type. In some cases an entire watershed is included under one water quality classification. In other cases, segments of waterbodies are listed separately because of their unique differences or problems. Water quality problems for each waterbody are briefly described when known or suspected. As explained above, waterbodies are classified as good, intermediate, impaired and unknown. The size of each water-body is also shown and is used to denote the extent of the waterbody listed under each water quality classification. For example, the WQA indicates that in Central Mission Bay, 1030 acres are good water quality and 10 acres are impaired. For waterbodies with water quality problems, the source is listed as point, nonpoint, or both. The WQA also indicates if a fact sheet has been prepared to further identify water quality problems and locations.

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d)

REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPAIRED WATERBODIES

The Clean Water Act, section 303(d), requires the State to identify those waters that do not meet water quality standards after application of technology based controls. Applicable water quality standards include the designated beneficial uses and the adopted water quality objectives.

Waters identified under section 303(d) are designated as Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs). The 303(d) list of WQLS is based on the WQA adopted by the Regional Board and State Board. The WQA is a catalog of the State's major waterbodies. The WQA process includes identifying the general condition of each waterbody and which federal lists including 303(d) list may apply. The Regional Board staff prepares the WQA based upon review of current information and public and agency input. Each Regional Board adopts its regional WQA at public meetings. These regional WQA are then compiled into the statewide WQA which is adopted by the State Board. Section 303(d) requires the establishment of a priority ranking of these WQLSs for purposes of developing ~~Total Maximum Daily Loads~~ (TMDLs), and establishing Waste Load Allocations (WLAs), and Load Allocations (LAs). The ~~Total Maximum Daily Load~~ (TMDL) is the amount of a pollutant that can be discharged into a water-body and still maintain water quality standards. Pollutant loadings above the TMDL are expected to adversely affect water quality by causing receiving waters to exceed applicable water quality standards. The TMDL is the sum of ~~waste load allocations~~ (WLAs) for point sources of pollution, ~~load allocations~~ (LAs) for nonpoint sources of pollution and natural background sources, and a margin of safety. Allocations of pollutant loadings to point and nonpoint sources must be calculated to ensure that applicable water quality standards are not exceeded in the receiving water. After development of a 303(d) list and TMDLs, WLA, and LA, states are required to submit them to USEPA for review and approval.

The process that the State Board has for establishing and implementing the TMDLs as required by section 303(d) is described in the

"California Report on Impaired Surface Waters", dated July, 1992 [California 303(d) report]. The USEPA has endorsed the California TMDL process. The Regional Board will implement the California TMDL process as approved by USEPA to comply with section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

In the California 303(d) report, the State Board identified the following four major activities needed to comply with section 303(d): (1) the ~~Water Quality Assessment~~ (WQA); (2) identification of highest priority waters; (3) preparation of action plans (TMDL worksheets); and (4) a periodic review and update. The Clean Water Act dictates that appropriate revisions to section 303(d) list be considered every 2 years.

Action Plans (TMDL Worksheets) were requested to be prepared for three water-bodies per region. The TMDL Worksheet requires a minimum of specific information which is required to address a 303(d) listed water-body. The information in the TMDL Worksheet provides a summary of the problem, the location, the water quality target, and the activities intended to meet the target. The TMDL Worksheet is not intended to be a comprehensive watershed management plan. Instead the Worksheet is intended to identify projects that are on-going and actions which are required in order to reach the quantifiable target.

The TMDL Worksheets have three major sections which describe the waterbody of concern, the water quality target, and the actions required to meet the target.

The first major section of the TMDL Worksheet describes the location, areal extent, pollutants, sources, etc. This information is derived from the WQA database. The problem description provides a brief narrative to assist the reader in understanding the magnitude of the problem.

The "*Quantifiable Target*" is the second major section of the Worksheet and is the focal point for all of the actions. The term quantifiable target is intended to provide a more understandable goal instead of the Clean Water Act's use of the term ~~Total Maximum Daily Load~~ (TMDL). Put simply, the State's use of quantifiable target is to be considered a TMDL or a phased TMDL. The purpose of the target must be to improve, restore or protect the beneficial use identified as adversely affected. Measurable changes in the

beneficial use may take years to accomplish after all of the measures are implemented.

The third major section of the TMDL Worksheet describes the implementation and monitoring strategy. The Clean Water Act uses the terms ~~Waste Load Allocation (WLA)~~ and ~~Load Allocation (LA)~~. WLAs are designated for point sources and LAs for nonpoint sources. These terms simply imply that one means to protect beneficial uses is to decide the maximum amount of a pollutant that can be added to a water-body without affecting the use. Once a load has been determined these terms imply that the State simply allocates maximum loadings to various sources. This simplistic approach is not workable for most, if not all, of the water quality problems on California's 303(d) list.

The great majority of California's water quality problems are caused by nonpoint sources. Measuring, allocating, and regulating nonpoint source loads as if they were point sources is not practical. The measures that need to be implemented are more complex and require coordination of numerous activities over long periods of time. For these reasons the California 303(d) Report replaced the use of the terms WLA and LA with Implementation Strategy. The Implementation Strategy includes studies, monitoring, basin planning, permits and demonstration projects.

As noted above, this TMDL process is developmental and will be subjected to periodic review and modification every 2 years as needed. The update will include an assessment of progress made on the scheduled actions identified in the TMDL worksheets. The update will be conducted by State and Regional Board staff, as well as by USEPA representatives. The update will address the following:

- (1) Water-body listing and targeting procedures, criteria, and results.
- (2) Minimum requirements for establishing "*Quantifiable Targets*", and Implementation Measures and how these terms meet the requirements of the Act for establishing TMDLs, WLAs, and LAs.
- (3) Progress in establishing Quantifiable Targets for targeted water-bodies.
- (4) Adequacy of public participation.

- (5) Progress in targeting USEPA funds and programs toward actions required on targeted water-bodies.
- (6) Ability of the State and USEPA to integrate the TMDL process into other programs such as the Coastal Nonpoint Control Program.
- (7) How to integrate threatened and unknown waters into the process.
- (8) How this program can assist the State in managing water quality problems on a watershed basis.

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD ~~(TMDL)~~ FOR DIAZINON, CHOLLAS CREEK WATERSHED, SAN DIEGO COUNTY

On August 14, 2002 the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R9-2002-0123, *Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) For Diazinon In Chollas Creek Watershed, San Diego County*. The terms and conditions of Resolution No. R9-2002-0123 are incorporated into the Basin Plan. This amendment establishes the ~~total maximum daily load (TMDL)~~TMDL of diazinon which Chollas Creek can receive and still attain applicable water quality objectives and support beneficial uses. This TMDL is allocated to all contributing sources of diazinon in the watershed by establishing Waste Load Allocations for all point sources and Load Allocations for all nonpoint sources in the watershed. This TMDL includes a margin of safety. The TMDL Implementation Plan and Monitoring Plan are presented below.

NECESSITY STANDARD [GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION §11353(b)]

Amendment of the Basin Plan to establish and implement a Total Maximum Daily Load ~~(TMDL)~~ for Chollas Creek is necessary because water quality in Chollas Creek cannot satisfy applicable water quality objectives for "*Toxicity*" and "*Pesticides*" even with implementation of waste discharge requirements containing technology-based effluent limits or water quality-based effluent limits for discharges of pollutants to Chollas Creek and its tributaries. Clean Water Act section 303(d) requires the Regional Board to develop an implement a TMDL under the conditions that exist in Chollas Creek. This TMDL for diazinon is necessary to ensure attainment of applicable water quality objectives and restoration of beneficial uses designated for Chollas Creek.

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d)

Chollas Creek is currently identified on the Clean Water Act section 303(d) list of impaired waters due to toxicity during storm events. Results from toxicity identification evaluations (TIEs) indicate that the insecticide diazinon in Chollas Creek has in part caused the toxicity during storm events.

BENEFICIAL USE IMPAIRMENTS

Chollas Creek supports several beneficial uses. The most sensitive beneficial uses are those designated for protection of aquatic life and aquatic dependent wildlife as described in the Basin Plan definition of the warm freshwater habitat (WARM) and wildlife habitat (WILD) beneficial uses. The WARM and WILD beneficial uses of Chollas Creek are adversely affected by toxicity due to diazinon.

WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

Diazinon levels in Chollas Creek cause toxicity during storm events. The Basin Plan does not contain a specific water quality objective for diazinon. The Basin Plan establishes narrative water quality objectives for "*Toxicity*" and "*Pesticides*" to ensure the protection of the WARM and WILD beneficial uses.

WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVE VIOLATIONS

Toxicity tests using the water flea *Ceriodaphnia dubia* indicate that Chollas Creek storm water flows are toxic. Toxicity Identification Evaluations (TIEs) show that diazinon is responsible for the toxicity to the water flea. Accordingly diazinon concentrations in Chollas Creek cause violations of the "*Toxicity*" and "*Pesticide*" water quality objectives during storm events. The average concentration of diazinon in Chollas Creek during storm events is 0.46 micrograms per liter (µg/L). Chollas Creek waters also contain metals that are responsible for toxicity to a marine invertebrate. A separate TMDL is under development to address metals in Chollas Creek.

SOURCES OF DIAZINON

Urban storm water flows represent the most significant source of diazinon to the Chollas Creek watershed.

CONCENTRATION-BASED TMDL

Because aquatic toxicity is the most significant adverse effect of diazinon and because aquatic toxicity is a function of water column concentrations, this TMDL is a concentration-based, rather than mass emission-based TMDL. The Numeric Targets, TMDL (Loading Capacity), and Waste Load and Load Allocations are all defined in terms of concentrations.

NUMERIC TARGETS

The TMDL Numeric Targets, which are derived from the water quality objectives, identify the specific water column, sediment, or tissue concentrations (or other endpoints) which equate to attainment of the Basin Plan water quality objectives and the protection of designated beneficial uses. Therefore, if the Numeric Targets are appropriately selected (for all causative pollutants), attainment of the Numeric Targets will result in attainment of the underlying water quality objectives and beneficial use protection.

The Numeric Targets for diazinon in Chollas Creek are set equal to the California Department of Fish and Game freshwater Water Quality Criteria for diazinon. The acute Water Quality Criterion of 0.08 $\mu\text{g/L}$ diazinon protects aquatic life from short-term exposure to diazinon, while the chronic criterion of 0.05 $\mu\text{g/L}$ diazinon protects aquatic life from long-term diazinon exposure.

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

The term ~~Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)~~, or Loading Capacity, is defined as the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still attain water quality objectives and protection of designated beneficial uses. The concentration-based Loading Capacity for diazinon in Chollas Creek is set at exactly the same concentrations as the Numeric Targets.

LINKAGE ANALYSIS

The purpose of the linkage analysis is to confirm that the TMDL will result in the attainment of applicable water quality objectives and beneficial use protection. With respect to diazinon, this TMDL will result in the attainment of the "Toxicity" and "Pesticide" water quality

objectives and the restoration of the WARM and WILD beneficial uses in the Chollas Creek watershed.¹ This is because the Numeric Targets are set equal to the diazinon Water Quality Criteria which are based on toxicity testing and are specifically established at levels to ensure the protection of aquatic life from acute and chronic exposure to diazinon. The Water Quality Criteria protect all aquatic life stages including the most sensitive stages.

WASTE LOAD AND LOAD ALLOCATIONS

The concentration-based Waste Load and Load allocations of this TMDL are applied equally to all diazinon discharge sources in the Chollas Creek watershed. All allocations are set at 90% of the Numeric Targets resulting in a diazinon allocation equal to 0.072 $\mu\text{g/L}$ under acute exposure conditions and a diazinon allocation of 0.045 $\mu\text{g/L}$ under chronic exposure conditions. These allocations include an explicit 10% margin of safety to account for uncertainties in the TMDL analysis. This concentration-based TMDL and its allocations apply year-round and will be protective during all flow conditions and seasons.

DIAZINON LOAD REDUCTIONS NEEDED

The current average concentration of diazinon in Chollas Creek measured during storm events was 0.46 $\mu\text{g/L}$ during the monitoring period 1998 through 2001. An 84% reduction of current diazinon concentration-based loads is needed to attain the acute diazinon allocations set forth in this TMDL. A 90% reduction of current diazinon concentration-based loads is needed to attain the chronic diazinon allocations set forth in this TMDL.

SEASONAL VARIATIONS AND CRITICAL CONDITIONS

¹ MULTIPLE POLLUTANTS: The attainment of water quality standards is qualified with the words "with respect to diazinon" because there are multiple pollutants causing toxicity. Toxicity conditions in Chollas Creek are caused by metals and diazinon. Successful implementation of both the Chollas Creek diazinon TMDL and the Chollas Creek metals TMDL is expected to result in full attainment of the "Toxicity" water quality objectives, and of the WARM and WILD beneficial uses.

This concentration-based diazinon TMDL and allocations apply year round and will be

protective during all flow conditions and seasons.

Numeric Targets for Diazinon in Chollas Creek ¹

Exposure Duration	Numeric Target	Averaging Period	Frequency of Allowed Exceedance
Acute	0.08 µg/L	One-hour average	Once every three years on the average
Chronic	0.05 µg/L	Four-day average	Once every three years on the average

TMDL (Loading Capacity) for Diazinon in Chollas Creek

Exposure Duration	TMDL	Averaging Period
Acute	0.08 µg/L	One-hour average
Chronic	0.05 µg/L	Four-day average

Waste Load and Load Allocations for Diazinon in Chollas Creek

Exposure Duration	Numeric Targets	Margin of Safety	Waste Load and Load Allocations
Acute	0.08 µg/L	0.008 µg/L	0.072 µg/L
Chronic	0.05 µg/L	0.005 µg/L	0.045 µg/L

Needed Load Reductions in Chollas Creek

Average Diazinon Concentration	Allocation		Reduction Needed	
	Chronic	Acute	Chronic	Acute
0.46 µg/L	0.045 µg/L	0.072 µg/L	90%	84%



Chollas Creek at Federal Boulevard crossing



Chollas Creek streamside

For the purpose of evaluating if the Numeric Targets have been attained, sample results shall be used as follows:

1. If only one sample is collected during the time period associated with the numeric target (e.g., one-hour average or four-day average), the single measurement shall be used to determine attainment of the numeric target for the entire time period.
2. The one-hour average shall be the moving arithmetic mean of grab samples over the specified one-hour period.
3. The four-day average shall apply to flow-weighted composite samples for the duration of the storm, or shall be the moving arithmetic mean of flow weighted 24-hour composite samples or grab samples.

RESPONSIBLE PARTIE(S)

As dischargers of diazinon in urban storm water flows to Chollas Creek, the City of San Diego, City of Lemon Grove, City of La Mesa, San Diego Unified Port District, County of San Diego, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) are responsible for implementation of this TMDL. These entities are regulated as municipal Copermittees under the San Diego MS4 Permit or the statewide Caltrans MS4 Permit.

TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The three most important mechanisms to implement the diazinon waste load reductions required by this TMDL are (1) USEPA's ongoing diazinon phase-out and elimination program; (2) modification of the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (MS4 Permit)¹ as needed for consistency with this TMDL; and (3) activities by the municipal Copermittees in the Chollas Creek watershed to reduce diazinon discharges pursuant to the MS4 Permit and Water Code section 13267.

(1) USEPA's Diazinon Phase-Out and Elimination Program

The single most important action to implement this TMDL is USEPA's national ongoing *Diazinon Phase-Out and Elimination Program*. In January 2001, USEPA reached an agreement with registrants (manufacturers) of diazinon to phase-out most uses (USEPA 2002). Under the agreement, all indoor uses will be terminated, and all outdoor non-agricultural uses will be phased-out over the next few years.

Specifically, the terms of the agreement implement the following phase out schedules:

- For the indoor household use, the registration will be canceled on March 2001, and all retail sales will stop by December 2002.

For all lawn, garden and turf uses, manufacturing stops in June 2003; all sales and distribution to retailers ends in

¹ Regional Board Order No. 2001-01 NPDES No. CAS0108758, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Urban Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds of the County of San Diego, and the San Diego Unified Port District.

August 2003. Further, the manufacturers will implement a product recovery program in 2004 to complete the phase-out of the product.

- Additionally, as part of the phase-out, for all lawn, garden, and turf uses, the agreement ratchets down the manufacturing amounts. Specifically, for 2002, there will be a 25 percent decrease in production; and for 2003, there will be a 50 percent decrease in production.
- Also, the agreement begins the process to cancel around 20 different uses on food crops.

In summary, the phase-out is designed to reduce diazinon use and sales, availability, and to increase its proper disposal. As a result of the phase-out, USEPA expects, on a national basis, that these actions will end over 90% of current diazinon uses. In the Chollas Creek watershed, since agricultural use is negligible, the phase-out should reduce current source loadings of diazinon, and the resulting aquatic toxicity, to negligible levels over time. For these reasons, the diazinon phase-out is by far the single most significant mechanism by which this TMDL will be implemented. The remaining TMDL implementation actions described below are designed to reduce the discharge of diazinon to the Chollas Creek watershed due to interim (during the phase-out) and residual (post phase-out) diazinon sales, use, and disposal. It should be noted that actions taken by the municipalities and other stakeholders to reduce diazinon discharges to the Chollas Creek watershed will likely be effective in reducing the discharges of alternative pesticides in the long-term as well.

(2) Modification of Existing Waste Discharge Requirements / NPDES Permits

The Regional Board's San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit, also known as the San Diego MS4 Permit (Regional Board Order No. 2001-01 NPDES No. CAS0108758) is the primary broad-based NPDES permit which directly regulates most pollutant discharges, including diazinon, in the Chollas Creek watershed. Federal regulations require that NPDES permits contain effluent limitations that are consistent with Waste Load Allocations developed under a TMDL [40 CFR 122.44 (d)(vii)(B)]. The Regional Board will

revise existing waste discharge requirements / NPDES permits to incorporate effluent limitations in conformance with the Waste Load Allocations for diazinon as specified above. Modifications to the MS4 Permit can occur when the permit is reopened or during scheduled permit reissuance.

Compliance with numeric limitations for diazinon will be required in accordance with a phased schedule of compliance. The compliance schedule will be jointly developed by the Regional Board and the Chollas Creek stakeholders and will be finalized no later than one year following adoption of this TMDL by the Regional Board. The phased compliance schedule will apply only to attainment of numeric limitations for diazinon. All other requirements of this TMDL will be immediately effective upon incorporation into applicable NPDES permits.

(3) Activities By Municipal Copermittees Pursuant to MS4 Permit and CWC Section 13267

Pursuant to the MS4 Permit and under the authority of Water Code section 13267, the Regional Board will direct the municipal Copermittees in the Chollas Creek watershed to do the following:

- a. **Legal Authority:** Enforce existing local ordinances, or adopt new legal authority, as needed to ensure Copermittee compliance with the Waste Load Allocations specified in this TMDL;
- b. **Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan:** Develop and implement a "*Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan*" to promote Copermittee compliance with the Waste Load Allocations specified in this TMDL. The Plan should consist of pollution prevention and source control ~~BMPs~~**best management practices** designed to reduce the discharge of diazinon to Chollas Creek.
- c. **Diazinon Public Outreach / Education Program:** Develop and implement a focused Public Outreach / Education program designed to reduce the discharge of diazinon to the Chollas Creek watershed. By reducing the discharge of diazinon, the Program will promote Copermittee compliance with the Waste Load Allocations specified in this TMDL. The

Program should contain the components described in the Regional Board Technical Report, *Total Maximum Daily Load for Diazinon in Chollas Creek Watershed San Diego County*, dated August 14, 2002, or equivalent components. The diazinon public outreach / education program may be incorporated into the Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan.

(4) Compliance with MS4 Permit

The municipal Copermittees in the Chollas Creek watershed shall implement the requirements of the MS4 Permit.

(5) Compliance with Existing Waste Discharge Prohibitions

Prohibitions against discharges of waste that cause pollution or nuisance, described in the Basin Plan, including discharges of diazinon that cause or contribute to violation of water quality objectives are applicable to the urban land users and land owners in the Chollas Creek watershed. Dischargers of diazinon in the watershed shall also comply with all other applicable waste discharge prohibitions contained in the Basin Plan.

(6) Enforcement Authority of Regional Board

The Regional Board will use its enforcement authority as necessary to ensure compliance with applicable waste discharge requirements and Basin Plan waste discharge prohibitions.

(7) Modification of Other Existing Waste Discharge Requirements

The ~~State Water Resources Control Board~~ (State Board) has issued three additional NPDES storm water permits that regulate the discharge of pollutants including diazinon in the Chollas Creek watershed. These permits are the statewide Caltrans Municipal Storm Water Permit (*State Board Order No. 99-06-DWQ NPDES No. CAS 000003*), the statewide General Industrial Storm Water Permit (*State Board Order No. 97-03-DWQ NPDES No. CAS 000001*), and the statewide General Construction Storm Water Permit (*State Board Order No. 99-08-DWQ NPDES No. CAS 000002*) which directly regulate discharges from Caltrans owned and operated facilities, and from industrial and construction sites respectively, located within the Chollas Creek watershed. Discharges from industrial and

construction sites in the Chollas Creek watershed are also indirectly regulated under the MS4 Permit which holds each municipal Copermittee ultimately responsible for all discharges from industrial and construction sites within its jurisdiction. The Regional Board will request the State Board to amend each of these three statewide permits as needed for consistency with this TMDL. Modifications to waste discharge requirements can occur when permits are reopened or reissued.

In addition to the broad-based regulation of discharges under the MS4 Permit, the discharge of pollutants, including diazinon, from utility companies and utility vaults is directly regulated under the State Board's General Permit for Utility Vaults (*State Board Order No.2001-11-DWQ NPDES No. CAG 990002*). The Regional Board will request the State Board to also revise the General Permit for Utility Vaults as needed for consistency with this TMDL.

(8) Adoption of New Waste Discharge Requirements / NPDES Permits

The Regional Board may adopt new waste discharge requirements / NPDES permits for any significant source(s) of diazinon identified by the municipal Copermittees or the Regional Board.

(9) Additional Investigations and Reports Pursuant to CWC Section 13225

The Regional Board may use its authority under ~~California~~ Water Code section 13225 to request the municipalities in the Chollas Creek watershed

to conduct additional investigations which are beyond the purview of the MS4 permit and to report on the findings of such investigations. Any such investigations will address diazinon-related issues in the Chollas Creek watershed for the ultimate purpose of reducing diazinon discharges to the watershed.

(10) Monitoring Plan

Pursuant to the MS4 permit and under the authority of Water Code section 13267, the Regional Board will direct the municipal Copermittees in the Chollas Creek watershed to develop and implement a Monitoring Plan. The Plan shall be designed to assess the effectiveness of this TMDL, its implementation measures, and progress towards the attainment of applicable water quality standards in the Chollas Creek watershed. The Plan should contain the components described in the Regional Board Technical Report, *Total Maximum Daily Load for Diazinon in Chollas Creek Watershed San Diego County*, dated August 14, 2002, or equivalent components.

(11) Schedule of Implementation

As described in Provision 2 above, *Modification of Existing Waste Discharge Requirements/ NPDES Permits*, compliance with numeric limitations for diazinon will be required in accordance with a phased schedule of compliance. All other requirements of this TMDL will be immediately effective upon incorporation into applicable NPDES permits as described below.

Schedule of Implementation			
Action	Description	Responsible Parties	Due Date
USEPA cancels registration for indoor household uses of diazinon		USEPA	March 31, 2001
IPM Workshop(s)	Conduct first workshop	Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	Within 1 year after USEPA approves TMDL and annually thereafter
Monitoring Plan	Initiate Monitoring Plan	Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	30-days after USEPA approves TMDL
Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan (DTCP)	Initiate DTCP	Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	30-days after USEPA approves TMDL
Retail sales of diazinon (indoor uses) end		USEPA	December 31, 2002
Manufacturing of diazinon for all lawn, garden and turf uses end		USEPA	June 31, 2003
Sales and distribution to retailers ends		USEPA	August 31, 2003
Phase out and eliminate diazinon usage and sales in the Chollas Creek watershed. Ensure proper disposal.		USEPA	2003 for non-agriculture uses
Modify MS4 permit for consistency with TMDL		Regional Board	No later than 2006
Implement legal authority to reduce diazinon discharges in the Chollas Creek watershed.		Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	6 months after USEPA approves TMDL
Compliance with MS4 permit		Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	Ongoing
Compliance with existing Waste Discharge prohibitions		Diazinon dischargers	Ongoing
Enforcement authority of Regional Board		Regional Board	Ongoing
Modification of other existing Waste Discharge Requirements		Regional and State Board	No later than next reissuance
Adoption of new WDRs Waste Discharge Requirements / NPDES permits	For significant diazinon sources only.	Regional Board	As needed
Additional investigations and reports pursuant to CWC section 13225		Diazinon dischargers	As needed
Submit Annual Reports	Effectiveness reports and monitoring reports	Chollas Creek watershed municipal copermittees	January 31 of each year.

~ ~ ~

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD FOR DISSOLVED COPPER, SHELTER ISLAND YACHT BASIN, SAN DIEGO BAY

On February 9, 2005, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R9-2005-0019, *A Resolution Adopting an Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Dissolved Copper in the Shelter Island Yacht Basin, San Diego Bay*. The TMDL Basin Plan Amendment was subsequently approved by the State Water Resources Control Board on [September 22, 2005](#)~~Insert Date~~, the Office of Administrative Law on [December 2, 2005](#)~~Insert Date~~, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency on [February 8, 2006](#)~~Insert Date~~. The TMDL is described in the Total Maximum Daily Load for Dissolved Copper in Shelter Island Yacht Basin, San Diego Bay, Technical Report dated [February 9, 2006](#)~~insert date~~.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Dissolved copper levels in Shelter Island Yacht Basin (SIYB) waters violate water quality objectives for copper, toxicity, and pesticides. Dissolved copper concentrations in SIYB threaten and impair the designated beneficial uses of marine habitat (MAR), and wildlife habitat (WILD).

NUMERIC TARGET

The TMDL Numeric Targets for copper, toxicity and pesticides are set equal to the numeric water quality objectives for dissolved copper as defined in the California Toxics Rule (CTR) and shown below.



Shelter Island Yacht Basin, San Diego Bay

Table 4-10. TMDL Numeric Targets.

Exposure	Water Quality Objective*	Numeric Target*
Continuous or Chronic (4 day average)	3.1 µg/L ** of copper (Cu)	3.1 µg/L ** of Cu
Maximum or Acute (1 hour average)	4.8 µg/L ** of Cu	4.8 µg/L ** of Cu

* Concentrations should not be exceeded more than once every three years.

** micrograms/liter (µg/L)

If the water quality objectives for dissolved copper in SIYB are modified in the future, as in the case of a site-specific objective, then the numeric targets will be set equal to the new water quality objectives.

SOURCE ANALYSIS

Approximately 98 percent of all copper loading to SIYB is attributable to copper-based antifouling paints applied to the hulls of recreational boats. The passive leaching of copper from antifouling paint is 93 percent of the total loading. The remaining five percent of total copper loading results from underwater hull cleaning operations in SIYB.

Table 4-11. Summary of Dissolved Copper Sources to SIYB.

Source	Mass Load (kg/year)	Percent Contribution (% Cu)
Passive Leaching	2,000	93
Hull Cleaning	100	5
Urban Runoff	30	1
Background	30	1
Direct Atmospheric Deposition	3	< 1
Sediment	0	0
Combined Sources	2,163	100

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

The TMDL or loading capacity for dissolved copper discharges into SIYB is 1.6 kilograms/day (kg/day) or 567 kilograms/year (kg/year).

MARGIN OF SAFETY

The TMDL includes an explicit and implicit margin of safety (MOS). Ten percent of the loading capacity was reserved as an explicit MOS and calculated to be 57 kg/year. The implicit MOS was incorporated into the TMDL source analysis through numerous conservative assumptions.

ALLOCATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

A 76 percent overall reduction of residual copper loading to SIYB is required to meet the TMDL of 567 kg/year as shown in the table below. The assigned allocations from each source translate into a percent reduction of dissolved copper from current loading. Loading due to passive leaching must be reduced by 81 percent from current loading. Loading due to underwater hull cleaning must be reduced by 28 percent from current loading. From an overall perspective, passive leaching loading must be reduced by 75 percent from the combined total loading of all sources to SIYB. Underwater hull cleaning loading must be reduced by one percent from the combined total loading of all sources to SIYB.

Table 4-12. TMDL and Allocation Summary.

Source	Current Load (kg/year of Cu)	Percent Contribution (% Cu)	Allocation (kg/year of Cu)	Percent Reduction from Current Source Load (%)	Percent Reduction from Total Loading to SIYB (%)
Passive Leaching	2,000	93	375	81	75
Hull Cleaning	100	5	72	28	1
Urban Runoff	30	1	30	0	0
Background	30	1	30	0	0
Direct Atmospheric Deposition	3	< 1	3	0	0
Sediment	0	0	0	0	0
Current Mass Load	2,163	100			0
Margin of Safety			57		0
TMDL			567		0
Total Load Reduction				76	76

RECALCULATIONS IF WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES CHANGE

If the water quality objectives for dissolved copper in SIYB are changed in the future, then the MOS, TMDL and allocations will be recalculated using the method shown in Appendix D of the Basin Plan.

TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The TMDL will be implemented as follows:

The Regional Board will coordinate with governmental agencies having legal authority over the use of copper-based antifouling paints to protect water quality from the adverse effects of copper-based antifouling paints in SIYB; and

The Regional Board will regulate discharges of copper to SIYB through the issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs), Waivers of WDRs (waivers), or adoption of Waste Discharge Prohibitions. WDRs could build upon pollution control programs developed by discharger organizations or the Port. Likewise, waivers or prohibitions could be conditioned on implementation of pollution control programs through third party agreements between the

Regional Board and discharger organizations, and/or other agencies.

The Regional Board will amend Order No. 2001-01, "Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Urban Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm /Sewer System" to require that discharges of copper into SIYB waters via the City's municipal separate storm/sewer system not exceed a 30 mg/kg wasteload for copper.

The dischargers will be required to monitor SIYB waters and provide monitoring reports to the Regional Board for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of the alternatives implemented.

COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE

Copper load and wasteload reductions are required over a 17-year staged compliance schedule period. The first stage consists of an initial 2-year orientation period during which no copper load reductions are required. The subsequent 15-year reduction period is comprised of three stages during which incremental copper load and wasteload reductions are required as shown below.

Table 4-13. Interim Loading Targets for Attainment of the TMDL.

Stage	Time Period	Percent Reduction from Current Estimated Loading	Reduction to be Attained by End of Year	Estimated Interim Target Loading (kg/year of dissolved Cu)
Stage 1	Years 1-2	0%	N/A	N/A
Stage 2	Years 2-7	10%	7	1,900
Stage 3	Years 7-12	40%	12	1,300
Stage 4	Years 12-17	76%	17	567

~ ~ ~

OTHER PROGRAMS

SAN DIEGO BAY TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD ~~(TMDL)~~ WORKSHEETS



The first TMDL worksheets in the San Diego Region are for San Diego Bay. These

worksheets describe the water quality limited segments in San Diego Bay and the sources of contaminants. They also contain an Implementation Strategy which includes a number of projects with interim deadlines. The Regional Board is committed to achieving these interim deadlines, as time and resources allow. The TMDL worksheet for San Diego Bay contains the following quantifiable targets which the Regional Board plans to achieve by January 1, 1997.

- (1) Compliance with the following numerical quantifiable water quality targets for water quality limited segments in San Diego Bay:

Pollutant	Objective	Time Frame
PCBs	30 ng/l	daily average
PCBs	70 pg/l	30-day average
Copper	2.9 µg/l	1-hour average
Mercury	2.1 µg/l	1-hour average
Mercury	25 ng/l	30-day average
TBT	5.0 ng/l	30-day average

- (2) Termination of all illicit waste discharges to San Diego Bay.
- (3) Cleanup of sediment in Convair Lagoon by Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical to less than an action level of 10 [milligrams per kilogram](#) (mg/kg) PCB (dry weight) as required by Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 86-92.

- (4) Cleanup of contaminated sediment caused by illicit boatyard waste discharge within Commercial Basin to less than 530 mg/kg copper (dry weight) and 4.8 mg/kg mercury (dry weight) as required by Cleanup and Abatement Order Nos. 88-79, 89-31, 88-78, 89-32, and 88-86. TBT concentrations in Commercial Basin water and sediments have been greatly reduced due to natural degradation processes and recent changes in regulations mandating reduction in the use of TBT in antifouling paint for small boats. The water column TBT concentration in Commercial Basin is expected to continue to decrease to below the water quality objective.
- (5) Termination of all copper ore discharges to San Diego Bay from the 24th Street Marine Terminal in accordance with Cleanup and Abatement Order 85-91.
- (6) Cleanup of bay sediment adjacent to the 24th Street Marine Terminal to less than 1,000 mg/kg copper (dry weight) by in accordance with Cleanup and Abatement Order 85-91.
- (7) Improvement of the assessment of water quality in San Diego Bay by establishing a bay wide sediment and water column monitoring program to determine the overall water quality of San Diego Bay.
- (8) Review each year, as staff resources allow, of available water quality data and general progress towards achieving the quantifiable targets and adjustment of actions as necessary.
- (9) Removal of Convair Lagoon, Commercial Basin, Shelter Island Yacht Basin, and the 24th Street Marine Terminal portions of San Diego Bay from the Clean Water Act section 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies.

GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT

Ground water management programs can both enhance water quality and protect beneficial uses of ground water in the larger basins of the San Diego Region. These management programs consist of measures for the periodic monitoring and assessment of ground water levels and quality; the planned extraction and export of poor quality ground water with recharge of better quality water from an outside source; controls established on the use of ground water within the basin; and controls on inflow of poor quality water from outside the basin.

Because of the limited amount of natural recharge, the use of reclaimed water for ground water recharge must be considered in any effective ground water management program in the San Diego Region. For this reason, agencies involved in wastewater disposal play a vital role in the development of these programs. Several local and state agencies, as well as some private consultants have been studying ways to encourage this approach for protecting the Region's ground water basins. Proponents have noted that there are many advantages in storing water and reclaimed water in ground water aquifers as opposed to surface water reservoirs. Underground facilities are less costly than surface storage facilities and they are less land intensive than surface water reservoirs. Also, the ground water aquifers can serve as distribution systems, minimizing the need for surface water transport facilities. In addition, reclaimed water stored in ground water aquifers are not subject to evaporative losses.

Filtration through the soils in the basin can provide additional treatment of the reclaimed water, and injection of reclaimed water along the coastal strip can be used to help combat seawater intrusion.

Ninety percent of the potable water supply for the San Diego Region comes from two major sources of imported water. Water from the Colorado River is imported through the Colorado River Aqueduct and water from northern California is imported through the State Water Project. Both sources are blended to form San Diego Region's water supply. Additionally, approximately ten percent of the water supply comes from local reservoirs. The quality of the imported water has been showing increases in mineral content, particularly boron, percent

sodium and ~~total dissolved solids (TDS)~~. Direct use of this supply reflects the mineral content of Colorado River water. Each additional use of the water (reclaimed from this supply) for irrigation and ground water recharge incrementally increases the dissolved mineral content.

Water reclamation activities should, then, be focused on local benefits and impacts on ground water quality. Proposed projects should be examined in terms of:

- Areas with high reclaimed water demands;
- Constituent concentrations in relation to basin plan objectives;
- Assimilative capacity of receiving basins; and
- Potential for improving ground water quality in near-surface and deep aquifers.

The major basins in San Diego County that have been studied for the implementation of a ground water management plan are the San Pasqual Valley, the Lower San Luis Rey Valley, Lower San Dieguito River Valley, Santee Basin, Lower Sweetwater River Basin, Lower Tijuana River Basin, Upper Santa Margarita River Basin, and the San Juan Creek Basin. A goal of these management plans is to rejuvenate the quality of the ground water in these basins to meet basin objectives. The general plan is to pump the poor quality ground water from these basins to the ocean, and recharge the basins with reclaimed and natural run off waters, which will then be extracted for beneficial use when water quality objectives are met. The following is a description of the proposed programs.

SAN PASQUAL VALLEY

The San Pasqual ground water management plan would utilize between 5,000 and 8,000 ~~AF/Yacre-foot per year~~ of reclaimed water for agricultural irrigation and ground water recharge, thus reducing the need for this amount of imported water. The reclaimed water is available from the City of Escondido Hale Avenue Wastewater treatment plant, which presently discharges directly to the ocean. The City of San Diego owns 7,436 acres of land in the San Pasqual Valley which has been set aside as an agricultural preserve. There is 38,000 acre-feet of usable ground water in the valley. The

western portion of the valley has degraded ground water quality, and has been designated as the reclamation basin. There is a plan to pump this poor quality ground water to the ocean and recharge the basin with reclaimed water of higher quality, to provide a positive salt balance. When the ground water quality improves, it will be used for irrigation of parks and golf courses, the Wild Animal Park and for landscape and freeway irrigation. There is a large and continued demand for irrigation water in the area. The eastern portion of the basin is designated as potable, and efforts will be made to keep the quality of the ground water from degrading. A third part of the basin, called the Narrows, is located between the San Pasqual reclamation basin and the Hodges basin. It has a very small capacity and will be used to prevent surface and ground water flows of reclaimed water from entering Lake Hodges Reservoir, a potable storage reservoir for the City of San Diego.

LOWER SAN LUIS REY VALLEY

Imported water comprises almost the entire supply for this basin. Ground water use is limited due to deteriorated water quality. There are four operating wastewater treatment facilities in this basin that could supply over 12,000 acre-feet per year (AF/Y) of treated wastewater that could be used for ground water recharge or other beneficial uses. At the present time reclaimed water is only being used for freeway landscape irrigation. Many springs and wells that used to be ephemeral, now flow all year long with imported irrigation return water. In many areas of this basin, reclaimed water is of higher quality than the existing ground water quality. Use of reclaimed water can be utilized to improve the conditions of the ground water quality.

LOWER SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY

The San Dieguito ground water management plan includes the utilization of approximately 2,000 to 4,000 ~~AF/Y acre-foot per year~~ of recharge of reclaimed water. The reclaimed water will initially be used for irrigation, rejuvenation of non-potable ground water resources and for creating a fresh water barrier near Interstate 5. Water from the City of Escondido's Hale Avenue Reclamation Facility will be treated to tertiary treatment standards and pumped to the reclamation area in the San Dieguito Valley, where it will undergo recharge to replace poor quality water pumped to

the ocean or desalted and treated to potable water standards. This reclaimed water will be used for agriculture and landscape irrigation. As the ground water quality improves, this basin could supply water to areas outside the basin, such as La Jolla Valley and North City West for landscape irrigation. The San Dieguito Basin lacks a centralized wastewater collection system. Water services are provided by four different governmental agencies, and sewer service is provided by eight governmental agencies. There are plans to interconnect the existing and proposed treatment facilities into an integrated system which can supply reclaimed water throughout the basin. The benefits of a ground water management plan in this basin include inexpensive storage and distribution of excess reclaimed water flows available during low irrigation months. This ground water management plan will result in improved ground water quality and will provide an efficient use of available water resources.

SANTEE

The Padre Dam Municipal Water District is reviewing the feasibility of a comprehensive ground water management plan for Santee basin. Ground water from the eastern part of the basin is used for domestic, agricultural and stock watering purposes, and generally has TDS concentrations of 260-1,310 mg/l. The ground water in the main portion of the Santee basin has TDS concentrations of up to 2,990 mg/l. In times of drought, this water could supplement imported water supplies. At the present time, reclaimed water is used only for recreational purposes at Santee Lakes Campground, and Park. The Padre Dam Municipal Water Districts 1.0 MGD tertiary and 2.0 MGD secondary capacity treatment facility provides 1,200 ~~AC/Y acre-foot per year~~ of reclaimed water which is used for the Santee Lakes. Water from Lake No. 1 is used to irrigate the landscaping of the surrounding the lakes. Currently only 1 MGD of the plant's capacity is being utilized. All flows over 1 MGD are sent to the Metropolitan Sewer System. Future water reuse projects include another 1,200 ~~AF/Y acre-foot per year~~ projected need for the Santee Town Center and city park and approximately 1,400 ~~AF/Y acre-foot per year~~ for industrial use. High quality reclaimed water could provide a potential source for recharging the ground water basin and improve existing water quality. Careful management of

the basin could mitigate impacts of a high water table to prevent resurfacing of reclaimed water.

LOWER SWEETWATER RIVER BASIN

The Sweetwater Authority completed initial ground water basin studies of the Lower Sweetwater River Basin in June, 1993. As part of the agency's water resources program, the Sweetwater Authority is reviewing the feasibility of using ground water from the Lower Sweetwater Basin to augment its potable water supply.

The Lower Sweetwater Basin extends along the Sweetwater River from the Sweetwater Reservoir Dam approximately eight miles to San Diego Bay. It consists of an alluvial aquifer and the underlying San Diego Formation aquifer. Current use of ground water within the basin is limited, with turf irrigation the predominate use. The Basin is recharged from natural runoff and water from the upstream urban runoff diversion system which, in part, surrounds the Sweetwater Reservoir and spills over the Sweetwater Dam. Water quality data indicate that the ground water is moderately saline with ~~TDS total dissolved solids~~ concentrations averaging 1,400 mg/l.

The Sweetwater Authority is currently evaluating the feasibility of constructing ground water extraction wells, a water treatment facility, a brackish water pipeline from each well to the treatment facility, a product water delivery pipeline and pump station, and a brine disposal pipeline. Preliminary findings indicate that extraction and treatment (to potable water standards) of 1,600 to 3,600 ~~AF/Y acre-foot per year~~ of ground water from the Lower Sweetwater River Basin is feasible. Some additional production and/or ground water storage may be available in the San Diego Formation aquifer. San Diego Formation hydrogeological studies are ongoing; however preliminary findings indicate that the managed storage potential in the aquifer may be significant.

LOWER TIJUANA RIVER BASIN

The Tijuana Valley County Water District adopted a Resolution of Intention to prepare a Ground Water Management Plan in accordance with ~~California~~ Water Code sections 10750 - 10755 in February, 1993. The stated goals of the District are summarized as follows:

- Protect ground water quality and quantity in the Tijuana River Basin for existing and future

property owners, agricultural and recreational users;

- Develop the ground water basin into a sub-regional water supply reservoir;
- Provide water to Valley customers and sell excess ground water to customers outside the Basin;
- Implement measures for ground water recharge with surface floodwater containment and runoff control facilities, and reclaimed water, if available; and
- Work with the City and County of San Diego and appropriate state and federal agencies, to propose a workable international floodwater and wastewater control solution for the Valley.

The District's current plans include development of ground water management alternatives for the production and treatment of approximately 2,500 ~~AF/Y acre-foot per year~~ of potable ground water.

UPPER SANTA MARGARITA RIVER BASIN

In Riverside County, the upper Santa Margarita River Basin contains several million acre-feet of high quality ground water in the Pauba/Temecula aquifer system. The Rancho California Water District is considering a plan that will implement the use of reclaimed water for beneficial uses and for ground water recharge. Some changes in basin plan water quality objectives are needed to develop this project. The Santa Rosa SBR Water Reclamation Facility, near Temecula, percolates reclaimed waters through highly permeable alluvium, which recharge and mix with ground water in an upper aquifer. A tentative projection calls for 5 MGD of reclaimed water production by the year 2000.

SAN JUAN CREEK

In Orange County, a management plan is underway in the San Juan Creek Basin. Ground water supplies are limited in this basin due to low recharge and poor quality. The capacity of the San Juan Creek Basin is approximately 90,000 acre-feet. With proper management of the ground water basin, approximately

50,000 ~~acre-foot per year (AF/Y)~~ could be utilized. The basin currently provides approximately 5,000 AF/Y of usable ground water - less than 2,000 AF/Y is used for urban supply and approximately 3,000 AF/Y is used for agricultural and irrigation purposes. The only ground water that meets drinking water standards and most agricultural requirements is found in the highlands of the northeasternmost portion of the basin. Ground water quality data indicate that the TDS concentration ranges from 300 mg/l (in the northeasternmost portion of the basin) to 1,850 mg/l (in the lower and western portion of the basin). Approximately 3.0 ~~million gallons per day (MGD)~~ of treated wastewater is being reclaimed for irrigation of a golf course, park, greenbelt and landscaping. In addition, reuse is proposed for effluent from Moulton-Niguel Water District's Water Reclamation Plant 3A, which has been expanded from a capacity of 0.5 ~~MGD million gallons per day~~ to 2.4 MGD, and for effluent from Trabuco Canyon Water District's Robinson Ranch Wastewater Reclamation Plant, which has a capacity of 0.25 MGD. The TDS concentration in secondary effluent in the basin ranges from 500 to 900 mg/l. Reclaimed water could be used to enhance surface water flows and quality or to improve ground water quality in the lower and western parts of the basin. The use of reclaimed water for urban or agricultural irrigation could help reduce demands for ground and imported water. A ground water monitoring plan for the San Juan Creek Basin has been proposed by the Department of Water Resources which would identify any basinwide changes that may occur in water quality that could affect current and potential beneficial uses. This program would provide an early warning that ground water supplies may be endangered.

SALT BALANCE


Salt balance is a theoretical concept where the total mass of dissolved minerals entering a ground water basin system from all sources is equal to the total mass of dissolved minerals leaving the system, either through extraction or natural outflow. It is preferable to have a balance of the salt inflows and outflows to maintain water quality in a basin.

Utilizing the following management measures would enhance the prospects for salt balance for ground water basins in the Region. These measures include:

- Limiting ground water extractions from basins to perennial-yield levels;
- Increasing the efficiency of irrigation practices;
- Reducing fertilizer application;
- Improving the quality of imported water used for irrigation;
- Use storm water runoff for ground water recharge, since storm water is low in TDS~~total dissolved solids~~;
- Extract and demineralize poor quality ground water when this option becomes economically feasible; and
- Utilize intrusion barriers and regulate ground water pumpage to prevent and reverse problems of salt water intrusion.

SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER PROGRAM

The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 provides for a sole source aquifer program. Under this program, USEPA may designate an aquifer as a sole source if it provides more than half of the drinking water for a given area, and no other affordable sources of drinking water exist. The Act provides that, when certain criteria are met, a group may petition the USEPA to designate a sole source aquifer. Thus, in May of 1993, a local citizens' group, Backcountry Against Dumps petitioned the USEPA to designate the Campo/ Cottonwood Creek aquifer as the sole source of drinking water in a 400 square-mile area. The Campo/Cottonwood aquifer is bordered by Mexico to the south, and includes within its borders reservations for the Campo, La Posta, Manzanita, and Cuyapaipe Indian tribes. The aquifer lies about 20 miles east of El Cajon, California. This designation means the USEPA may review proposed projects in the aquifer area which receive partial federal funding and which could contaminate the aquifer or endanger public health. Examples of projects potentially subject to review include construction or renovation of housing projects, airports, and highways. Projects that do not receive some federal funds would not be reviewed.



REFERENCES

Annapolis Field Office Region III Environmental Protection Agency. January, 1974. Distribution of Metals in Baltimore Harbor Sediments. Technical Reports 59.

Bengtson, Debell, Elkin & Titus, Ltd. 1989. Best Management Practices Manual for the Shipbuilding and repair Industry. Draft Document. Prepared for Virginia State Water Control Board. Richmond, Virginia.

California Administrative Code. 1985 (and all amendments thereto). Title 22 and Title 23.

California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, ~~California~~ Water Code, Division 2 and 7. 1969 (and all amendments thereto).

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. 1975. Comprehensive Water Quality Control Plan Report for the San Diego Basin (9). James M. Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. June 12, 1992. Policy Statement - Water Rights Phase of the Bay Delta Estuary Proceedings.

Department of Water Resources. 1964. Names and Areal Code Numbers of Hydrologic Areas in the Southern District.

Department of Water Resources. 1967. Ground Water Occurrence and Quality San Diego Region. Bulletin No. 106-2. Volume 1: Text. 235 pp.

Engineering-Science, Inc. February 22, 1974. Summary Report, Lower James River Basin Comprehensive Water Quality Management Study.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act. 1972 (and all amendments thereto). PL 92-500. (Clean Water Act).

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 1992. CEQA California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines 1992. Sacramento, California. 256 pp.

Jayne, Deborah S. February 1, 1993. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. Staff Report on Petitions to Downgrade Threat to Water Quality and Complexity Ratings for Campbell Industries, Southwest Marine, and National Steel and Shipbuilding Company Shipyards, Revised Edition.

Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory. March, 1973. A Study of Sediments and Soil Samples from Pearl Harbor Area. Port Hueneme, California.

Planning and Conservation League Foundation. June 1985. Citizen's Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act. 14 pp.

Pryde, Philip P. 1976. Chapter 8, Water Supply for the County. In San Diego, An Introduction to the Region. pp. 103-120. Prepared by the Department of Geography, San Diego State University. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa.

San Diego County Water Authority. 1992. Forty-Sixth Annual Report of Authority Operations for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1992. San Diego, California. 128 pp.

San Diego County Water Authority. November 1993. Water Resources Plan: Urban Water Management Plan. 83pp.

SCS Engineers. 1989. Hazardous Waste Minimization Audit Study of Marine yards for Maintenance and Repair. File No. 188057.00. Prepared for California Department of Health Services, Alternative Technology and Policy Development Section. Sacramento, California.

State Water Resources Control Board. July 1975. Comprehensive Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin, Abstract. 58 pp.

State Water Resources Control Board. 1988. Water Quality Inventory. Nonpoint Source Management Plan.

State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality, Nonpoint Source Section. 1994. Polluted Runoff Watershed Solutions. 31pp.

State Water Resources Control Board. 1990. Chapter 9: Compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

State Water Resources Control Board. June 1992. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and Related Code Sections (including 1991 amendments). 218 pp.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1974. Draft Report to the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board on Guidelines for the Control of Shipyard Pollutants. National Field Investigations Center. Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1979. Development Document for Proposed Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Shipbuilding and repair Point Source Category. Effluent Guidelines Division, WH-552. Washington, D.C.

Vanderver, T.A., R.V. Randle, and J.C. Martin. 1989. Chapter 10: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). pp 441-472. In Environmental Law Handbook, Tenth Edition. Government Institutes, Inc.

Virginia Institute of Marine Science. 1972. Study of Channel Sediments, Baltimore Harbor (Norfolk District), York River Entrance Channel.

Virginia Institute of Marine Science. June, 1971. Study of Channel Sediments, James River.

INDEX – CHAPTER 4

Abrasive blast waste.....	53	Diazinon.....	108
Abrasive grit	52	Dredged material	
Administrative civil liability.....	22	Beach replenishment.....	62
Alternative systems	29	California Coastal Zone Management Act.....	60
Applied chemicals.....	86	California Environmental Quality Act of 1973	
Auto shredder waste.....	73	60
Bilge waste.....	53	California Fish and Game Code.....	60
Blast wastewater.....	53	Capping	63
Boatyards.....	56	Chemical characteristics.....	61
Dredged material	60	Clean Water Act	57
California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23,		Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972	57
Chapter 15	65	Confined disposal.....	63
California Water Code		Contaminated sediment.....	63
Division 7	58	Disposal of	61
Section 13050	18	Endangered Species Act of 1973.....	57
Section 13242	1	Enforcement process for contaminated	
Section 13243	18	sediments	59
Section 13263	3	Federal statutes and regulation.....	57
Section 13269	9	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 ..	57
Section 13301	22	Habitat restoration/ enhancement	62
Section 13376	19	LA-5 ocean dredged material disposal site....	63
Section 13523	17	Ocean disposal	62
Cease and desist orders.....	21	Ocean Plan.....	59
Channelization impacts.....	93	Physical behavior	61
Clean Water Act		Physical characteristics	61
Section 104(b)(3)	75	Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899	57
Section 131.11	105	San Diego Bay, history of projects	60
Section 201(g)(1)(b)	75	State Board Resolution No. 74-43.....	59
Section 205(j)(5)	75	State statutes and regulations	58
Section 303(d)	105, 106	Upland (landfill) disposal.....	63
Section 304(l)	105	Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed	
Section 304(m)	105	Bays and Estuaries	59
Section 304(s)	105	Enforcement action	
Section 314.....	106	Administrative civil liability	22
Section 319.....	106	Cease and desist orders	22
Section 319(h):	75	Cleanup and abatement orders	21
Section 401	20, 59	Criminal penalties	22
Section 402(p)	77	Injunctive relief	22
Section 404.....	20	Judicial civil liability	22
Section 603(c)(2)	75	Level A	21
Section 604(b)	75	Level B	21
Clean water grants and loans	24	Level C	21
Clean water grants program	24	Level D	22
Clean Water Strategy.....	105	Selection of	22
Cleanup and abatement		Time schedule orders	21
Investigations.....	100	Enforcement program	21
Orders	21	Erosion	91
Policy	99	Erosion and Sediment Control Program	90
Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments		Flood control	93
(CZARA)	85	General construction storm water permit	83
Community sewerage systems	28	Requirements.....	83
Dairies	88	Gravel	92
Department of Defense (DoD) facilities	98	Ground water cleanup levels	101

Ground water dewatering	56	Resolution No. 79-44	26
Ground water management		Resolution No. 81-16	43
Lower San Dieguito river valley	120	Resolution No. 83-21	92
Lower San Luis Rey valley	120	Resolution No. 85-92	73
Lower Sweetwater river valley	121	Resolution No. 87-71	88
Lower Tijuana river basin.....	121	Resolution No. 87-91	90
San Juan creek basin.....	121	Resolution No. 90-53	40
San Pasqual Valley	119	Resolution No. 90-61	42
Santee.....	120	Resolution No. 92-21	91
Upper Santa Margarita river basin.....	121	Regional Board Dairy Waste Management Policy	88
Ground water management programs.....	119	Regional Board permitting programs.....	3
Guidelines for New Community and Individual		Remediation programs	95
Sewerage Facilities.....	26	Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).....	3
Hazardous waste source reduction.....	23	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	65
Highway runoff control program	83	Salt balance	122
Hydroblasting	52	San Diego Gas and Electric Company.....	45
Implementation program		Sand, gravel, and related operations	92
Elements of	1	Sediment control.....	89
Individual sewerage systems.....	29	Shipyards	51
Industrial storm water permit	82	Activities at	51
Industrial wastewater management		Industrial processes.....	51
pretreatment program	44	Materials used	52
Irrigation return water	86	San Diego Bay.....	55
Irrigation water	86	Waste generated at.....	53
Load Allocations (LAs)	106	Shredder Waste Policy	73
Marinas	49	Sludge.....	71
CZARA (g) guidance	49	Sludge disposal.....	72
Marine sanitation devices	49	Soil cleanup levels.....	104
Mixing zones	9	Sole source aquifer program	122
Monitoring		Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT)	71
Compliance monitoring and inspections	21	Southern California Edison.....	45
Self monitoring program.....	20	Spills, Leaks, Investigation and Cleanup (SLIC)	97
Municipal storm water permits	79	Program.....	97
Municipal wastewater	23	Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes..	82
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System		State Board Resolution No. 77-1	31
(NPDES) permit	8	Steam electric power plants	45
Nonpoint source funding	75	Storm water	
Nonpoint Source Management Plan (NPSMP) ..	75	Definition of	77
Nonpoint source management program.....	75	pollutants	78
Nonpoint source pollution		program.....	77
Chronology of control measures	73	Storm water permit	82
Definition of	74	General construction	83
Severity of	74	General industrial	82
Plans and policies.....	59	Subsurface disposal	
Point source		campgrounds	46
Control categories	2	systems.....	24
Definition of	2	Time schedule orders.....	21
Effluent limitations	2	Time schedules.....	104
Pollution prevention	78	TMDL worksheet	118
Education.....	79	Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).....	106
Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)	23	Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund	97
Quantifiable target.....	107	Underground storage tank program.....	96
Reclaimed water storage requirements	43	Vessels	
Regional Board		Regulation of.....	49
Resolution No. 78-24.....	46		
Resolution No. 79-25.....	91		

U.S. Navy.....	47	Water Quality Assessment (WQA)	105
Wastes	47	Water quality certification, Section 401	20
water quality	46	Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs)	106
Waste classification	66	Water reclamation	34, 119
Waste discharge		Water reclamation and reuse.....	30
Permit programs	3	Water reclamation law	17
Prohibitions.....	18	Water reclamation requirements	10
Requirements (Waiver policy)	9	Watershed protection approach	95
to land	64	Wetlands, riparian systems	
Waste Load Allocations (WLAs).....	106	Value of.....	94