

## Santa Ana River Basin Monitoring Task Force

August 24, 2021

## Waste Load Allocation Model Update



#### Draft Supplemental Report Available for Review



Adjustments

Removed Sterling discharges to City Creek YVWD TIN permit limit adjusted from 6.7 mg/L to 5.5 mg/L for all scenarios



WLAM was rerun for the following GMZs:

San Timoteo Bunker Hill-B Colton

#### Supplemental Predictive Scenario Results for TIN & 10-year Averaging Period

GMZ	TIN OBJECTIVE(S) (MG/L)	AMBIENT	ASSIMILATIVE CAPACITY	2020 CONDITIONS			2040 CONDITIONS		
				Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min
San Timoteo	5.0/2.7	1.5	3.5	3.39	3.35	3.32	2.86	2.65	2.49
Bunker Hill B	7.3	5.8	1.5	2.76	2.48	2.24	2.52	2.43	2.16
Colton	2.7	3.3	None	2.70	1.86	1.65	2.53	2.37	1.78

# Basin Plan Amendments – Updated Mineral Increment Language

These mineral increments were incorporated into the 1983 Basin Plan. They will be incorporated into waste discharge requirements when appropriate and necessary. In general, it may not be necessary to incorporate mineral increment requirements when a water quality based effluent limitation for salinity imposed on a Publicly Owned Treatment Work (POTW) in accordance with an approved wasteload allocation for salinity.

# Basin Plan Amendments — Clarification re: Application of Table 5-5

The WLAM does not evaluate off channel discharges of treated wastewater or off-channel uses of recycled water for landscape or crop irrigation, and thus the wasteload allocations in Table 5-5 are not directly applicable to such discharges. The wasteload allocations in Table 5-5 will be applied only to the surface water discharges of these POTWs to the Santa Ana River and its tributaries. Except as identified in Table 5-5, the results from the updated WLAM as articulated in the June 2020 report may not be used to support new permits or changes to existing effluent limits until the updated WLAM is further validated using actual precipitation data and actual discharge data from water years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, to compare WLAM projections to actual observations at Prado Dam.

# Basin Plan Amendments – TDS 120-month volume-weighted running average (Existing Draft)

Effluent limits that are imposed for the purpose of implementing the approved wasteload allocation for TDS shall require dischargers to demonstrate compliance based on a 120-month volume-weighted running average that is updated every month. The use of a 120-month volume-weighted running average for TDS accounts for drought cycles, long-term climate change, and other factors such as changes in source water supplies. The 120-month volume-weighted running average for TDS shall be the standard averaging period as long as the discharger takes all reasonable steps to improve the quality of the influent to the treatment facility (such as through source control or improved water supplies), and provided that chemical additions are minimized to the extent feasible. The Regional Board retains discretion authority to impose longer or shorter averaging periods, on a case-by-case basis, when it determines that doing so is necessary and appropriate.

#### Water Board Staff Concerns

- Sets 120-month average as the default standard and puts burden on Water Board staff to permit something other than 120-month volume-weighted running average
- Eliminates POTW evaluation of ongoing and anticipated new activities for controlling salinity and long-term impacts
- May masque potential impacts if case-by-case evaluation is not conducted prior to including a 120-month volume-weighted running average permit limit
- Remains unsettled issue

### Options for Task Force Discussion

- Indicate that 12-month volume-weighted running average is the default but that a different averaging period (up to a 120-month period) may be included if the discharger conducts a discharger-specific evaluation to demonstrate that a longer averaging period is appropriate. (Or, perhaps 12-month annual average?)
- Indicate that 120-month volume-weighted running average is the default but indicate that a trigger limit based on 12-month average would need to be included and that additional actions by the discharger would need to occur.
- Evaluate options for excusing occasional permit non-compliance of the 12-month volume-weighted running average due to drought or other similar situations.

### Draft Language Option 1

Effluent limits that are imposed for the purpose of implementing the approved wasteload allocation for TDS shall generally require dischargers to demonstrate compliance based on a 12-month running average. The Regional Board may consider imposing effluent limits for TDS identified in Table 5-5 (below) using longer averaging periods (not to exceed an averaging period of 120-months as a volume-weighted running average) based on a case-by-case evaluation that considers the dischargers ongoing actions and activities that are being implemented to address and/or avoid long-term salinity impacts.

Permittee & Discharges	Primary Rece	Discharge (mgd)		TDS (mg/L)	TIN (mg/L)	
	Surface Stream(s) Groundwater MZ(s)		<mark>2020 2040</mark>			
City of Beaumont	Noble Cr, Cooper's Cr. to San Timoteo CrR4	Beaumont & San Timoteo	3.8 (1.8)	<mark>6.3</mark> (1.8)	300 (400)	3.6 (6.0)
Yucaipa Valley Water District	San Timoteo CrR3	San Timoteo	<mark>8.0</mark>	<mark>8.0</mark>	400	5.5
City of San Bernardino: Geothermal Discharges	East Twin Cr. & Warm Cr. to SAR-R5	Bunker Hill-A & B	<mark>1.0</mark>	<mark>1.0</mark>	264	0.7
City of Rialto	SAR-R4	Riverside-A	<mark>7.2</mark>	<mark>18.0</mark>	490	10.0
RIX (Cities of Colton & San Bernardino)	SAR-R4	Riverside-A	<mark>34.5</mark>	<mark>30.1</mark>	550	10.0
City of Riverside-RWQCP	SAR-R3	Chino-South	<mark>33.8</mark>	<mark>46.0</mark>	650	10.0
City of Corona: WWTP-1	Temescal CrR1A	N/A (PBMZ)	<mark>11.5</mark>	<mark>15.0</mark>	700	10.0
Inland Empire Utilities Agency: RP1, RP4, RP5, & CC	Chino Cr. & Cucamonga Cr.	Chino-North (or PBMZ)	<mark>85</mark>	<mark>107.0</mark>	550	8.0
Western MWD: WRCRWA	SAR-R3	N/A (PBMZ)	<mark>12.0</mark>	<mark>15.3</mark>	625	10.0
Western MWD: Arlington Desalter	Temescal CrR1A	N/A (PBMZ)	<mark>7.25</mark>	<mark>7.25</mark>	260	4.4
Temescal Valley Water District-TVWRF	Temescal CrR2	Upper Temescal Vly.	<mark>2.3</mark>	<mark>2.3</mark>	650	10.0
Elsinore Valley MWD: RWWRF-DP001	Temescal CrR5	Upper Temescal Vly.	<mark>8.0</mark>	<mark>12.0</mark>	700	10.0
Eastern MWD: SJV, MV, PV, SC, TV	Temescal CrR5	Upper Temescal Vly.	<mark>52.5</mark>	<mark>52.5</mark>	650	10.0

### Next Steps for Task Force

Reach agreement on BPA language with Water Board staff re: averaging period for TDS limits

Finalize BPA language (clean draft to be sent this week)

Revise Staff Report based on final agreed on language

Water Board to complete, make ADA compliant, release for 45-day public comment

Potential December hearing date, but may be later