

ATTACHMENT A

WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN OCEAN WATERS OF CALIFORNIA



Established 1972

Revised 2019

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

- c. The Department, as subject to the provisions of Chapter III.L.2.b, shall develop and implement monitoring plans that demonstrate the effectiveness of the controls and compliance with full capture system equivalency*. Monitoring reports shall be provided to the State Water Board on an annual basis, and shall include GIS-mapped locations and drainage area served for each of the full capture systems*, multi-benefit projects*, other treatment controls*, and/or institutional controls* installed or utilized by the Department. In developing the monitoring report, the Department should consider the following questions:
- (1) What type of and how many treatment controls* institutional controls*, and/or multi-benefit projects* have been used and in what locations?
 - (2) How many full capture systems* have been installed (if any), in what locations have they been installed, and what is the individual and cumulative area served by them?
 - (3) What is the effectiveness of the total combination of treatment controls*, institutional controls*, and multi-benefit projects* employed by the Department?
 - (4) Has the amount of Trash* discharged from the Department's MS4* decreased from the previous year? If so, by how much? If not, explain why.
 - (5) Has the amount of Trash* in the receiving waters decreased from the previous year? If so, by how much? If not, explain why.
- d. Dischargers that are subject to the provisions of Chapter III.L.2.c herein shall be required to report the measures used to comply with Chapter III.L.2.c.

M. Implementation Provisions for Desalination Facilities*

1. Applicability and General Provisions

- a. Chapter III.M applies to desalination facilities* using seawater.* Chapter III.M.2 does not apply to desalination facilities* operated by a federal agency. Chapter III.M.2, M.3, and M.4 do not apply to portable desalination facilities* that withdraw less than 0.10 million gallons per day (MGD) of seawater* and are operated by a governmental agency. These standards do not alter or limit in any way the authority of any public agency to implement its statutory obligations. The Executive Director of the State Water Board may temporarily waive the application of chapter III.M to desalination facilities* that are operating to serve as a critical short-term water supply during a state of emergency as declared by the Governor.
- b. Definitions of New, Expanded, and Existing Facilities:

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (1) For purposes of chapter III.M, “existing facilities” means desalination facilities* that have been issued an NPDES permit and all building permits and other governmental approvals necessary to commence construction for which the owner or operator has relied in good faith on those previously-issued permits and approvals and commenced construction of the facility beyond site grading prior to January 28, 2016.
 - (2) For purposes of chapter III.M, “expanded facilities” means existing facilities for which, after January 28, 2016, the owner or operator does either of the following in a manner that could increase intake or mortality of all forms of marine life * beyond that which was originally approved in any NPDES permit or Water Code section 13142.5, subdivision (b) (hereafter Water Code section 13142.5(b)) determination: 1) increases the amount of seawater* used either exclusively by the facility or used by the facility in conjunction with other facilities or uses, or 2) changes the design or operation of the facility. To the extent that the desalination facility* is co-located with another facility that withdraws water for a different purpose and that other facility reduces the volume of water withdrawn to a level less than the desalination facility’s* volume of water withdrawn, the desalination facility* is considered to be an expanded facility.
 - (3) For purposes of chapter III.M, “new facilities” means desalination facilities* that are not existing facilities or expanded facilities.
- c. Chapter III.M.2 (Water Code §13142.5(b) Determinations for New and Expanded Facilities: Site, Design, Technology, and Mitigation Measures) applies to new and expanded desalination facilities* withdrawing seawater.*
 - d. Chapter III.M.3 (Receiving Water Limitation for Salinity*) applies to all desalination facilities* that discharge into ocean waters* and wastewater facilities that receive brine* from seawater* desalination facilities* and discharge into ocean waters.*
 - e. Chapter III.M.4 (Monitoring and Reporting Programs) applies to all desalination facilities* that discharge into ocean waters.* Chapter III.M.4 shall not apply to a wastewater facility that receives brine* from a seawater* desalination facility* and discharges a positively buoyant commingled effluent through an existing wastewater outfall that is covered under an existing NPDES permit, as long as the owner or operator monitors for compliance with the receiving water limitation set forth in chapter III.M.3. For the purposes of chapter III.M.4, a positively buoyant commingled effluent shall mean that the commingled plume rises when it enters the receiving water body due to salinity* levels in the commingled discharge being lower than the natural background salinity.*

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- f. References to the regional water board include the regional water board acting under delegated authority. For provisions that require consultation between regional water board and State Water Board staff, the regional water board shall notify and consult with the State Water Board staff prior to making a final determination on the item requiring consultation.
 - g. All desalination facilities must comply with all other applicable sections of the Ocean Plan.
2. Water Code section 13142.5(b) Determinations for New and Expanded Facilities: Site, Design, Technology, and Mitigation Measures Feasibility Considerations
- a. General Considerations
 - (1) The owner or operator shall submit a request for a Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination to the appropriate regional water board as early as practicable. This request shall include sufficient information for the regional water board to conduct the analyses described below. The regional water board in consultation with the State Water Board staff may require an owner or operator to provide additional studies or information if needed, including any information necessary to identify and assess other potential sources of mortality to all forms of marine life. All studies and models are subject to the approval of the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff. The regional water board may require an owner or operator to hire a neutral third party entity to review studies and models and make recommendations to the regional water board.
 - (2) The regional water board shall conduct a Water Code section 13142.5(b) analysis of all new and expanded desalination facilities.* A Water Code section 13142.5(b) analysis may include future expansions at the facility. The regional water board shall first analyze separately as independent considerations a range of feasible* alternatives for the best available site, the best available design, the best available technology, and the best available mitigation measures to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.* Then, the regional water board shall consider all four factors collectively and determine the best combination of feasible* alternatives to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.* The best combination of alternatives may not always include the best alternative under each individual factor because some alternatives may be mutually exclusive, redundant, or not feasible* in combination.
 - (3) The regional water board's Water Code section 13142.5(b) analysis for expanded facilities may be limited to those expansions or other changes

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

that result in the increased intake or mortality of all forms of marine life,* unless the regional water board determines that additional measures that minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* are feasible* for the existing portions of the facility.

- (4) In conducting the Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination, the regional water boards shall consult with other state agencies involved in the permitting of that facility, including, but not limited to: California Coastal Commission, California State Lands Commission, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The regional water board shall consider project-specific decisions made by other state agencies; however, the regional water board is not limited to project-specific requirements set forth by other agencies and may include additional requirements in a Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination.
- (5) A regional water board may expressly condition a Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination based on the expectation of the occurrence of a future event. Such future events may include, but are not limited to, the permanent shutdown of a co-located power plant with intake structures shared with the desalination facility,* or a reduction in the volume of wastewater available for the dilution of brine.* The regional water board must make a new Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination if the foreseeable future event occurs.
 - (a) The owner or operator shall provide notice to the regional water board as soon as it becomes aware that the expected future event will occur, and shall submit a new request for a Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination to the regional water board at least one year prior to the event occurring. If the owner or operator does not become aware that the event will occur at least one year prior to the event occurring, the owner or operator shall submit the request as soon as possible.
 - (b) The regional water board may allow up to five years from the date of the event for the owner or operator to make modifications to the facility required by a new Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination, provided that the regional water board finds that 1) any water supply interruption resulting from the facility modifications requires additional time for water users to obtain a temporary replacement supply, or 2) such a compliance period is otherwise in the public interest and reasonably required for modification of the facility to comply with the determination.
 - (c) If the regional water board makes a Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination for a desalination facility* that will be co-located with a power plant, the regional water board shall condition its

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

determination on the power plant remaining in compliance with the Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling.

- b. Site is the general onshore and offshore location of a new or expanded facility. There may be multiple potential facility design configurations within any given site. The regional water board shall require that the owner or operator evaluate a reasonable range of nearby sites, including sites that would likely support subsurface intakes. For each potential site, in order to determine whether a proposed facility site is the best available site feasible* to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life,* the regional water board shall require the owner or operator to:
- (1) Consider whether subsurface intakes* are feasible.*
 - (2) Consider whether the identified need for desalinated* water is consistent with an applicable adopted urban water management plan prepared in accordance with Water Code section 10631, or if no urban water management plan is available, other water planning documents such as a county general plan or integrated regional water management plan.
 - (3) Analyze the feasibility of placing intake, discharge, and other facility infrastructure in a location that avoid impacts to sensitive habitats* and sensitive species.
 - (4) Analyze the direct and indirect effects on all forms of marine life* resulting from facility construction and operation, individually and in combination with potential anthropogenic effects on all forms of marine life* resulting from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities within the area affected by the facility.
 - (5) Analyze oceanographic geologic, hydrogeologic, and seafloor topographic conditions at the site, so that the siting of a facility, including the intakes and discharges, minimizes the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.*
 - (6) Analyze the presence of existing discharge infrastructure, and the availability of wastewater to dilute the facility's brine* discharge.
 - (7) Ensure that the intake and discharge structures are not located within a MPA or SWQPA* with the exception of intake structures that do not have marine life mortality associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the intake structures (e.g. slant wells). Discharges shall be sited at a sufficient distance from a MPA or SWQPA* so that the salinity* within the boundaries of a MPA or SWQPA* does not exceed

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

natural background salinity.* To the extent feasible,* surface intakes shall be sited so as to maximize the distance from a MPA or SWQPA.*

- c. Design is the size, layout, form, and function of a facility, including the intake capacity and the configuration and type of infrastructure, including intake and outfall structures. The regional water board shall require that the owner or operator perform the following in determining whether a proposed facility design is the best available design feasible* to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life:*
- (1) For each potential site, analyze the potential design configurations of the intake, discharge, and other facility infrastructure to avoid impacts to sensitive habitats* and sensitive species.
 - (2) If the regional water board determines that subsurface intakes* are not feasible* and surface water intakes are proposed instead, analyze potential designs for those intakes in order to minimize the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.*
 - (3) Design the outfall so that the brine mixing zone* does not encompass or otherwise adversely affect existing sensitive habitat.*
 - (4) Design the outfall so that discharges do not result in dense, negatively-buoyant plumes that result in adverse effects due to elevated salinity* or hypoxic conditions occurring outside the brine mixing zone.* An owner or operator must demonstrate that the outfall meets this requirement through plume modeling and/or field studies. Modeling and field studies shall be approved by the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff.
 - (5) Design outfall structures to minimize the suspension of benthic sediments.
- d. Technology is the type of equipment, materials,* and methods that are used to construct and operate the design components of the desalination facility.* The regional water board shall apply the following considerations in determining whether a proposed technology is the best available technology feasible* to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life:*
- (1) Considerations for Intake Technology:
 - (a) Subject to chapter M.2.a.(2), the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff shall require subsurface intakes* unless it determines that subsurface intakes* are not feasible* based upon a comparative analysis of the factors listed below for surface and subsurface intakes.* A design capacity in excess of the need for desalinated* water as identified in chapter

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

III.M.2.b.(2) shall not be used by itself to declare subsurface intakes* as not feasible.*

- i. The regional water board shall consider the following factors in determining feasibility of subsurface intakes:* geotechnical data, hydrogeology, benthic topography, oceanographic conditions, presence of sensitive habitats,* presence of sensitive species, energy use for the entire facility; design constraints (engineering, constructability), and project life cycle cost. Project life cycle cost shall be determined by evaluating the total cost of planning, design, land acquisition, construction, operations, maintenance, mitigation, equipment replacement and disposal over the lifetime of the facility, in addition to the cost of decommissioning the facility. Subsurface intakes* shall not be determined to be economically infeasible solely because subsurface intakes* may be more expensive than surface intakes. Subsurface intakes* may be determined to be economically infeasible if the additional costs or lost profitability associated with subsurface intakes,* as compared to surface intakes, would render the desalination facility* not economically viable. In addition, the regional water board may evaluate other site- and facility-specific factors.
 - ii. If the regional water board determines that subsurface intakes* are not feasible* for the proposed intake design capacity, it shall determine whether subsurface intakes* are feasible* for a reasonable range of alternative intake design capacities. The regional water board may find that a combination of subsurface* and surface intakes is the best feasible* alternative to minimize intake and mortality of marine life and meet the identified need for desalinated water as described in chapter III.M.2.b.(2).
- (b) Installation and maintenance of a subsurface intake* shall avoid, to the maximum extent feasible,* the disturbance of sensitive habitats* and sensitive species.
- (c) If subsurface intakes* are not feasible,* the regional water board may approve a surface water intake, subject to the following conditions:
- i. The regional water board shall require that surface water intakes be screened. Screens must be functional while the facility is withdrawing seawater.*
 - ii. In order to reduce entrainment, all surface water intakes must be screened with a 1.0 mm (0.04 in) or smaller slot size screen when the desalination facility* is withdrawing seawater.*

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- iii. An owner or operator may use an alternative method of preventing entrainment so long as the alternative method results in intake and mortality of eggs, larvae, and juvenile organisms that is less than or equivalent to a 1.0 mm (0.04 in) slot size screen. The owner or operator must demonstrate the effectiveness of the alternative method to the regional water board. The owner or operator must conduct a study to demonstrate the effectiveness of the alternative method, and use an Empirical Transport Model* (ETM)/ Area of Production Forgone* (APF) approach* to estimate entrainment. The study period shall be at least 12 consecutive months. Sampling for environmental studies shall be designed to account for variation in oceanographic or hydrologic conditions and larval abundance and diversity such that abundance estimates are reasonably accurate. Samples must be collected using a mesh size no larger than 335 microns and individuals collected shall be identified to the lowest taxonomical level practicable. The ETM/APF analysis* shall evaluate entrainment for a broad range of species, species morphologies, and sizes under the environmental and operational conditions that are representative of the entrained species and the conditions at the full-scale desalination facility.* At their discretion, the regional water boards may permit the use of existing entrainment data to meet this requirement.
- iv. In order to minimize impingement, through-screen velocity at the surface water intake shall not exceed 0.15 meters per second (0.5 feet per second).

(2) Considerations for Brine* Discharge Technology:

- (a) The preferred technology for minimizing intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* resulting from brine* discharge is to commingle brine* with wastewater (e.g., agricultural, municipal, industrial, power plant cooling water, etc.) that would otherwise be discharged to the ocean. The wastewater must provide adequate dilution to ensure salinity* of the commingled discharge meets the receiving water limitation for salinity* in chapter III.M.3. Nothing in this section shall preclude future recycling of the wastewater.
- (b) Multiport diffusers* are the next best method for disposing of brine* when the brine* cannot be diluted by wastewater and when there are no live organisms in the discharge. Multiport diffusers* shall be engineered to maximize dilution, minimize the size of the brine mixing zone,* minimize the suspension of benthic sediments, and minimize mortality of all forms of marine life.*

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (c) Brine* discharge technologies other than wastewater dilution and multiport diffusers,* may be used if an owner or operator can demonstrate to the regional water board that the technology provides a comparable level of intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* as wastewater dilution if wastewater is available, or multiport diffusers* if wastewater is unavailable. The owner or operator must evaluate all of the individual and cumulative effects of the proposed alternative discharge method on the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life,* including (where applicable); intake-related entrainment, osmotic stress, turbulence that occurs during water conveyance and mixing, and shearing stress at the point of discharge. When determining the intake and mortality associated with a brine* discharge technology or combination of technologies, the regional water board shall require the owner or operator to use empirical studies or modeling to:
- i. Estimate intake entrainment impacts using an ETM/APF approach.*
 - ii. Estimate degradation of all forms of marine life* from elevated salinity* within the brine mixing zone,* including osmotic stresses, the size of impacted area, and the duration that all forms of marine life* are exposed to the toxic conditions. Considerations shall be given to the most sensitive species, and community structure and function.
 - iii. Estimate the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* that occurs as a result of water conveyance, in-plant turbulence or mixing, and waste* discharge.
 - iv. Within 18 months of beginning operation, submit to the regional water board an empirical study that evaluates intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* associated with the alternative brine* discharge technology. The study must evaluate impacts caused by any augmented intake volume, intake and pump technology, water conveyance, waste brine* mixing, and effluent discharge. Unless demonstrated otherwise, organisms entrained by the alternative brine* discharge technology are assumed to have a mortality rate of 100 percent. The study period shall be at least 12 consecutive months. If the regional water board requires a study period longer than 12 months, the final report must be submitted to the regional water board within 6 months of the completion of the empirical study.
 - v. If the empirical study shows that the alternative brine* discharge technology results in more intake and mortality of all forms of

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

marine life* than a facility using wastewater dilution or multiport diffusers,* then the facility must either: (1) cease using the alternative brine* discharge technology and install and use wastewater dilution or multiport diffusers* to discharge brine* waste, or (2) re-design the alternative brine* discharge technology system to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* to a level that is comparable with wastewater dilution if wastewater is available, or multiport diffusers* if wastewater is unavailable,* subject to regional water board approval.

- (d) Flow augmentation* as an alternative brine* discharge technology is prohibited with the following exceptions:
- i. At facilities that use subsurface intakes* to supply augmented flow water for dilution. Facilities that use subsurface intakes* to supply augmented flow water for dilution are exempt from the requirements of chapter III.M.2.d.(2)(c) if the facility meets the receiving water limitation for salinity* in chapter III.M.3.
 - ii. At a facility that has received a conditional Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination and is over 80 percent constructed by January 28, 2016. If the owner or operator of the facility proposes to use flow augmentation* as an alternative brine* discharge technology, the facility must: use low turbulence intakes (e.g., screw centrifugal pumps or axial flow pumps) and conveyance pipes; convey and mix dilution water in a manner that limits thermal stress, osmotic stress, turbulent shear stress, and other factors that could cause intake and mortality of all forms of marine life*; comply with chapter III.M.2.d.(1); and not discharge through multiport diffusers.*
- e. Mitigation for the purposes of this section is the replacement of all forms of marine life* or habitat that is lost due to the construction and operation of a desalination facility* after minimizing intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* through best available site, design, and technology. The regional water board shall ensure an owner or operator fully mitigates for the operational lifetime of the facility and uses the best available mitigation measures feasible* to minimize intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.* The owner or operator may choose whether to satisfy a facility's mitigation measures pursuant to chapter III.M.2.e.(3) or, if available, M.2.e.(4), or a combination of the two.
- (1) *Marine Life Mortality Report.* The owner or operator of a facility shall submit a report to the regional water board estimating the marine life mortality resulting from construction and operation of the facility after

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

implementation of the facility's required site, design, and technology measures.

- (a) For operational mortality related to intakes, the report shall include a detailed entrainment study. The entrainment study period shall be at least 12 consecutive months and sampling shall be designed to account for variation in oceanographic or hydrologic conditions and larval abundance and diversity such that abundance estimates are reasonably accurate. At their discretion, the regional water boards may permit the use of existing entrainment data from the facility to meet this requirement. Samples must be collected using a mesh size no larger than 335 microns and individuals collected shall be identified to the lowest taxonomical level practicable. The ETM/APF analysis* shall be representative of the entrained species collected using the 335 micron net. The APF* shall be calculated using a one-sided, upper 95 percent confidence bound for the 95th percentile of the APF distribution. An owner or operator with subsurface intakes* is not required to do an ETM/APF analysis* for their intakes and is not required to mitigate for intake-related operational mortality. The regional water board may apply a one percent reduction to the APF* acreage calculated in the Marine Life Mortality Report to account for the reduction in entrainment of all forms of marine life* when using a 1.0 mm slot size screen.
- (b) For operational mortality related to discharges, the report shall estimate the area in which salinity* exceeds 2.0 parts per thousand above natural background salinity* or a facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation (see chapter III.M.3). The area in excess of the receiving water limitation for salinity* shall be determined by modeling and confirmed with monitoring. The report shall use any acceptable approach approved by the regional water board for evaluating mortality that occurs due to shearing stress resulting from the facility's discharge, including any incremental increase in mortality resulting from a commingled discharge.
- (c) For construction-related mortality, the report shall use any acceptable approach approved by the regional water board for evaluating the mortality that occurs within the area disturbed by the facility's construction. The regional water board may determine that the construction-related disturbance does not require mitigation because the disturbance is temporary and the habitat is naturally restored.
- (d) Upon approval of the report by the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff, the calculated marine life

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

mortality shall form the basis for the mitigation provided pursuant to this section.

- (2) The owner or operator shall mitigate for the mortality of all forms of marine life* determined in the report above by choosing to either complete a mitigation project as described in chapter III.M.2.e.(3) or, if an appropriate fee-based mitigation program is available, provide funding for the program as described in chapter III.M.2.e.(4). The mitigation project or the use of a fee-based mitigation program and the amount of the fee that the owner or operator must pay is subject to regional water board approval.
- (3) *Mitigation Option 1: Complete a Mitigation Project.* The mitigation project must satisfy the following provisions:
 - (a) The owner or operator shall submit a Mitigation Plan. Mitigation Plans shall include: project objectives, site selection, site protection instrument (the legal arrangement or instrument that will be used to ensure the long-term protection of the compensatory mitigation project site), baseline site conditions, a mitigation work plan, a maintenance plan, a long-term management plan, an adaptive management plan, performance standards and success criteria, monitoring requirements, and financial assurances.
 - (b) The mitigation project must meet the following requirements:
 - i. Mitigation shall be accomplished through expansion, restoration or creation of one or more of the following: kelp beds,* estuaries,* coastal wetlands, natural reefs, MPAs, or other projects approved by the regional water board that will mitigate for intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* associated with the facility.
 - ii. The owner or operator shall demonstrate that the project fully mitigates for intake-related marine life mortality by including expansion, restoration, or creation of habitat based on the APF* acreage calculated in the Marine Life Mortality Report above. The owner or operator using surface water intakes shall do modeling to evaluate the areal extent of the mitigation project's production area to confirm that it overlaps the facility's source water body.* Impacts on the mitigation project due to entrainment by the facility must be offset by adding compensatory acreage to the mitigation project.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- iii. The owner or operator shall demonstrate that the project also fully mitigates for the discharge-related marine life mortality projected in the Marine Life Mortality Report above.
 - iv. The owner or operator shall demonstrate that the project also fully mitigates for the construction-related marine life mortality identified in the Marine Life Mortality Report above.
 - v. The regional water board may permit out-of-kind mitigation* for mitigation of open water or soft-bottom species. In-kind mitigation* shall be done for all other species whenever feasible.*
 - vi. For out-of-kind mitigation,* an owner or operator shall evaluate the biological productivity of the impacted open water or soft-bottom habitat calculated in the Marine Life Mortality Report and the proposed mitigation habitat. If the mitigation habitat is a more biologically productive habitat (e.g. wetlands, estuaries,* rocky reefs, kelp beds,* eelgrass beds,* surfgrass beds*), the regional water boards may apply a mitigation ratio based on the relative biological productivity of the impacted open water or soft-bottom habitat and the mitigation habitat. The mitigation ratio shall not be less than one acre of mitigation habitat for every ten acres of impacted open water or soft-bottom habitat.
 - vii. For in-kind mitigation,* the mitigation ratio shall not be less than one acre of mitigation habitat for every one acre of impacted habitat.
 - viii. For both in-kind* and out-of-kind mitigation,* the regional water boards may increase the required mitigation ratio for any species and impacted natural habitat calculated in the Marine Life Mortality Report when appropriate to account for imprecisions associated with mitigation including, but not limited to, the likelihood of success, temporal delays in productivity, and the difficulty of restoring or establishing the desired productivity functions.
 - ix. The rationale for the mitigation ratios must be documented in the administrative record for the permit action.
- (c) The Mitigation Plan is subject to approval by the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff and with other agencies having authority to condition approval of the project and require mitigation.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (4) *Mitigation Option 2: Fee-based Mitigation Program.* If the regional water board determines that an appropriate fee-based mitigation program has been established by a public agency, and that payment of a fee to the mitigation program will result in the creation and ongoing implementation of a mitigation project that meets the requirements of chapter M.2.e.(3), the owner or operator may pay a fee to the mitigation program in lieu of completing a mitigation project.
- (a) The agency that manages the fee-based mitigation program must have legal and budgetary authority to accept and spend mitigation funds, a history of successful mitigation projects documented by having set and met performance standards for past projects, and stable financial backing in order to manage mitigation sites for the operational life of the facility.
 - (b) The amount of the fee shall be based on the cost of the mitigation project, or if the project is designed to mitigate cumulative impacts from multiple desalination facilities or other development projects, the amount of the fee shall be based on the desalination facility's* fair share of the cost of the mitigation project.
 - (c) The manager of the fee-based mitigation program must consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Ocean Protection Council, Coastal Commission, State Lands Commission, and State and regional water boards to develop mitigation projects that will best compensate for intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* caused by the desalination facility.* Mitigation projects that increase or enhance the viability and sustainability of all forms of marine life* in Marine Protected Areas are preferred, if feasible.*
- (5) California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the regional water board, and State Water Board may perform audits or site inspections of any mitigation project.
- (6) An owner or operator, or a manager of a fee-based mitigation program, must submit a mitigation project performance report to the regional water board 180 days prior to the expiration date of their NPDES permit.
- (7) For conditionally permitted facilities or expanded facilities, the regional water boards may:
- (a) Account for previously-approved mitigation projects associated with a facility when making a new Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (b) Require additional mitigation when making a new Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination for any additional mortality of all forms of marine life resulting from the occurrence of the conditional event or the expansion of the facility. The additional mitigation must be to compensate for any additional construction, discharge, or other increases in intake or impacts or an increase in intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.*
3. Receiving Water Limitation for Salinity*
- a. Chapter III.M.3 is applicable to all desalination facilities discharging brine* into ocean waters,* including facilities that commingle brine* and wastewater.
- b. The receiving water limitation for salinity* shall be established as described below:
- (1) Discharges shall not exceed a daily maximum of 2.0 parts per thousand (ppt) above natural background salinity* measured no further than 100 meters (328 ft) horizontally from each discharge point. There is no vertical limit to this zone.
- (2) In determining an effluent limit necessary to meet this receiving water limitation, permit writers shall use the formula in chapter III.C.4 that has been modified for brine* discharges as follows:

$$\text{Equation 1: } C_e = C_o + D_m(2.0 \text{ ppt})$$

$$C_e = (2.0 \text{ ppt} + C_s) + D_m(2.0 \text{ ppt})$$

Where:

C_e = the effluent concentration limit, ppt

C_o = the salinity* concentration to be met at the completion of initial* dilution = 2.0 ppt + C_s

C_s = the natural background salinity,* ppt

D_m = minimum probable initial dilution* expressed as parts seawater* per part brine* discharge

- (a) The fixed distance referenced in the initial dilution* definition shall be no more than 100 meters (328 feet).
- (b) In addition, the owner or operator shall develop a dilution factor (D_m) based on the distance of 100 meters (328 feet) or initial dilution,* whichever is smaller. The dilution factor (D_m) shall be developed within the brine mixing zone* using applicable water quality models that have been approved by the regional water boards in consultation with State Water Board staff.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (c) The value 2.0 ppt in Equation 1 is the maximum incremental increase above natural background salinity* (Cs) allowed at the edge of the brine mixing zone.* A regional water board may substitute an alternative numeric value for 2.0 ppt in Equation 1 based upon the results of a facility-specific alternative salinity* receiving water limitation study, as described in chapter III.M.3.c below.
- c. An owner or operator may submit a proposal to the regional water board for approval of an alternative (other than 2 ppt) salinity* receiving water limitation to be met no further than 100 meters horizontally from the discharge. There is no vertical limit to this zone.
- (1) To determine whether a proposed facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation is adequately protective of beneficial uses, an owner or operator shall:
- (a) Establish baseline biological conditions at the discharge location and at reference locations over a 12-month period prior to commencing brine* discharge. The biologic surveys must characterize the ecologic composition of habitat and marine life using measures established by the regional water board. At their discretion, the regional water boards may permit the use of existing data to meet this requirement.
- (b) Conduct at least the following chronic toxicity* Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) tests: germination and growth for giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*); development for red abalone (*Haliotis refescens*); development and fertilization for purple urchin (*Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*); development and fertilization for sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*); larval growth rate for topsmelt (*Atheriniops affinis*). WET tests shall be performed by an Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) certified laboratory.
- (c) The regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff may require an owner or operator to do additional toxicity studies if needed.
- (2) The regional water board in consultation with the State Water Board staff may require an owner or operator to provide additional studies or information in order to approve a facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation for salinity.*
- (3) The facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation shall be based on the lowest observed effect concentration (LOEC)* for the most

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

sensitive species and toxicity endpoint as determined in the chronic toxicity* studies. The regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff has discretion to approve the proposed facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation for salinity.*

- (4) The regional water board shall review a facility's monitoring data, the studies as required in chapter III.M.4 below, or any other information that the regional water board deems to be relevant to periodically assess whether the facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation for salinity* is adequately protective of beneficial uses. The regional water board may eliminate or revise a facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation for salinity* based on its assessment of the data.
- d. The owner or operator of a facility that has received a conditional Water Code section 13142.5(b) determination and is over 80 percent constructed by January 28, 2016 that proposes flow augmentation* using a surface water intake may submit a proposal to the regional water board in consultation with the State Water Board staff for approval of an alternative brine mixing zone* not to exceed 200 meters laterally from the discharge point and throughout the water column. The owner or operator of such a facility must demonstrate, in accordance with chapter III.M.2.d.(2)(c), that the combination of the alternative brine mixing zone* and flow augmentation* using a surface water intake provide a comparable level of intake and mortality of all forms of marine life* as the combination of the standard brine mixing zone* and wastewater dilution if wastewater is available, or multiport diffusers* if wastewater is unavailable. In addition to the analysis of the effects required by chapter III.M.2.d.(2)(c), the owner or operator must also evaluate the individual and cumulative effects of the alternative brine mixing zone* on the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.* In no case may the discharge result in hypoxic conditions outside of the alternative brine mixing zone.* If an alternative brine mixing zone* is approved, the alternative distance and the areal extent of the alternative brine mixing zone* shall be used in lieu of the standard brine mixing zone* for all purposes, including establishing an effluent limitation and a receiving water limitation for salinity, in chapter III.M.
- e. Existing facilities that do not meet the receiving water limitation at the edge of the brine mixing zone* and throughout the water column by January 28, 2016 must either: 1) establish a facility-specific alternative receiving water limitation for salinity* as described in chapter III.M.3.c; or, 2) upgrade the facility's brine* discharge method in order to meet the receiving water limitation in chapter III.M.3.b in accordance with the State Water Board's Compliance Schedule Policy, as set forth in chapter III.M.3.f below. An owner or operator that chooses to upgrade the facility's method of brine* discharge:

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (1) Must demonstrate to the regional water board that the brine* discharge does not negatively impact sensitive habitats,* sensitive species, MPAs, or SWQPAs.*
 - (2) Is subject to the Considerations for Brine* Discharge Technology described in chapter III.M.2.d.(2).
- f. The regional water board may grant compliance schedules for the requirements for brine* waste discharges for desalination facilities.* All compliance schedules shall be in accordance with the State Water Board's Compliance Schedule Policy, except that the salinity* receiving water limitation set forth in chapters III.M.3.b and III.M.3.c shall be considered to be a "new water quality objective" as used in the Compliance Schedule Policy.
 - g. The regional water board in consultation with the State Water Board staff may require an owner or operator to provide additional studies or information if needed. All studies and models are subject to the approval of the regional water board in consultation with State Water Board staff. The regional water board may require an owner or operator to hire a neutral third party entity to review studies and models and make recommendations to the regional water board.
4. Monitoring and Reporting Programs
- a. The owner or operator of a desalination facility* must submit a Monitoring and Reporting Plan to the regional water board for approval. The Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall include monitoring of effluent and receiving water characteristics and impacts to all forms of marine life.* The Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall, at a minimum, include monitoring for benthic community health, aquatic life toxicity, hypoxia, and receiving water characteristics consistent with Appendix III of this Plan and for compliance with the receiving water limitation in chapter III.M.3. Receiving water monitoring for salinity* shall be conducted at times when the monitoring locations are most likely affected by the discharge. For new or expanded facilities the following additional requirements apply:
 - (1) An owner or operator must perform facility-specific monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the receiving water limitation for salinity,* and evaluate the potential effects of the discharge within the water column, bottom sediments, and the benthic communities. Facility-specific monitoring is required until the regional water board determines that a regional monitoring program is adequate to ensure compliance with the receiving water limitation. The monitoring and reporting plan shall be reviewed, and revised if necessary, upon NPDES permit renewal.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.

- (2) Baseline biological conditions shall be established at the discharge location and at a reference location prior to commencement of construction. The owner or operator is required to conduct biological surveys (e.g., Before-After Control-Impact study), that will evaluate the differences between biological communities at a reference site and at the discharge location before and after the discharge commences. The regional water board will use the data and results from the surveys and any other applicable data for evaluating and renewing the requirements set forth in a facility's NPDES permit.

N. Water Quality Standards Variance

Federal regulations establish an explicit regulatory framework for the adoption of a water quality standards variance (WQS Variance*) that states may use to implement adaptive management approaches to improve water quality (40 C.F.R. § 131.14 (herein referred to as the federal rule)). The State Water Board and Regional Water Boards are not required to adopt specific authorizing provisions into state law before establishing a WQS Variance* consistent with the federal rule. The following explains the existing requirements that a water board must follow to establish a WQS Variance* consistent with the federal rule.

Under the federal rule, a WQS Variance* may be adopted for one or more NPDES dischargers or for a water body or waterbody segment, but the WQS Variance* only applies to the discharger(s) or the water body or waterbody segment specified in the WQS Variance*.

The federal rule specifies that any WQS Variance* is not effective unless and until it is approved by U.S. EPA. The federal rule also specifies that a WQS Variance* is subject to the public participation requirements at 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 131.20(b), which requires that one or more public hearings be held in accordance with state law and U.S. EPA's public participation regulation (40 C.F.R. part 25).

Where a discharger-specific WQS Variance* is established by a single permit, including an individual permit or a general permit, or other order, the federal rule's public participation requirements must be satisfied, and the provisions in the permit or other order that rely upon the discharger-specific WQS Variance* must be conditioned upon U.S. EPA approval. Because the establishment of a discharger-specific WQS Variance* in such a permit or other order is not the establishment or revision of a rule, the permit action need not be accompanied by a rulemaking action. The applicable hearing requirement for any other WQS Variance* would be subject to the hearing requirement and other procedures applicable to revising a water quality control plan, which are consistent with the federal rule's public participation requirements.

* See Appendix I for definition of terms.