



Comparison of Effluent Limits in 2004 and 2015 WLA Model Runs

Permittee(s)	TDS (mg/L)		TIN (mg/L)	
	2004	2015	2004	2015
Corona WRF #1	700	700	10	10
Lee Lake	650	650	13	13
Rialto	490	490	10	10
RIX (San Bernardino & Colton)	550	550	10	10
Elsinore Valley MWD	700	700	13	13
City of Riverside	650	650	<38 mgd = 13 >38 mgd = 10	10 ¹
Corona WRF #3	700	700	10	10
Beaumont	490	330 - 400 ²	6	6 ³
West Riverside WRF (WMWD)	625	625	10	10
EMWD: SJV, MV, PV, SC, TV & SR WRFs	650	650	10	10
IEUA: RP1, RP4, RP5 & Carbon Cyn. WRFs	550	550	8	8
Yucaipa Valley Water District	540	540 ⁴	6	6 ⁵

¹ TIN limit revised in Res. No. R8-2013-0016 to assure compliance with surface water objective for Reach 3 of the Santa Ana River following POTW upgrades.

² TDS effluent limit for City of Beaumont varies by outfall in accordance with Res. No. R8-2015-0026.

³ TIN effluent limit for City of Beaumont = 6.7 mg/L in accordance with allocation of assimilative capacity approved by Res. No. R8-2015-0026 & R8-2014-0005.

⁴ TDS effluent limit for YVWD = 400 mg/L in accordance with Res. No. R8-2015-0027

⁵ TIN effluent limit for YVWD = 6.7 mg/L in accordance with allocation of assimilative capacity approved by Res. No. R8-2015-0027 & R8-2014-0005.

Table 6
Wasteload Allocation for POTWs in the Upper Santa Ana River Watershed and Regulatory Implications

POTW	Wasteload Allocation			Receiving Waters	For Receiving Waters with No Assimilative Capacity	For Receiving Groundwaters with Assimilative Capacity
	TDS	TIN	Range of Discharge Simulated in Scenario 8		1. Does the POTW discharge contribute to flow in a surface-water reach with a compliance metric (as predicted by the WLAM) that exceeds a water quality objective? or 2. Does the POTW discharge contribute to streambed recharge to a GMZ with a compliance metric (as predicted by the WLAM) that exceeds a water quality objective?	Is an Antidegradation Analysis Required?
	mg/L	mg/L	mgd			
City of Beaumont WWTP #1	DP-001: 400 DP-007: 330 DP-009-11: 330	6	DP-001: 1.8 DP-007: 0.7 DP-009-11: 0 - 1.25	DP-001: Cooper's Creek, San Timoteo Creek, San Timoteo GMZ DP-007: Marshall Creek, San Timoteo Creek, Beaumont GMZ DP-009-11: unnamed tributary to Marshall Creek, Marshall Creek, Noble Creek, Beaumont MZ, San Timoteo MZ	Yes to (2). The TDS concentration of streambed recharge to the San Timoteo GMZ exceeded the TDS objective of 400 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8b, 8c, 8e, and 8f. The Regional Board already has a Salt Management Plan in place for City of Beaumont discharge to the San Timoteo GMZ (see R8-2014-0005).	In scenarios 8e and 8f, the TIN concentration in streambed recharge to the Beaumont GMZ exceeded the current ambient concentrations of 2.9 mg/L for nitrate-nitrogen. In all scenarios, the TIN concentration in streambed recharge to the San Timoteo GMZ exceeded the current ambient concentrations of 2.3 mg/L for nitrate-nitrogen. Antidegradation analyses are not required because the Regional Board already has a Salt Management Plan in place for the City of Beaumont discharge to the Beaumont and San Timoteo GMZs (see R8-2014-0005).
Yucaipa Valley Water District Wochholz WTP	540	6	1.6 - 4.25	San Timoteo Creek San Timoteo GMZ Bunker Hill-B GMZ	Yes to (2). The TDS concentration of streambed recharge to the San Timoteo GMZ exceeded the TDS objective of 400 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8b, 8c, 8e, and 8f. The Regional Board already has a Salt Management Plan in place for YVWD discharge to the San Timoteo GMZ (see R8-2014-0005).	In all scenarios, the TIN concentration in streambed recharge to the San Timoteo GMZ exceeded the current ambient concentrations of 2.3 mg/L for nitrate-nitrogen. Antidegradation analyses are not required because the Regional Board already has a Salt Management Plan in place for YVWD discharge to the San Timoteo GMZ (see R8-2014-0005).
City of Rialto WWTP	490	10	6.6 - 8.8	Santa Ana River Riverside-A GMZ Chino-South GMZ	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'. Yes to (2). The TIN concentration of streambed recharge to the Chino-South GMZ exceeded the nitrate-nitrogen objective of 4.2 mg/L in all scenarios.	Yes. In all scenarios, the TDS and TIN concentrations in streambed recharge to the Riverside-A GMZ exceeded the current ambient concentrations of 420 mg/L for TDS and 5.4 mg/L for nitrate-nitrogen.
City of San Bernardino City of Colton RIX Facility	550	10	22.7 - 31.8	Santa Ana River Riverside-A GMZ Chino-South GMZ	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'. Yes to (2). The TIN concentration of streambed recharge to the Chino-South GMZ exceeded the nitrate-nitrogen objective of 4.2 mg/L in all scenarios.	Yes. In all scenarios, the TDS and TIN concentrations in streambed recharge to the Riverside-A GMZ exceeded the current ambient concentrations of 420 mg/L for TDS and 5.4 mg/L for nitrate-nitrogen.
City of Riverside RWQCP	650	10	28.9 - 33.15	Santa Ana River Chino-South GMZ	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'. Yes to (2). The TIN concentration of streambed recharge to the Chino-South GMZ exceeded the nitrate-nitrogen objective of 4.2 mg/L in all scenarios.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Western Municipal Water District Western Water Recycling Facility	550	6	0 - 0.95	Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Inland Empire Utilities Agency RP1 DP-001 RP1/RP4 DP-002 RP5 Carbon Canyon WRP	550	8	Combined: 13.36 - 41.55 4.12 - 19.45 3.46 - 5.35 4.34 - 9.8 1.44 - 6.95	Chino Creek Cucamonga Creek Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority WRCRWTP	625	10	6.0 - 12.0	Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
City of Corona WWTP #1	700	10	1.5 - 7.6	Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
City of Corona WWTP #3	700	10	0 - 0.5	Temescal Creek Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Lee Lake Water District WWTP	650	13	0 - 0.7	Temescal Creek Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District RWWRP	700	13	0.5 - 6.4	Temescal Creek Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.
Eastern Municipal Water District Discharge at Nichols Road	650	10	0 - 52.5	Temescal Creek Prado Basin GMZ Santa Ana River	Yes to (1). The TDS concentration of the SAR below Prado Dam exceeded the Reach 3 TDS objective of 700 mg/L in scenarios 8a, 8a', 8b, 8b', 8d and 8d'.	There are no receiving waters with assimilative capacity.