

May 26, 2016

Mr. James Marshall
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200
Ranch Cordova, CA 95670

Subject: Bear Valley Water District Tentative Order Comments/Suggestions

Dear Mr. Marshall:

The purpose of this submittal is to provide the Regional Water Board with comments and suggestions regarding the Bear Valley water District (District) Bear Valley Wastewater Treatment Facility Tentative Order provided to the District for review April 29, 2016.

We greatly appreciate the time you and your staff have taken to work closely with the District during the permit development process. The District is generally in support of the Order as written, with the exception of the comments and suggestions presented in the following table for your consideration.

Page	Section	Comment
4 17	III.F VII.H	The 1987 guidance from the Department of Health Services in "Wastewater Disinfection for Health Protection" recommended 1 part effluent in 20 parts of <u>downstream</u> receiving water flow (i.e., $\leq 5\%$ effluent), not 1 part effluent in 20 parts of upstream flow (i.e., $\leq 4.76\%$ effluent). We request the original guidance be followed.
13 E-6	VI.C.2.a.ii V.B.7	We believe maintaining a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of >1 TUc while providing dilution credits for aquatic life protection water quality criteria is not appropriate and adds probable cost to rate payers, while providing no real additional protection to the environment. The following example makes the point clear. Example: A Discharger has demonstrated the need for, and availability of, a dilution credit (D) of 100 for chronic aquatic life criteria. Would the Discharger be expected to exceed a chronic bioassay trigger of 1 TUc? Yes, otherwise the Discharger has no need for any Ds, or the bioassay test is over sensitive, and/or the criteria is overly conservative. We are not in a position to question the validity of the chronic bioassay test or the chronic aquatic life criteria. However, we do believe we are in a position to request consistent regulation. If we receive a chronic aquatic life criterion D of 4 or more, we believe the chronic bioassay trigger should be 4TUc, or more, as preceded by the Orders for dischargers as small as (and as similar as) San Andreas Sanitary District, and as large as Sacramento Regional. We request the trigger be increased to >4 TUc based on 1) the logic that if we need a D of 4 or more for chronic aquatic life criteria, then we also need a trigger of >4 for the chronic aquatic life bioassay results, and 2) the precedence established by the Regional Water Board.

14 E-18 F-46 F-62	VI.C.4.a, IX.D.1. Table E-10, 3.vii.a.1 3.vii.a.3 VI.B.4.b	The reporting requirement for “Maximization of Land Application” is not necessary or appropriate if the NPDES Order leaves all regulation of land discharge matters to the WDR Order. This reporting requirement also duplicates reporting of the same information required in the WDR annual report and would appear to not be a good use of District resources. We recommend removing this requirement where it appears throughout the tentative order and leaving regulation of all land discharge matters to the WDR Order.
E-15	1x.B.2	Please clarify whether monthly SMRs are to be submitted even in the “no discharge” months of July through December. Such submittals would appear not to be a good use of District resources. We request no SMRs be submitted in “no discharge” months.
E-8	VI	The heading for this section “LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS” risks conflict with the WDR Order. We recommend replacing this language with “Storage/Polishing Reservoir Monitoring Requirements”.
E-8, F-45 F-64	VI.A.1, VIII.B.1 IV.C.3.c.ix.(a)(5) VII.B.4	Monitoring of the <u>surface</u> of the storage/polishing reservoir from 1 December through 30 June 1 is 1) not representative of the discharge effluent, and 2) presents significant safety hazards to District staff during conditions of heavy snow and when the pond is iced over. Monitoring Location EFF-001 001 provides for flow-through testing where samples are representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. We recommend these sections be changed to read: “. . . the Discharger shall monitor the storage reservoir at Monitoring Location EFF-001. . . .” These changes should also be reflected in the footnotes following Table E-5.
E-14	Footnote 4	Where grab samples have been permitted at Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001 the water characterization analysis, footnote 4 should be deleted to avoid confusion with the “grab” effluent sample type identified in Table E-8.
F-63	VII.A	The monitoring frequency for influent should be changed to correspond to match the MRP in Table E-2, page E-3.

Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss these comments.

Sincerely,

Jeff Gouveia
District Manager

c. Eric Zeigler, Stantec Consulting Services Inc.