



## California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

*"An Advocate for Fisheries, Habitat and Water Quality"*

3536 Rainier Avenue, Stockton, CA 95204

T: 209-464-5067, F: 209-464-1028, E: [deltakeep@aol.com](mailto:deltakeep@aol.com), W: [www.calsport.org](http://www.calsport.org)

3 January 2009

Mr. Ken Landau, Assistant Executive Officer  
Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Central Valley Region  
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6144  
[klandau@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:klandau@waterboards.ca.gov)

VIA: Electronic Submission  
Hardcopy if Requested

RE: Renewal Of Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078948) for City of Turlock Water Quality Control Facility, Stanislaus County

Dear Mr. Landau,

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) has reviewed the proposed Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078948) for City of Turlock Water Quality Control Facility (Permit) and submits the following comments.

CSPA requests status as a designated party for this proceeding. CSPA is a 501(c)(3) public benefit conservation and research organization established in 1983 for the purpose of conserving, restoring, and enhancing the state's water quality and fishery resources and their aquatic ecosystems and associated riparian habitats. CSPA has actively promoted the protection of water quality and fisheries throughout California before state and federal agencies, the State Legislature and Congress and regularly participates in administrative and judicial proceedings on behalf of its members to protect, enhance, and restore California's degraded water quality and fisheries. CSPA members reside, boat, fish and recreate in and along waterways throughout the Central Valley, including Stanislaus County.

- 1. The proposed Permit contains an inadequate antidegradation analysis that does not comply with the requirements of Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act, Federal Regulations 40 CFR § 131.12, the State Board's Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) and California Water Code (CWC) Sections 13146 and 13247. The antidegradation analysis in the proposed Permit Fact Sheet does not contain sufficient information regarding the factual, legal and policy questions considered in preparing the permit as required by 40 CFR 124.8 (a) and (a)(4).**

Currently, treated municipal and industrial wastewater is discharged to Harding Drain (001), also known as the Turlock Irrigational District (TID) Lateral 5 Canal, which is tributary to the San Joaquin River approximately 5 miles downstream of the discharge point. In addition to the effluent from the Facility, Harding Drain carries flows from TID operational spill water, tailwater from row and orchard crops, municipal storm water, and other runoff. The Discharger

is currently planning to construct a dedicated pipeline to transport and discharge treated wastewater from the Facility directly to the San Joaquin River (002). The approximate location of the proposed Discharge Point in the San Joaquin River, approximately 500 feet upstream in the San Joaquin River from the confluence of the Harding Drain and the San Joaquin River.

The purpose of moving the discharge point is not discussed in the proposed permit, however it can only be concluded that the Discharger is undertaking the great expense of constructing a 5-mile long discharge pipeline and moving the point of discharge to gain dilution in the river rather than provide additional treatment which would be required to achieve compliance with the limitations at the current point of discharge. Despite this assumption, the proposed Permit, Fact Sheet, Antidegradation Policy, concludes that:

“The Regional Water Board concurs with the Antidegradation Analysis provided by the Discharger. The Regional Water Board finds that the permitted surface water discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. This Order provides for the relocation of the discharge of tertiary effluent from Harding Drain to the San Joaquin River. Currently, the Facility discharges to Harding Drain which then empties into the San Joaquin River. The proposed relocation of the discharge into the San Joaquin River simply moves the point of discharge in the San Joaquin River approximately 560 feet upstream from where Harding Drain empties into the River. Therefore no increased flows or pollutant concentrations/loadings will occur as a result of the discharge relocation. The discharge is a Title 22, or equivalent, tertiary-level treated wastewater, which is a high level of treatment of sewage waste that is considered BPTC for most constituents in the wastewater and will result in attaining water quality standards applicable to the discharge.” (Emphasis added)

However, the Effluent Limitations, contrary to the Fact Sheet Antidegradation Policy discussion, do allow for an increased concentration and loading after the discharge is moved to the San Joaquin River:

Parameter	Units	Harding Drain (001)		San Joaquin River (002)	
		Monthly Average	Daily Maximum	Monthly Average	Daily Maximum
Copper	ug/l	7.4	12	7.6	13
Carbon tetrachloride	ug/l	0.25	0.72	2.0	5.7
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/l	0.41	0.78	4.2	8.1
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/l	0.56	0.81	9.6	14

The Antidegradation Policy discussion is not only incorrect with regard to allowing increased concentrations and loading to the San Joaquin River, but only cites an analysis by Larry Walker Associates rather than contain any information regarding the factual, legal and policy questions considered in preparing the permit as required by 40 CFR 124.8 (a) and (a)(4). The conclusory, unsupported, undocumented statements regarding the concurrence with Larry Walker Associates in the Permit are no substitute for a defensible antidegradation analysis. The Fact Sheet is required to contain sufficient factual, legal and policy information to determine the basis for the proposed Permit, not a simple reference to a consultant for the Discharger.

As is shown above the proposed permit allows for mixing zones rather than treatment, which results in lowering of water quality. The Regional Board must apply the antidegradation policy whenever it takes an action that will lower water quality (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 3, 5, 18, and Region IX Guidance, p. 1). Application of the policy does not depend on whether the action will actually impair beneficial uses (State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 6). Actions that trigger use of the antidegradation policy include issuance, re-issuance, and modification of NPDES and Section 404 permits and waste discharge requirements, waiver of waste discharge requirements, issuance of variances, relocation of discharges, issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, increases in discharges due to industrial production and/or municipal growth and/or other sources, exceptions from otherwise applicable water quality objectives, etc. (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 7-10, Region IX Guidance, pp. 2-3). Both the state and federal policies apply to point and nonpoint source pollution (State Antidegradation Guidance p. 6, Region IX Guidance, p. 4).

CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy. The State Board has adopted the Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16), which the Regional Board has incorporated into its Basin Plan. The Regional Board is required by the CWC to comply with the Antidegradation Policy.

Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the basis for the antidegradation policy, states that the objective of the Act is to “restore and maintain the chemical, biological and physical integrity of the nation’s waters.” Section 303(d)(4) of the CWA carries this further, referring explicitly to the need for states to satisfy the antidegradation regulations at 40 CFR § 131.12 before taking action to lower water quality. These regulations (40 CFR § 131.12(a)) describe the federal antidegradation policy and dictate that states must adopt both a policy at least as stringent as the federal policy as well as implementing procedures.

California’s antidegradation policy is composed of both the federal antidegradation policy and the State Board’s Resolution 68-16 (State Water Resources Control Board, Water Quality Order 86-17, p. 20 (1986) (“Order 86-17”); Memorandum from Chief Counsel William Attwater, SWRCB to Regional Board Executive Officers, “federal Antidegradation Policy,” pp. 2, 18 (Oct. 7, 1987) (“State Antidegradation Guidance”). As a state policy, with inclusion in the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), the antidegradation policy is binding on all of the Regional Boards (Water Quality Order 86-17, pp. 17-18).

Implementation of the state’s antidegradation policy is guided by the State Antidegradation Guidance, SWRCB Administrative Procedures Update 90-004, 2 July 1990 (“APU 90-004”) and USEPA Region IX, “Guidance on Implementing the Antidegradation Provisions of 40 CFR 131.12” (3 June 1987) (“ Region IX Guidance”), as well as Water Quality Order 86-17.

The federal antidegradation regulations delineate three tiers of protection for waterbodies. Tier 1, described in 40 CFR § 131.12(a)(1), is the floor for protection of all waters of the United States (48 Fed. Reg. 51400, 51403 (8 Nov. 1983); Region IX Guidance, pp. 1-2; APU 90-004,

pp. 11-12). It states that “[e]xisting instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected.” Uses are “existing” if they were actually attained in the water body on or after November 28, 1975, or if the water quality is suitable to allow the use to occur, regardless of whether the use was actually designated (40 CFR § 131.3(e)). Tier 1 protections apply even to those waters already impacted by pollution and identified as impaired. In other words, already impaired waters cannot be further impaired.

Tier 2 waters are provided additional protections against unnecessary degradation in places where the levels of water quality are better than necessary to support existing uses. Tier 2 protections strictly prohibit degradation unless the state finds that a degrading activity is: 1) necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area, 2) water quality is adequate to protect and maintain existing beneficial uses and 3) the highest statutory and regulatory requirements and best management practices for pollution control are achieved (40 CFR § 131.12(a) (2)). Cost savings to a discharger alone, absent a demonstration by the project proponent as to how these savings are “necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area,” are not adequate justification for allowing reductions in water quality (Water Quality Order 86-17, p. 22; State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 13). If the waterbody passes this test and the degradation is allowed, degradation must not impair existing uses of the waterbody (48 Fed. Reg. 51403). Virtually all waterbodies in California may be Tier 2 waters since the state, like most states, applies the antidegradation policy on a parameter-by-parameter basis, rather than on a waterbody basis (APU 90-004, p. 4). Consequently, a request to discharge a particular chemical to a river, whose level of that chemical was better than the state standards, would trigger a Tier 2 antidegradation review even if the river was already impaired by other chemicals.

Tier 3 of the federal antidegradation policy states “[w]here high quality waters constitute an outstanding national resource, such as waters of national and State parks and wildlife refuges and waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance, that water shall be maintained and protected (40 CFR § 131.12(a)(3)). These Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRW) are designated either because of their high quality or because they are important for another reason (48 Fed. Reg. 51403; State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 15). No degradation of water quality is allowed in these waters other than short-term, temporary changes (Id.). Accordingly, no new or increased discharges are allowed in either ONRW or tributaries to ONRW that would result in lower water quality in the ONRW (EPA Handbook, p. 4-10; State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 15). Existing antidegradation policy already dictates that if a waterbody “should be” an ONRW, or “if it can be argued that the waterbody in question deserves the same treatment [as a formally designated ONRW],” then it must be treated as such, regardless of formal designation (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 15-16; APU 90-004, p. 4). Thus the Regional Board is required in each antidegradation analysis to consider whether the waterbody at issue should be treated as an ONRW. It should be reiterated that waters cannot be excluded from consideration as an ONRW simply because they are already “impaired” by some constituents. By definition, waters may be “outstanding” not only because of pristine quality, but also because of recreational significance, ecological significance or other reasons (40 CFR §131.12(a)(3)). Waters need not be “high quality” for every parameter to be an ONRW (APU 90-004, p. 4). For example, Lake Tahoe is on the 303(d) list due to sediments/siltation and nutrients, and Mono Lake is listed for salinity/TDC/chlorides but both are listed as ONRW.

The State Board's APU 90-004 specifies guidance to the Regional Boards for implementing the state and federal antidegradation policies and guidance. The guidance establishes a two-tiered process for addressing these policies and sets forth two levels of analysis: a simple analysis and a complete analysis. A simple analysis may be employed where a Regional Board determines that: 1) a reduction in water quality will be spatially localized or limited with respect to the waterbody, e.g. confined to the mixing zone; 2) a reduction in water quality is temporally limited; 3) a proposed action will produce minor effects which will not result in a significant reduction of water quality; and 4) a proposed activity has been approved in a General Plan and has been adequately subjected to the environmental and economic analysis required in an EIR. A complete antidegradation analysis is required if discharges would result in: 1) a substantial increase in mass emissions of a constituent; or 2) significant mortality, growth impairment, or reproductive impairment of resident species. Regional Boards are advised to apply stricter scrutiny to non-threshold constituents, i.e., carcinogens and other constituents that are deemed to present a risk of source magnitude at all non-zero concentrations. If a Regional Board cannot find that the above determinations can be reached, a complete analysis is required.

Even a minimal antidegradation analysis would require an examination of: 1) existing applicable water quality standards; 2) ambient conditions in receiving waters compared to standards; 3) incremental changes in constituent loading, both concentration and mass; 4) treatability; 5) best practicable treatment and control (BPTC); 6) comparison of the proposed increased loadings relative to other sources; 7) an assessment of the significance of changes in ambient water quality and 8) whether the waterbody was a ONRW. A minimal antidegradation analysis must also analyze whether: 1) such degradation is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state; 2) the activity is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area; 3) the highest statutory and regulatory requirements and best management practices for pollution control are achieved; and 4) resulting water quality is adequate to protect and maintain existing beneficial uses. A BPTC technology analysis must be done on an individual constituent basis; while tertiary treatment may provide BPTC for pathogens, dissolved metals may simply pass through. Tertiary treatment also does not discuss why ultraviolet light disinfection is not considered BPTC as it is widely used throughout California's Central Valley.

The antidegradation review process is especially important in the context of waters protected by Tier 2. See EPA, Office of Water Quality Regulations and Standards, *Water Quality Standards Handbook*, 2nd ed. Chapter 4 (2nd ed. Aug. 1994). Whenever a person proposes an activity that may degrade a water protected by Tier 2, the antidegradation regulation requires a state to: (1) determine whether the degradation is "necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located"; (2) consider less-degrading alternatives; (3) ensure that the best available pollution control measures are used to limit degradation; and (4) guarantee that, if water quality is lowered, existing uses will be fully protected. 40 CFR § 131.12(a)(2); EPA, Office of Water Quality Regulations and Standards, *Water Quality Standards Handbook*, 2nd ed. 4-1, 4-7 (2nd ed. Aug. 1994). These activity-specific determinations necessarily require that each activity be considered individually.

For example, the APU 90-004 states:

“Factors that should be considered when determining whether the discharge is necessary to accommodate social or economic development and is consistent with maximum public benefit include: a) past, present, and probably beneficial uses of the water, b) economic and social costs, tangible and intangible, of the proposed discharge compared to benefits. The economic impacts to be considered are those incurred in order to maintain existing water quality. The financial impact analysis should focus on the ability of the facility to pay for the necessary treatment. The ability to pay depends on the facility’s source of funds. In addition to demonstrating a financial impact on the publicly – or privately – owned facility, the analysis must show a significant adverse impact on the community. The long-term and short-term socioeconomic impacts of maintaining existing water quality must be considered. Examples of social and economic parameters that could be affected are employment, housing, community services, income, tax revenues and land value. To accurately assess the impact of the proposed project, the projected baseline socioeconomic profile of the affected community without the project should be compared to the projected profile with the project...EPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook (Chapter 5) provides additional guidance in assessing financial and socioeconomic impacts”

There is nothing resembling an economic or socioeconomic analysis in the Permit. There are viable alternatives that have never been analyzed. The evaluation contains no comparative costs. As a rule-of-thumb, USEPA recommends that the cost of compliance should not be considered excessive until it consumes more than 2% of disposable household income in the region. This threshold is meant to suggest more of a floor than a ceiling when evaluating economic impact. In the Water Quality Standards Handbook, USEPA interprets the phrase “necessary to accommodate important economic or social development” with the phrase “substantial and widespread economic and social impact.”

The antidegradation analysis must discuss the relative economic burden as an aggregate impact across the entire region using macroeconomics. Considering the intrinsic value of the Delta to the entire state and the potential effects upon those who rely and use Delta waters, it must also evaluate the economic and social impacts to water supply, recreation, fisheries, etc. from the Discharger’s degradation of water quality in the Delta. Nor has the case been made that there is no alternative for necessary housing other than placing it where its wastewater must discharge directly into sensitive but seriously degraded waters. It is unfortunate that the agency charged with implementing the Clean Water Act has apparently decided it is more important to protect the polluter than the environment.

There is nothing in the Permit resembling an alternatives analysis evaluating less damaging and degrading alternatives. Unfortunately, the Permit fails to evaluate and discuss why there is no alternative other than using chlorine rather than UV disinfection. Other communities have successfully built and utilize UV disinfection eliminating chlorination byproducts without discharging additional pollutants to degraded rivers. A proper alternatives analysis would cost out various alternatives and compare each of the alternatives’ impacts on beneficial uses.

There is nothing resembling an analysis buttressing the unsupported claim that BPTC is being provided. An increasing number of wastewater treatment plants around the country and state are employing UV disinfection. If this is not the case, the antidegradation analysis must explicitly detail how and why a run-of-the-mill chlorination system that facilitates an increased mass loadings of constituents can be considered BPTC.

There is nothing in the Permit resembling an analysis that ensures that existing beneficial uses are protected. While the Permit identifies the constituents that are included on the 303(d) list as impairing receiving waters, it fails to discuss how and to what degree the identified beneficial uses will be additionally impacted by the discharge. Nor does the Permit analyze the incremental and cumulative impact of increased loading of non-impairing pollutants on beneficial uses. In fact, there is almost no information or discussion on the composition and health of the identified beneficial uses. Any reasonably adequate antidegradation analysis must discuss the affected beneficial uses (i.e., numbers and health of the aquatic ecosystem; extent, composition and viability of agricultural production; people depending upon these waters for water supply; extent of recreational activity; etc.) and the probable effect the discharge will have on these uses.

The antidegradation analysis in the proposed Permit is not simply deficient, it is literally nonexistent. The brief discussion of antidegradation requirements, in the Findings and Fact Sheet, consist only of skeletal, unsupported, undocumented conclusory statements totally lacking in factual analysis. NPDES permits must include any more stringent effluent limitation necessary to implement the Regional Board Basin Plan (Water Code 13377). The Tentative Permit fails to properly implement the Basin Plan's Antidegradation Policy.

**2. The proposed Permit contains an allowance for a mixing zone that does not comply with the requirements of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (SIP) or the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan).**

A “completely mixed discharge” is defined by the SIP, Appendix 1-1, when a pollutant concentration is less than 5% different across a transect of the waterbody at a point within two stream/river widths from the point of discharge. The SIP, Section 1.4.2, requires that for incompletely mixed discharges; mixing zones will only be considered following the completion of a mixing zone study by the Discharger. In ignoring this requirement of the SIP, the proposed Permit contains the following statements regarding mixing of the discharge with receiving waters:

“The Discharger has requested dilution credits be used for calculation of WQBELs for carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate for discharges to the San Joaquin River. Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, provides that mixing zones should not be allowed at or near drinking water intakes. Furthermore, regarding the application of a mixing zone for protection of human health, the TSD states that,” *...the presence of mixing zones should not result in significant health risks, when evaluated using reasonable assumptions about exposure pathways. Thus, where drinking water contaminants are a concern, mixing zones should not encroach on drinking water intakes.*“. There are no known drinking water intakes in the vicinity of the discharge. For

constituents where water quality criteria are based on human health objectives, critical environmental impacts are expected to occur far downstream from the source such that complete mixing is a valid assumption. With regard to completely mixed discharges the SIP states, “*For completely mixed discharges...the amount of receiving water available to dilute the effluent shall be determined by calculating the dilution ratio (i.e. the critical receiving water flow divided by the effluent flow)...*” Therefore, for purposes of establishing WQBELs for carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane in this Order for discharges to the San Joaquin River, dilution credits may be granted based on the critical flows of the receiving water and effluent discharge. For nitrate, the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) is designed to be protective over shorter periods of time (e.g., 30 days or less), and therefore a human health dilution credit is not appropriate. For human health criteria the SIP recommends using the harmonic mean receiving water flow and the long-term arithmetic mean to calculate a dilution credit (SIP at Section 1.4.2.1). Based on the harmonic mean flow of 617 cubic feet per second (cfs) or 398 MGD of the San Joaquin River calculated using USEPA’s DFLOW software for the period of 1981 through 2008, and a long term arithmetic mean discharge flow of 17.7 cfs or 11.4 MGD, a dilution ratio of up to 36:1 may be allowed for the calculation of WQBELs for carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane. The Discharger has not submitted a mixing zone or dilution study evaluating available dilution for acute and chronic aquatic life criteria.”

The proposed Permit fails to comply with the SIP requirement for a complete mixed discharge within two stream widths and then fails to provide a mixing zone analysis for an incomplete mix situation in allowing for mixing zones for human health based criteria. In accordance with SIP Section 1.4.2, a mixing zone cannot be granted, including for human health criteria, absent a complete and independent mixing zone study. The dilution credits for human health criteria must be removed from the proposed Order and end-of-pipe limitations based solely on the criteria or standards must be developed.

A very clear unaddressed requirement (SIP Section 1.4.2.2) for mixing zones is that the point(s) in the receiving stream where the applicable criteria must be met shall be specified in the proposed Permit. The “edge of the mixing zone” as defined in the proposed Permit is “far downstream” which is not a “point” as required by the SIP.

The Basin Plan, Page IV-17.00, allows the Regional Board to grant mixing zones provided that the Discharger has demonstrated that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. The beneficial uses of the receiving stream include municipal and domestic uses. The proposed Permit’s mixing zones allowance does not specify the point of compliance but the mixing zone would apply “far downstream”. The approach taken in applying a mixing zone, and ignoring the requirements of the SIP, do not address that the municipal and domestic beneficial uses would be adversely impacted within the mixing zone, which extends “far downstream”.

This mixing zone approach assumes that the drinking water beneficial uses of the receiving water only needs to be protected at established drinking water intakes. Even if this approach were valid, there is no evidence in the proposed Permit that the Regional Board has any knowledge of

where drinking water intakes exist in the specified receiving water. It must be remembered that drinking water intakes are not solely regulated by the California Department of Public Health (DPH); small systems are regulated by the County, and very small systems and individual homes have no regulatory oversight. The proposed Permit does not document the absence of drinking water intakes and does not discuss degradation of this beneficial use.

“A mixing zone is an area where an effluent discharge undergoes initial dilution and is extended to cover the secondary mixing in the ambient waterbody. A mixing zone is an allocated impact zone where water quality criteria can be exceeded as long as acutely toxic conditions are prevented” according to EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* (TSD) (USEPA, 1991), (Water quality criteria must be met at the edge of a mixing zone.) Mixing zones are regions within public waters adjacent to point source discharges where pollutants are diluted and dispersed at concentrations that routinely exceed human health and aquatic life water quality standards (the maximum levels of pollutants that can be tolerated without endangering people, aquatic life, and wildlife.) Mixing zone policies allow a discharger’s point of compliance with state and federal water quality standards to be moved from the “end of the pipe” to the outer boundaries of a dilution zone. The CWA was adopted to minimize and eventually eliminate the release of pollutants into public waters because fish were dying and people were getting sick. The CWA requires water quality standards (WQS) be met in all waters to prohibit concentrations of pollutants at levels assumed to cause harm. Since WQS criteria are routinely exceeded in mixing zones it is likely that in some locations harm is occurring. The general public is rarely aware that local waters are being degraded within these mixing zones, the location of mixing zones within a waterbody, the nature and quantities of pollutants being diluted, the effects the pollutants might be having on human health or aquatic life, or the uses that may be harmed or eliminated by the discharge. Standing waist deep at a favorite fishing hole, a fisherman has no idea that he is in the middle of a mixing zone for pathogens for a sewage discharger that has not been required to adequately treat their waste.

In 1972, backed by overwhelming public support, Congress overrode President Nixon’s veto and passed the Clean Water Act. Under the CWA, states are required to classify surface waters by *uses* – the beneficial purposes provided by the waterbody. For example, a waterbody may be designated as a drinking water source, or for supporting the growth and propagation of aquatic life, or for allowing contact recreation, or as a water source for industrial activities, or all of the above. States must then adopt *criteria* – numeric and narrative limits on pollution, sufficient to protect the uses assigned to the waterbody. *Uses + Criteria = Water Quality Standards (WQS)*. WQS are regulations adopted by each state to protect the waters under their jurisdiction. If a waterbody is classified for more than one use, the applicable WQS are the criteria that would protect the most sensitive use.

All wastewater dischargers to surface waters must apply for and receive a permit to discharge pollutants under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES.) Every NPDES permit is required to list every pollutant the discharger anticipates will be released, and establish effluent limits for these pollutants to ensure the discharger will achieve WQS. NPDES permits also delineate relevant control measures, waste management procedures, and monitoring and reporting schedules.

It is during the process of assigning effluent limits in NPDES permits that variances such as mixing zones alter the permit limits for pollutants by multiplying the scientifically derived water quality criteria by dilution factors. The question of whether mixing zones are legal has never been argued in federal court.

Mixing zones are never mentioned or sanctioned in the CWA. To the contrary, the CWA appears to speak against such a notion:

“whenever...the discharges of pollutants from a point source...would interfere with the attainment or maintenance of that water quality...which shall assure protection of public health, public water supplies, agricultural and industrial uses, and the protection and propagation of a balanced population of shellfish, fish and wildlife, and allow recreational activities in and on the water, effluent limitations...shall be established which can reasonably be expected to contribute to the attainment or maintenance of such water quality.”

A plain reading of the above paragraph calls for the application of effluent limitations whenever necessary to assure that WQS will be met in all waters. Despite the language of the Clean Water Act; US EPA adopted 40 CFR 131.13, General policies, that allows States to, at their discretion, include in their State standards, policies generally affecting their application and implementation, such as mixing zones, low flows and variances. According to EPA; (EPA, Policy and Guidance on Mixing Zones, 63 Fed Reg. 36,788 (July 7, 1998)) as long as mixing zones do not eliminate beneficial uses in the whole waterbody, they do not violate federal regulation or law. California has mixing zone policies included in individual Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) and the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (2005) permitting pollutants to be diluted before being measured for compliance with the state’s WQS.

Federal Antidegradation regulations at 40 CFR 131.12 require that states protect waters at their present level of quality and that all beneficial uses remain protected. The corresponding State Antidegradation Policy, Resolution 68-16, requires that any degradation of water quality not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses. Resolution 68-16 further requires that: “Any activity which produces or may produce or increase volume or concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.”

- Pollution is defined in the California Water Code as an alteration of water quality to a degree, which unreasonably affects beneficial uses. In California, Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) contain water quality standards and objectives, which are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan for California’s Central Valley Regional Water Board states that: “According to Section 13050 of the California Water Code, Basin Plans consist of a designation or establishment for the waters within a specified area of beneficial uses to be protected, water quality objectives to protect those uses, and a

program of implementation needed for achieving the objectives. State law also requires that Basin Plans conform to the policies set forth in the Water Code beginning with Section 13000 and any state policy for water quality control. Since beneficial uses, together with their corresponding water quality objectives, can be defined per federal regulations as water quality standards, the Basin Plans are regulatory references for meeting the state and federal requirements for water quality control (40 CFR 131.20).”

- Nuisance is defined in the California Water Code as anything which is injurious to health, indecent, offensive or an obstruction of the free use of property, which affects an entire community and occurs as a result of the treatment or disposal of waste.

The Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) allows water quality to be lowered as long as beneficial uses are protected (pollution or nuisance will not occur), best practicable treatment and control (BPTC) of the discharge is provided, and the degradation is in the best interest of the people of California. Water quality objectives were developed as the maximum concentration of a pollutant necessary to protect beneficial uses and levels above this concentration would be considered pollution. The Antidegradation Policy does not allow water quality standards and objectives to be exceeded. Mixing zone are regions within public waters adjacent to point source discharges where pollutants are diluted and dispersed at concentrations that routinely exceed water quality standards.

The Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) requires that best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) of the discharge be provided. Mixing zones have been allowed in lieu of treatment to meet water quality standards at the end-of-the-pipe prior to discharge. To comply with the Antidegradation Policy, the trade of receiving water beneficial uses for lower utility rates must be in the best interest of the people of the state and must also pass the test that the Discharger is providing BPTC. By routinely permitting excessive levels of pollutants to be legally discharged, mixing zones act as an economic disincentive to Dischargers who might otherwise have to design and implement better treatment mechanisms. Although the use of mixing zones may lead to individual, short-term cost savings for the discharger, significant long-term health and economic costs may be placed on the rest of society. An assessment of BPTC, and therefore compliance with the Antidegradation Policy, must assess whether treatment of the wastestream can be accomplished, is feasible, and not simply the additional costs of compliance with water quality standards. A BPTC case can be made for the benefits of prohibiting mixing zones and requiring technologies that provide superior waste treatment and reuse of the wastestream.

EPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook states that: “It is not always necessary to meet all water quality criteria within the discharge pipe to protect the integrity of the waterbody as a whole.” The primary mixing area is commonly referred to as the zone of initial dilution, or ZID. Within the ZID acute aquatic life criteria are exceeded. To satisfy the CWA prohibition against the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts, regulators assume that if the ZID is small, significant numbers of aquatic organisms will not be present in the ZID long enough to encounter acutely toxic conditions. EPA recommends that a ZID not be located in an area populated by non-motile or sessile organisms, which presumably would be unable to leave the primary mixing area in time to avoid serious contamination.

Determining the impacts and risks to an ecosystem from mixing pollutants with receiving waters at levels that exceed WQS is extremely complex. The range of effects pollutants have on different organisms and the influence those organisms have on each other further compromises the ability of regulators to assess or ensure “acceptable” short and long-term impacts from the use of mixing zones. Few if any mixing zones are examined prior to the onset of discharging for the potential effects on impacted biota (as opposed to the physical and chemical fate of pollutants in the water column). Biological modeling is especially challenging – while severely toxic discharges may produce immediately observable effects, long-term impacts to the ecosystem can be far more difficult to ascertain. The effects of a mixing zone can be insidious; impacts to species diversity and abundance may be impossible to detect until it is too late for reversal or mitigation.

The CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 10, WATER, SEC. 2 states that: “It is hereby declared that because of the conditions prevailing in this State the general welfare requires that the water resources of the State be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use of water be prevented, and that the 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 right to water or to the use or flow of water in or from any natural stream or water course in this State is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water. Riparian rights in a stream or water course attach to, but to no more than so much of the flow thereof as may be required or used consistently with this section, for the purposes for which such lands are, or may be made adaptable, in view of such reasonable and beneficial uses; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be construed as depriving any riparian owner of the reasonable use of water of the stream to which the owner's land is riparian under reasonable methods of diversion and use, or as depriving any appropriator of water to which the appropriator is lawfully entitled. This section shall be self-executing, and the Legislature may also enact laws in the furtherance of the policy in this section contained.” The granting of a mixing zone is an unreasonable use of water when proper treatment of the wastestream can be accomplished to meet end-of-pipe limitations. Also contrary to the California Constitution, a mixing zone does not serve the beneficial use; to the contrary, beneficial uses are degraded within the mixing zone.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Basin Plan, page IV-16.00, requires the Regional Board use EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control (TSD)* in assessing mixing zones. The TSD, page 70, defines a first stage of mixing, close to the point of discharge, where complete mixing is determined by the momentum and buoyancy of the discharge. The second stage is defined by the TSD where the initial momentum and buoyancy of the discharge are diminished and waste is mixed by ambient turbulence. The TSD goes on to state that in large rivers this second stage mixing may extend for miles. There are drinking water intakes, and proposed intakes, downstream of the wastewater discharge that could be impacted prior to the pollutants from the discharge are completely mixed. The TSD, Section 4.4, requires that if complete mix does not occur in a short distance mixing zone monitoring and modeling must be undertaken.

The State's *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (SIP), Section 1.4.2.2, contains requirements for a mixing zone study which must be analyzed before a mixing zone is allowed for a wastewater discharge. Properly adopted state Policy requirements are not optional. The proposed Effluent Limitations in the proposed Permit are not supported by the scientific investigation that is required by the SIP and the Basin Plan.

SIP Section 1.4.2.2 requires that a mixing zone shall not:

1. Compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody.
2. Cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life.
3. Restrict the passage of aquatic life.
4. Adversely impact biologically sensitive habitats.
5. Produce undesirable aquatic life.
6. Result in floating debris.
7. Produce objectionable color, odor, taste or turbidity.
8. Cause objectionable bottom deposits.
9. Cause Nuisance.
10. Dominate the receiving water body or overlap a different mixing zone.
11. Be allowed at or near any drinking water intake.

The proposed Permit's mixing zones have not addressed a single required item of the SIP.

Few mixing zones are adequately evaluated to determine whether the modeling exercise was in fact relevant or accurate, or monitored over time to assess the impacts of the mixing zone on the aquatic environment. The sampling of receiving waters often consists of analyzing one or two points where the mixing zone boundary is supposed to be – finding no pollution at the mixing zone boundary is often considered proof that mixing has been “successful” when in fact the sampling protocol might have missed the plume altogether.

**3. The proposed Permit contains no Effluent Limitations for settleable solids (SS) which are present in the existing NPDES Permit contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1).**

Under the Clean Water Act (CWA), point source dischargers are required to obtain federal discharge (NPDES) permits and to comply with water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) in NPDES permits sufficient to make progress toward the achievement of water quality standards or goals. The antibacksliding and antidegradation rules clearly spell out the interest of Congress in achieving the CWA's goal of continued progress toward eliminating all pollutant discharges. Congress clearly chose an overriding environmental interest in clean water through discharge reduction, imposition of technological controls, and adoption of a rule against relaxation of limitations once they are established.

Upon permit reissuance, modification, or renewal, a discharger may seek a relaxation of permit limitations. However, according to the CWA, relaxation of a WQBEL is permissible only if the requirements of the antibacksliding rule are met. The antibacksliding regulations prohibit EPA from reissuing NPDES permits containing interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions

less stringent than the final limits contained in the previous permit, with limited exceptions. These regulations also prohibit, with some exceptions, the reissuance of permits originally based on best professional judgment (BPJ) to incorporate the effluent guidelines promulgated under CWA §304(b), which would result in limits less stringent than those in the previous BPJ-based permit. Congress statutorily ratified the general prohibition against backsliding by enacting §§402(o) and 303(d)(4) under the 1987 Amendments to the CWA. The amendments preserve present pollution control levels achieved by dischargers by prohibiting the adoption of less stringent effluent limitations than those already contained in their discharge permits, except in certain narrowly defined circumstances.

When attempting to backslide from WQBELs under either the antidegradation rule or an exception to the antibacksliding rule, relaxed permit limits must not result in a violation of applicable water quality standards. The general prohibition against backsliding found in §402(o)(1) of the Act contains several exceptions. Specifically, under §402(o)(2), a permit may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant *if*: (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation; (B)(i) information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy [(e.g., Acts of God)]; (D) the permittee has received a permit modification under section 1311(c), 1311(g), 1311(h), 1311(i), 1311(k), 1311(n), or 1326(a) of this title; or (E) the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit, and has properly operated and maintained the facilities, but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

Even if a discharger can meet either the requirements of the antidegradation rule under §303(d)(4) or one of the statutory exceptions listed in §402(o)(2), there are still limitations as to how far a permit may be allowed to backslide. Section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor to restrict the extent to which BPJ and water quality-based permit limitations may be relaxed under the antibacksliding rule. Under this subsection, even if EPA allows a permit to backslide from its previous permit requirements, EPA may never allow the reissued permit to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the current effluent limitation guidelines for that pollutant, or which would cause the receiving waters to violate the applicable state water quality standard adopted under the authority of §303.49.

Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1) have been adopted to implement the antibacksliding requirements of the CWA:

(1) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (1)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)

(2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

(i) Exceptions--A permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

(A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;

(B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);

(C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;

(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or

(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain an effluent limitation which is less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time the permit is renewed, reissued, or modified. In no event may such a permit to discharge into waters be renewed, issued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation if the implementation of such limitation would result in a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 applicable to such waters.

The existing NPDES permit (R5-200-) for this facility contains Effluent Limitations for settleable solids (SS). The most important physical characteristic of wastewater is its total solids content. SS are an approximate measure of the quantity of sludge that will be removed by sedimentation. Low, medium and high strength wastewaters will generally contain 5 ml/l, 10 ml/l and 20 ml/l of SS, respectively. Knowledge of SS parameters is critical for proper

wastewater treatment plant design, evaluating sludge quantities, operation and troubleshooting. Excessive SS in the effluent discharge are typically indicative of process upset or overloading of the system. Failure to limit and monitor for SS limits the regulators ability to assess facility operations and determine compliance. Settleable matter is a water quality objective in the Basin Plan. Failure to include an Effluent Limitations for SS threatens to allow violation of the settleable matter receiving water limitation. As such, there is a reasonable potential for settleable solids to exceed the Basin Plan's water quality standard and Effluent Limitations are required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44. We applaud the operators if indeed they did not violate the SS limitation during the life of the existing permit; this does not however remove the reasonable potential to cause exceedances in the future during system upsets or overloading; this also does not constitute "new" information as is required under the antibacksliding regulations.

**4. The proposed Permit replaces Effluent Limitations for turbidity which were present in the existing permit; contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1).**

Under the Clean Water Act (CWA), point source dischargers are required to obtain federal discharge (NPDES) permits and to comply with water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) in NPDES permits sufficient to make progress toward the achievement of water quality standards or goals. The antibacksliding and antidegradation rules clearly spell out the interest of Congress in achieving the CWA's goal of continued progress toward eliminating all pollutant discharges. Congress clearly chose an overriding environmental interest in clean water through discharge reduction, imposition of technological controls, and adoption of a rule against relaxation of limitations once they are established.

Upon permit reissuance, modification, or renewal, a discharger may seek a relaxation of permit limitations. However, according to the CWA, relaxation of a WQBEL is permissible only if the requirements of the antibacksliding rule are met. The antibacksliding regulations prohibit EPA from reissuing NPDES permits containing interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions less stringent than the final limits contained in the previous permit, with limited exceptions. These regulations also prohibit, with some exceptions, the reissuance of permits originally based on best professional judgment (BPJ) to incorporate the effluent guidelines promulgated under CWA §304(b), which would result in limits less stringent than those in the previous BPJ-based permit. Congress statutorily ratified the general prohibition against backsliding by enacting §§402(o) and 303(d)(4) under the 1987 Amendments to the CWA. The amendments preserve present pollution control levels achieved by dischargers by prohibiting the adoption of less stringent effluent limitations than those already contained in their discharge permits, except in certain narrowly defined circumstances.

When attempting to backslide from WQBELs under either the antidegradation rule or an exception to the antibacksliding rule, relaxed permit limits must not result in a violation of applicable water quality standards. The general prohibition against backsliding found in §402(o)(1) of the Act contains several exceptions. Specifically, under §402(o)(2), a permit may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant *if*: (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation; (B)(i)

information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy [(e.g., Acts of God)]; (D) the permittee has received a permit modification under section 1311(c), 1311(g), 1311(h), 1311(i), 1311(k), 1311(n), or 1326(a) of this title; or (E) the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit, and has properly operated and maintained the facilities, but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

Even if a discharger can meet either the requirements of the antidegradation rule under §303(d)(4) or one of the statutory exceptions listed in §402(o)(2), there are still limitations as to how far a permit may be allowed to backslide. Section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor to restrict the extent to which BPJ and water quality-based permit limitations may be relaxed under the antibacksliding rule. Under this subsection, even if EPA allows a permit to backslide from its previous permit requirements, EPA may never allow the reissued permit to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the current effluent limitation guidelines for that pollutant, or which would cause the receiving waters to violate the applicable state water quality standard adopted under the authority of §303.49.

Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1) have been adopted to implement the antibacksliding requirements of the CWA:

(1) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)

(2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

(i) Exceptions--A permit with respect to which paragraph (l)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

(A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;

(B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);

(C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;

(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or

(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain an effluent limitation which is less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time the permit is renewed, reissued, or modified. In no event may such a permit to discharge into waters be renewed, issued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation if the implementation of such limitation would result in a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 applicable to such waters.

The proposed Permit Fact Sheet discusses Pathogens and states that the previous Order established Effluent Limitations for turbidity. Turbidity limitations are maintained in the proposed Permit but have been moved to “Special Provisions”, they are no longer Effluent Limitations. The Fact Sheet Pathogen discussion states that infectious agents in sewage are bacteria, parasites and viruses and that tertiary treatment is necessary to effectively remove these agents. This discussion also states that turbidity limitations were originally established: “...to ensure that the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for total coliform organisms. This discussion is incorrect. First; coliform organism limitations are also an indicator parameter of the effectiveness of tertiary treatment. The coliform limitations in the proposed and past Permit are significantly lower than the Basin Plan Water Quality Objective and are based on the level of treatment recommended by the California Department of Public Health (DPH). Second; both the coliform limitations and turbidity are recommended by DPH as

necessary to protect recreational and irrigated agricultural beneficial uses of the receiving water. Turbidity has no lesser standing than coliform organisms in the DPH recommendation. Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. There are no limitations for viruses and parasites in the proposed Permit, which the Regional Board has indicated, are necessary to protect the contact recreation and irrigated agricultural uses of the receiving water. Both coliform and turbidity limitations are treatment effectiveness indicators that the levels of bacteria viruses and parasites are adequately removed to protect the beneficial uses. Special Provisions are not Effluent Limitations as required by the Federal Regulations. The turbidity Effluent Limitations must be restored in accordance with the Clean Water Act and Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1).

The only rationale that can explain moving the turbidity from Effluent Limitations to Provisions is to protect Dischargers from mandatory minimum penalties as prescribed by the California Water Code, Section 13385. It is doubtful that it was intent of the legislature in adopting the mandatory penalty provisions to have the Regional Boards delete Effluent Limitations from permit to avoid penalties.

**5. Effluent Limitations for aluminum, iron and manganese are improperly regulated as an annual average contrary to Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.45 (d)(2) and common sense.**

Federal Regulation 40 CFR 122.45 (d)(2) requires that permit for POTWs establish Effluent Limitations as average weekly and average monthly unless impracticable. The proposed Permit establishes Effluent Limitations for aluminum, iron and manganese as an annual average contrary to the cited Federal Regulation. Establishing the Effluent Limitations for aluminum, iron and manganese in accordance with the Federal Regulation is not impracticable, to the contrary the Central Valley Regional Board has a long history of having done so. Proof of impracticability is properly a steep slope and the Regional Board has not presented any evidence that properly and legally limiting aluminum, iron and manganese is impracticable.

**6. The proposed Permit fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for copper, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate, aluminum, boron, iron and manganese as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.45(b).**

Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 122.45 (b) requires that in the case of POTWs, permit Effluent Limitations, standards, or prohibitions shall be based on design flow. Concentration is not a basis for design flow. Mass limitations are concentration multiplied by the design flow and therefore meet the regulatory requirement.

Section 5.7.1 of U.S. EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control* (TSD, EPA/505/2-90-001) states with regard to mass-based Effluent Limits:

“Mass-based effluent limits are required by NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 122.45(f). The regulation requires that all pollutants limited in NPDES permits have limits,

standards, or prohibitions expressed in terms of mass with three exceptions, including one for pollutants that cannot be expressed appropriately by mass. Examples of such pollutants are pH, temperature, radiation, and whole effluent toxicity. Mass limitations in terms of pounds per day or kilograms per day can be calculated for all chemical-specific toxics such as chlorine or chromium. Mass-based limits should be calculated using concentration limits at critical flows. For example, a permit limit of 10 mg/l of cadmium discharged at an average rate of 1 million gallons per day also would contain a limit of 38 kilograms/day of cadmium.

Mass based limits are particularly important for control of bioconcentratable pollutants. Concentration based limits will not adequately control discharges of these pollutants if the effluent concentrations are below detection levels. For these pollutants, controlling mass loadings to the receiving water is critical for preventing adverse environmental impacts.

However, mass-based effluent limits alone may not assure attainment of water quality standards in waters with low dilution. In these waters, the quantity of effluent discharged has a strong effect on the instream dilution and therefore upon the RWC. At the extreme case of a stream that is 100 percent effluent, it is the effluent concentration rather than the mass discharge that dictates the instream concentration. Therefore, EPA recommends that permit limits on both mass and concentration be specified for effluents discharging into waters with less than 100 fold dilution to ensure attainment of water quality standards.”

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.45 (f), states the following with regard to mass limitations:

- “(1) all pollutants limited in permits shall have limitations, standards, or prohibitions expressed in terms of mass except:
- (i) For pH, temperature, radiation or other pollutants which cannot be expressed by mass;
  - (ii) When applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement; or
  - (iii) If in establishing permit limitations on a case-by-case basis under 125.3, limitations expressed in terms of mass are infeasible because the mass of the pollutant discharged cannot be related to a measure of operation (for example, discharges of TSS from certain mining operations), and permit conditions ensure that dilution will not be used as a substitute for treatment.
- (2) Pollutants limited in terms of mass additionally may be limited in terms of other units of measurement, and the permit shall require the permittee to comply with both limitations.”

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.45 (B)(1), states the following: “In the case of POTWs, permit effluent limitations, standards, or prohibitions shall be calculated based on design flow.”

Traditional wastewater treatment plant design utilizes average dry weather flow rates for organic, individual constituent, loading rates and peak wet weather flow rates for hydraulic design of pipes, weir overflow rates, and pumps.

Increased wet weather flow rates are typically caused by inflow and infiltration (I/I) into the sewer collection system that dilutes constituent loading rates and does not add to the mass of wastewater constituents.

For POTWs priority pollutants, such as metals, have traditionally been reduced by the reduction of solids from the wastestream, incidental to treatment for organic material. Following adoption of the CTR, compliance with priority pollutants is of critical importance and systems will need to begin utilizing loading rates of individual constituents in the WWTP design process. It is highly likely that the principal design parameters for individual priority pollutant removal will be based on mass, making mass based Effluent Limitations critically important to compliance. The inclusion of mass limitations will be of increasing importance to achieving compliance with requirements for individual pollutants.

As systems begin to design to comply with priority pollutants, the design systems for POTWs will be more sensitive to similar restrictions as industrial dischargers currently face where production rates (mass loadings) are critical components of treatment system design and compliance. Currently, Industrial Pretreatment Program local limits are frequently based on mass. Failure to include mass limitations would allow industries to discharge mass loads of individual pollutants during periods of wet weather when a dilute concentration was otherwise observed, upsetting treatment processes, causing effluent limitation processes, sludge disposal issues, or problems in the collection system.

In addition to the above citations, on June 26<sup>th</sup> 2006 U.S. EPA, Mr. Douglas Eberhardt, Chief of the CWA Standards and Permits Office, sent a letter to Dave Carlson at the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board strongly recommending that NPDES permit effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass as well as concentration.

**7. The proposed Permit does not contain an Effluent Limitation for oil and grease in violation of Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 and California Water Code Section 13377.**

The proposed Permit is for a domestic wastewater treatment plant. Domestic wastewater treatment plants, by their nature, receive oil and grease in concentrations from home cooking and restaurants that present a reasonable potential to exceed the Basin Plan water quality objective for oil and grease (Basin Plan III-5.00). Confirmation sampling is not necessary to establish that domestic wastewater treatment systems contain oil and grease in concentrations that present a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objective. It is not unusual for sewerage systems to allow groundwater cleanup systems, such as from leaking underground tanks, to discharge into the sanitary sewer. Groundwater polluted with petroleum hydrocarbons can also infiltrate into the collection system as easily as sewage exfiltrates. The Central Valley Regional Board has

a long established history of including oil and grease limitations in NPDES permits at 15 mg/l as a daily maximum and 10 mg/l as a monthly average, which has established BPTC for POTWs.

The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: "...the state board or the regional boards shall...issue waste discharge requirements...which apply and ensure compliance with ...water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses..." Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established, 40 CFR §122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be established using USEPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), proposed State criteria or a State policy interpreting narrative criteria supplemented with other relevant information, or an indicator parameter. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in *Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program* (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that "where the preponderance of evidence clearly indicates the potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of State water quality standards (even though the data may be sparse or absent) a limit MUST be included in the permit." Failure to include an effluent limitation for oil and grease in the proposed permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

**8. The proposed Permit contains an Effluent Limitation for acute toxicity that allows mortality to aquatic life that exceeds the Basin Plan water quality objective and does not comply with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) or the Clean Water Act.**

Under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), states are required to classify surface waters by *uses* – the beneficial purposes provided by the waterbody. For example, a waterbody may be designated as a drinking water source, or for supporting the growth and propagation of aquatic life, or for allowing contact recreation, or as a water source for industrial activities, or all of the above. States must then adopt *criteria* – numeric and narrative limits on pollution, sufficient to protect the uses assigned to the waterbody. Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), adopted to require implementation of the CWA, require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/ San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00), for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. This section of the Basin Plan further states, in part that, compliance with this objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms (toxicity tests).

The proposed Permit requires that the Discharger conduct acute toxicity tests and states that compliance with the toxicity objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms. However, the Tentative Permit contains a discharge limitation that allows 30% mortality (70%

survival) of fish species in any given toxicity test. Surely, mortality is a detrimental physiological response to aquatic life.

For an ephemeral or low flow stream, allowing 30% mortality in acute toxicity tests allows that same level of mortality in the receiving stream, in violation of federal regulations and contributes to exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative water quality objective for toxicity. In receiving streams where dilution may be available the primary mixing area is commonly referred to as the zone of initial dilution, or ZID. Within the ZID acute aquatic life criteria are exceeded. To satisfy the CWA prohibition against the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts, regulators assume that if the ZID is small, significant numbers of aquatic organisms will not be present in the ZID long enough to encounter acutely toxic conditions. The allowance of 30% mortality will result in acute toxicity within the ZID. Before the discharge can be allowed a complete mixing zone analysis is required in accordance with the Basin Plan and the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (SIP) to show that discharge limitations prevent toxicity; such an analysis has not been completed. CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy. The State Board has adopted the SIP and the Regional Board is required to the Policy.

US EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 104, that:

“When setting a whole effluent toxicity limit to protect against acute effects, some permitting authorities use an end-of-pipe approach. Typically these limits are established as an LC50>100% effluent at the end of the pipe. These limits are routinely set without any consideration as to the fate of the effluent and the concentrations of toxicant(s) after the discharge enters the receiving water. Limits derived in this way are not water quality based limits and suffer from significant deficiencies since the toxicity of a pollutant depends mostly upon concentration, duration of exposure, and repetitiveness of the exposure. This is especially true in effluent dominated waters. For example, an effluent that has an LC50=100% contains enough toxicity to be lethal up to 50% of the test organisms. If the effluent is discharged to a low flow receiving waterbody that provides no more than a three fold dilution at the critical flow, significant mortality can occur in the receiving water. Furthermore, such a limit could not assure protection against chronic effects in the receiving waterbody. Chronic effects could occur if the dilution in the receiving water multiplied by the acute to chronic ratio is greater than 100 percent. Therefore, in effluent dominated situations, limits set using this approach may be severely underprotective. In contrast, whole effluent toxicity limits set using this approach in very high receiving water flow conditions may be overly restrictive.”

Following US EPA's rationale the limitations of allowing 70% survival (30% mortality) in acute toxicity tests, as is the case in the cited LC50, will result in the allowance of toxic discharges to ephemeral streams, which is representative of the receiving waters at Davis. While the State and Regional Board's method of prescribing an effluent limitation of 70% percent survival may be

protective in waterbodies with significant dilution; such a limitation should be subject to a complete mixing zone analysis. For an ephemeral receiving stream a mixing zone analysis would not be applicable under worst-case dry stream conditions. The Order should be revised to require the Regional Board to prohibit acute toxicity (100% survival as compared to the laboratory control) in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i).

With regard to WET testing variability; US EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 11, that:

“In summary, whole effluent toxicity testing can represent practical tests that estimate potential receiving water impacts. Permit limits that are developed correctly from whole effluent toxicity tests should protect biota if the discharged effluent meets the limits. It is important not confuse permit limit variability with toxicity test variability” (emphasis added)

The proposed Permit must be revised to prohibit acute toxicity, require 100% survival in toxicity tests, in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), the CWA, the SIP, the CWC and the Basin Plan.

**9. The proposed Permit does not contain enforceable Effluent Limitations for chronic toxicity and therefore does not comply with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) and the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (SIP).**

Proposed Permit, State Implementation Policy states that: “On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.”

The SIP, Section 4, Toxicity Control Provisions, Water Quality-Based Toxicity Control, states that: “A chronic toxicity effluent limitation is required in permits for all dischargers that will cause, have a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to chronic toxicity in receiving waters.” The SIP is a state *Policy* and CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy.

Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a

level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality. There has been no argument that domestic sewage contains toxic substances and presents a reasonable potential to cause toxicity if not properly treated and discharged. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/ San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00) for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. The Proposed Permit contains a narrative Effluent Limitation prohibiting the discharge of chronically toxic substances: however a *Compliance Determination* has been added to the proposed Permit: “Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE provisions of Provision VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with effluent limitations contained in sections IV.A.1.d and IV.B.1.d of this Order for chronic whole effluent toxicity “. The *Compliance Determination* nullifies the Effluent Limitation and makes toxic discharges unenforceable. Sampling does not equate with or ensure compliance. The Tentative Permit requires the Discharger to conduct an investigation of the possible sources of toxicity if a threshold is exceeded. This language is not a limitation and essentially eviscerates the Regional Board’s authority, and the authority granted to third parties under the Clean Water Act, to find the Discharger in violation for discharging chronically toxic constituents. An enforceable effluent limitation for chronic toxicity must be included in the Order.

**10. The proposed Permit establishes Effluent Limitations for metals based on the hardness of the effluent as opposed to the ambient upstream receiving water hardness as required by Federal Regulations, the California Toxics Rule (CTR, 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4)).**

Federal Regulation 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4) states that: “For purposes of calculating freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals from the equations in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/l or less as calcium carbonate, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water shall be used in those equations.” (Emphasis added). The proposed Permit states that the effluent hardness was used to calculate Effluent Limitations for metals. The definition of *ambient* is “in the surrounding area”, “encompassing on all sides”. It has been the Region 5, Sacramento, NPDES Section, in referring to Basin Plan objectives for temperature, to define *ambient* as meaning upstream. It is reasonable to assume, after considering the definition of ambient, that EPA is referring to the hardness of the receiving stream before it is potentially impacted by an effluent discharge. It is also reasonable to make this assumption based on past interpretations and since EPA, in permit writers’ guidance and other reference documents, generally assumes receiving streams have dilution, which would ultimately “encompass” the discharge. Ambient conditions are in-stream conditions unimpacted by the discharge.

The Federal Register, Volume 65, No. 97/Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup> 2000 (31692), adopting the California Toxics Rule in confirming that the ambient hardness is the upstream hardness, absent the wastewater discharge, states that: “A hardness equation is most accurate when the relationship between hardness and the other important inorganic constituents, notably alkalinity and pH, are nearly identical in all of the dilution waters used in the toxicity tests and in the surface waters to which the equation is to be applied. If an effluent raises hardness but not alkalinity and/or pH, using the lower hardness of the downstream hardness might provide a

lower level of protection than intended by the 1985 guidelines. If it appears that an effluent causes hardness to be inconsistent with alkalinity and/or pH the intended level of protection will usually be maintained or exceeded if either (1) data are available to demonstrate that alkalinity and/or pH do not affect the toxicity of the metal, or (2) the hardness used in the hardness equation is the hardness of upstream water that does not include the effluent. The level of protection intended by the 1985 guidelines can also be provided by using the WER procedure.”

The proposed Permit goes into great detail citing the Federal Regulation requiring the receiving water hardness be used to establish Effluent Limitations. The result of using a higher effluent or downstream hardness value is that metals are toxic at higher concentrations, discharges have less reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards and the resulting Permits have fewer Effluent Limitations. The comparative Effluent Limitation values presented to defend the unsupported statements regarding which is more protective. Once again the public is subject to a bureaucrat “knowing better” and simply choosing to ignore very clear regulatory requirements. The Regional Board staff have chosen to deliberately ignore Federal Regulations placing themselves above the law. There are procedures for changing regulations if peer reviewed science indicates the need to do so, none of which have been followed. The proposed Permit fails to include Effluent Limitations for metals based on the actual ambient hardness of the surface water and is contrary to the cited Federal Regulation and must be amended to comply with the cited regulatory requirement.

**11. The proposed Permit fails to contain an Effluent Limitation for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate despite a clear reasonable potential to exceed waste quality standards in violation of Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44.**

Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is a commonly used plasticizer and is ubiquitous in the environment. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is used in the formation of plastics and has been documented in the available literature to be present in plastic pipes, bottles, bags and widely distributed throughout the environment. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate has been detected in the wastewater effluent at 17.5  $\mu\text{g/l}$ , also above the CTR Water Quality Standard of 1.8  $\mu\text{g/l}$ . The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: “...the state board or the regional boards shall...issue waste discharge requirements...which apply and ensure compliance with ...water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses...” Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Failure to include an effluent limitation for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate in the proposed permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

**12. The proposed Permit fails to require a site-specific study for Temperature as was required by State Board Order WQO 2002-0016.**

Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 5-01-122 contained a receiving water limitation for temperature based on a water quality objective contained in the Basin Plan, which states that “At no time shall the temperature of ... WARM intrastate waters be increased more than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature.” In petitioning Order No. 5-01-122, the Discharger objected to the receiving water limitation for temperature. The Discharger argued that the limitation,

which regulates increases over ambient temperature, is inappropriate because the Basin Plan objective addresses “natural receiving water temperature” and that Harding Drain has no natural temperature. In Order WQO 2002-0016, the State Water Board concluded that the Regional Water Board should impose appropriate temperature controls on the discharge based upon a site-specific study. The State Water Board stayed the receiving water limitation for temperature. In light of the fact that the Discharger is planning on moving the discharge from Harding Drain to the San Joaquin River during the term of this Order, a site-specific study to determine appropriate temperature limitations will not be required. The proposed permit fails to provide any explanation of why the elevated temperatures would not have a similar detrimental impact on aquatic life in surface waters regardless of the location. It is assumed that the San Joaquin River would provide a greater aquatic life habitat than Harding Drain and the associated temperature impacts. The proposed Permit also fails to assess that the discharge to Harding Drain is still allowed in the proposed Order. The permit writer intentionally ignores the State Board’s direct order to conduct a site-specific temperature study without any supporting defense.

**13. The proposed permit contains an inadequate reasonable potential by using incorrect statistical multipliers as required by Federal regulations, 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii) and the proposed permit fails to contain adequate Effluent Limitations as required by federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44.**

Federal regulations, 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii), state “when determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the permitting authority shall use procedures which account for existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, **the variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the effluent**, the sensitivity of the species to toxicity testing (when evaluating whole effluent toxicity), and where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.” Emphasis added. The reasonable potential analysis fails to consider the statistical variability of data and laboratory analyses as explicitly required by the federal regulations. The procedures for computing variability are detailed in Chapter 3, pages 52-55, of USEPA’s *Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control*. The Regional Water Board conducted the RPA in accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP. The proposed Permit states that: “Although the SIP applies directly to the control of CTR priority pollutants, the State Water Board has held that the Regional Water Board may use the SIP as guidance for water quality-based toxics control” but fails to discuss compliance with 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii). The State and Regional Boards do not have the authority to override and ignore federal regulation. The fact that the SIP illegally ignores this fundamental requirement does not exempt the Regional Board from its obligation to consider statistical variability in compliance with federal regulations. The failure to utilize statistical variability results in significantly fewer Effluent Limitations that are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. The reasonable potential analyses for CTR constituents are flawed and must be recalculated.

- The maximum effluent concentration of arsenic was 9 ug/l. The drinking water maximum contaminant level (MCL), a Chemical Constituents water quality objective incorporated into the Basin Plan is 10 ug/l. Using proper statistical variability the discharge presents a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality standard and an

Effluent Limitation is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44.

- Methylene Blue Activated Substances (MBAS) was detected in the effluent at 530 ug/l. The drinking water maximum contaminant level (MCL) for MBAS, a Chemical Constituents water quality objective incorporated into the Basin Plan is 500 ug/l. Even without proper statistical variability the discharge presents a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality standard and an Effluent Limitation is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44.
- Zinc was detected in the effluent at 61 ug/l. The CTR CMC and CCC water quality objective are both 109 ug/l. The number of samples collected for zinc was not presented in Attachment G, however it is likely that with a proper statistical variability analysis the discharge presents a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality standard and an Effluent Limitation is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44.

Thank you for considering these comments. If you have questions or require clarification, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Jennings". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Bill" being more prominent.

Bill Jennings, Executive Director  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance