

Response to Comments

Comment Deadline: April 29, 2019 by 5:00 p.m.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order R7-2019-0004, City of Calexico, Calexico Water Pollution Control Plant

Comment Letter #	Date	Commenter	Affiliation
Email 1	4/29/2019	Pascal Mues	USEPA – Environmental Engineer

Changes proposed in response to comments made on 4/29/19 will be incorporated into the tentative WDRs as shown in the errata sheet prepared on 5/2/19

Comment #	Location in the WDR	Comment	Response
1	Page numbers	The sequences of A-# and C-# were each repeated for several attachments in succession, so that (for example) there are three separate pages numbered B-8 (in the standard provisions, MRP, and fact sheet respectively).	These editorial changes will be made in the adopted version.
2	Attachment F. Fact Sheet, III.D. Impaired Water Bodies on Clean Water Act 303(d) List. Rationale for Effluent Limitations, IV.C.3. Determining the Need for WQBELs for Priority Pollutants	<u>My most significant issue is addressing 303(d) listed impairments more clearly and explicitly.</u> Given the long list of chemical impairments for the New River, Salton Sea, and Imperial Valley Drains (Fact Sheet section III.D) , I would have liked to see a clear statement that each facility’s priority pollutant scans (and other monitoring data) were reviewed for the presence/absence of each of the impairing pollutants- most of them do not appear to be addressed anywhere in the permit record outside of the mention of the impairment listings. The idea that nutrient impairments would not need to be addressed in the context of a WWTP discharge, for example, warrants specific explanation, especially in light of the basin plan’s prohibition of “biostimulatory substances...”. Similar issues might arise for addressing the impairments for low DO and “sediment”.	The draft NPDES permit/WDRs do contain a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) for all pollutants for which there are water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) in the permit, including for the receiving water’s 303(d) List of impairing pollutants. For clarity, staff recommends adding the following language in bold to the Attachment F, Fact Sheet, Section IV.C.3. second to the last paragraph: “Based on the RPA, the discharge demonstrates reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the water quality standard for selenium. Except for selenium, the discharge from the Facility does not contain any of the 303(d)-List, impairing pollutants for the receiving water at detectable levels. Based on current data, there is no longer any reasonable potential for cyanide to cause to an excursion above the applicable water quality standard.”

3	<p>Attachment F. Fact Sheet, IV.D.1. anti-backsliding Requirements IV.D.2. Determining the Need for WQBELs for Priority - Pollutants</p>	<p>Given the pattern of eliminating narrative TDS limits in favor of only keeping the numeric receiving water limits, I would like to see (separate from these permit issuance documents, and on a whole-board scale) a data table on which permits have had that TDS narrative limit removed in their most recent reissuances, and what receiving water limits were implemented in each case. I think we'd want to be able to demonstrate consistency (as well as protectiveness) since implementation of RW limits can be challenging, especially in the context of receiving waters which may have flow interruptions or other drought-driven effects over the life of the permits.</p>	<p>The removal of narrative TDS effluent limitation will not affect the quality of the discharge or degrade receiving waters.</p> <p>The "narrative" TDS effluent limitation in the prior Order (R7-2014-0001) was written as a receiving water limitation, with compliance measured as the discharge not causing the concentration of TDS in the receiving water to exceed an annual average concentration of 4,000 mg/l or a maximum daily concentration of 4,500 mg/l. This exact same requirement is still retained as a receiving water limitation. Accordingly, the removal of the TDS "narrative" effluent limitation will not result in any less stringent requirements in the permit.</p> <p>Staff is happy to work with EPA further on this issue.</p>
---	---	--	--