

Castaneda, Mary@Waterboards

From: Mues, Pascal <Mues.Pascal@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 4:25 PM
To: Castaneda, Mary@Waterboards
Cc: Dunn, Kai@Waterboards
Subject: RE: Tentative Orders R7-2019-0004 & R7-2019-0005

Mary – thank you for the opportunity to review these permits. The issues I noticed include the following:

- a) For Calexico, I noticed an error in the page numbering of the attachments. The sequences of A-# and B-# 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).
- b) For Niland, the same numbering error occurred but with A-# and C-# sections instead of A- and B-#.
- c) My most significant issue is addressing 303(d) listed impairments more clearly and explicitly. 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".
In Niland's case, the claim that the TSS effluent limitations comply with the sediment TMDL's WLA needs to be demonstrated. When I back-calculate from the TBEL TSS limits, I get $[(396 \text{ lbs/day}) * (365 \text{ days/year}) * (1 \text{ ton}/2000 \text{ lbs})] = 72.27 \text{ tons/year}$, well in excess of the stated WLA of 11.4 tons per year. Assertion of compliance with the WLA isn't enough when the numbers show that kind of disparity.
One potential way to address this question for most other parameters would be to add some additional discussion to the numbers presented in table F-3 and how they are consistent with the requirements for discharging to a water listed as impaired for those substances.
- d) 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.

I hope these comments are useful and help you to refine the permits before taking them to the board for issuance. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Pascal Mues, Environmental Engineer
NPDES Permits office, U.S. EPA Region 9, WTR-2-3
75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415)-972-3768 | mues.pascal@epa.gov

From: Castaneda, Mary@Waterboards <Mary.Castaneda@waterboards.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 5:04 PM
To: Mues, Pascal <Mues.Pascal@epa.gov>