

Bill Jennings
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
3536 Rainier Avenue
Stockton, CA 95204
Tel: 209-464-5067
Fax: 209-464-1028
E-mail: deltakeep@aol.com



Mike Jackson
Law Office of Mike Jackson
P.O. Box 207
429 W. Main Street
Quincy, CA 95971
Tel: 530-283-1007
Fax: 530-283-0712
E-mail: mjatty@sbcglobal.net

Andrew Packard
Law Office of Andrew Packard
319 Pleasant Street
Petaluma, CA 94952
Tel: 707-763-7227
Fax: 707-763-9227
E-mail: andrew@packardlawoffices.com

For Petitioner California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

**In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements)
For City of Turlock Wastewater Treatment Plant;)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board)
- Central Valley Region Order No. R5-2010-0002)
NPDES No. CA0078948)**

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 13320 of California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (“CSPA” or “petitioner”) petitions the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review and vacate the final decision of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central

Valley Region ("Regional Board") in adopting Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078948) for City of Turlock Wastewater Treatment Plant, on 28 January 2010. See Order No. R5-2010-0002. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments.

1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
3536 Rainier Avenue
Stockton, California 95204
Attention: Bill Jennings, Executive Director

2. THE SPECIFIC ACTION OR INACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH THE STATE BOARD IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW AND A COPY OF ANY ORDER OR RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH IS REFERRED TO IN THE PETITION:

Petitioner seeks review of Order No. R5-2010-0002. Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078948) for the City of Turlock Wastewater Treatment Plant. A copy of the adopted Order is attached as Attachment No. 1.

3. THE DATE ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED OR REFUSED TO ACT OR ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD WAS REQUESTED TO ACT:

28 January 2010

4. A FULL AND COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE REASONS THE ACTION OR FAILURE TO ACT WAS INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER:

CSPA submitted detailed comment letters on 20 November 2009, 11 September 2009, 30 January 2009 and 3 January 2009. Those letters and the following comments set forth in detail the reasons and points and authorities why CSPA believes the Order fails to comport with statutory and regulatory requirements. The specific reasons the adopted Orders are improper are:

A. The Permit contains a compliance schedule for electrical conductivity (EC) that violates the Basin Plan, Federal regulation and the Clean Water Act.

The Basin Plan, Implementation, page IV-17, states that: "Where the Regional Water Board determines it is infeasible to achieve immediate compliance with water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Water Board or the State Water Board, or with water quality criteria adopted by the USEPA, or with an effluent limitation based on these objectives or criteria, the Regional Water Board may establish in NPDES permits a schedule of compliance. The schedule of compliance shall include a time schedule for completing specific actions that demonstrate

reasonable progress toward the attainment of the objectives or criteria and shall contain a final compliance date, based on the shortest practicable time (determined by the Regional Water Board) required to achieve compliance. In no event shall an NPDES permit include a schedule of compliance that allows more than ten years (from the date of adoption of the objective or criteria) for compliance with water quality objectives, criteria or effluent limitations based on the objectives or criteria. Schedules of compliance are authorized by this provision only for those water quality objectives or criteria adopted after the effective date of this provision [25 September 1995]. (Emphasis added)

The Permit states that: “h. Electrical Conductivity. The discharge of electrical conductivity shall not exceed the following: i. 1,000 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$, as a monthly average from 1 September to 31 March; and ii. 700 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$, as a monthly average from 1 April through 31 August. Compliance with final effluent limitations for electrical conductivity is not required until 28 July 2022 (all water year types, except critically dry) or 28 July 2026 (critically dry water years), per the compliance schedule in section VI.C.7.a.” The Permit allows a compliance schedule of 13 to 17 years.

40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(3) formerly authorized compliance schedules delaying the effective date of WQBELs being set based on the NTR and CTR. Even if 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8) did not preclude issuing compliance schedules which delay the effective date of WQBELs set under the NTR and CTR, the CWA itself precludes such compliance schedules—and any compliance schedule which delays the effective date of WQBELs past 1977.

Numerous courts have held that neither the EPA nor the States have the authority to extend the deadlines for compliance established by Congress in CWA section 301(b)(1). 33 U.S.C. §1311(b)(1); *See State Water Control Board v. Train*, 559 F.2d 921, 924-25 (4th Cir. 1977) (“Section 301(b)(1)’s effluent limitations are, on their face, unconditional”); *Bethlehem Steel Corp. v. Train*, 544 F.2d 657, 661 (3d Cir. 1976), *cert. denied sub nom. Bethlehem Steel Corp. v. Quarles*, 430 U.S. 975 (1977) (“Although we are sympathetic to the plight of Bethlehem and similarly situated dischargers, examination of the terms of the statute, the legislative history of [the Clean Water Act] and the case law has convinced us that July 1, 1977 was intended by Congress to be a rigid guidepost”).

This deadline applies equally to technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs. *See Dioxin/Organochlorine Ctr. v. Rasmussen*, 1993 WL 484888 at *3 (W.D. Wash. 1993), *aff’d sub nom. Dioxin/Organochlorine Ctr. v. Clarke*, 57 F.3d 1517 (9th Cir. 1995) (“The Act required the adoption by the EPA of ‘any more stringent limitation, including those necessary to meet water quality standards,’ by July 1, 1977”) (citation omitted); *Longview Fibre Co. v. Rasmussen*, 980 F.2d 1307, 1312 (9th Cir. 1992) (“[Section 1311(b)(1)(C)] requires achievement of the described limitations ‘not later than July 1, 1977.’ ”) (citation omitted). Any discharger not in compliance with a WQBEL after July 1, 1977, violates this clear congressional mandate. *See Save Our Bays and Beaches v. City & County of Honolulu*, 904 F. Supp. 1098, 1122-23 (D. Haw. 1994).

Congress provided no blanket authority in the Clean Water Act for extensions of the July 1, 1977, deadline, but it did provide authority for the States to foreshorten the deadline. CWA section 303(f) (33 U.S.C. § 1313(f)) provides that: “[n]othing in this section [1313] shall be construed to affect any effluent limitations or schedule of compliance required by any State to be implemented prior to the dates set forth in section 1311(b)(1) and 1311(b)(2) of this title nor to preclude any State from requiring compliance with any effluent limitation or schedule of compliance at dates earlier than such dates.”

Because the statute contains explicit authority to expedite the compliance deadline but not to extend it, the Regional Board may not authorize extensions beyond this deadline in discharge permits.

The July 1, 1977, deadline for achieving WQBELs applies equally even if the applicable WQS are established after the compliance deadline. 33 U.S.C. section 1311(b)(1)(C) requires the achievement of “more stringent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards . . . established pursuant to any State law . . . or required to implement any applicable water quality standard established pursuant to this chapter.” Congress understood that new WQS would be established after the July 1, 1977, statutory deadline; indeed, Congress mandated this by requiring states to review and revise their WQS every three years. *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c). Yet, Congress did not draw a distinction between achievement of WQS established before the deadline and those established after the deadline.

Prior to July 1, 1977, therefore, a discharger could be allowed some time to comply with an otherwise applicable water quality-based effluent limitation. Beginning on July 1, 1977, however, dischargers were required to comply as of the date of permit issuance with WQBELs, including those necessary to meet standards established subsequent to the compliance deadline.

In the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1977, Congress provided limited extensions of the July 1, 1977, deadline for achieving WQBELs. In CWA section 301(i), Congress provided that “publicly-owned treatment works” (“POTWs”) that must undertake new construction in order to achieve the effluent limitations, and need Federal funding to complete the construction, may be eligible for a compliance schedule that may be “in no event later than July 1, 1988.” 33 U.S.C. § 1311(i)(1) (emphasis added). Congress provided for the same limited extension for industrial dischargers that discharge into a POTW that received an extension under section 1311(i)(1). *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1311(i)(2). In addition, dischargers that are not eligible for the time extensions provided by section 1311(i) but that do discharge into a POTW, may be eligible for a compliance schedule of no later than July 1, 1983. *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1319(a)(6).

The fact that Congress explicitly authorized certain extensions indicates that it did not intend to allow others, which it did not explicitly authorize. In *Homestake Mining*, the Eighth Circuit held

that an enforcement extension authorized by section 1319(a)(2)(B) for technology-based effluent limitations did not also extend the deadline for achievement of WQBELs. 595 F.2d at 427-28. The court pointed to Congress' decision to extend only specified deadlines: “[h]aving specifically referred to water quality-based limitations in the contemporaneously enacted and similar subsection [1319](a)(6), the inference is inescapable that Congress intended to exclude extensions for water quality-based permits under subsection [1319](a)(5) by referring therein only to Section [1311](b)(1)(A). *Id.* at 428 (citation omitted). By the same reasoning, where Congress extended the deadline for achieving effluent limitations for specific categories of discharges and otherwise left the July 1, 1977, deadline intact, there is no statutory basis for otherwise extending the deadline.

The Clean Water Act defines the term effluent limitation as: “any restriction established . . . on quantities, rates, and concentrations of chemical, physical, biological, and other constituents which are discharged from point sources into navigable waters, the waters of the contiguous zone, or the ocean, including schedules of compliance.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(11).

The term schedule of compliance is defined, in turn, as “a schedule of remedial measures including an enforceable sequence of actions or operations leading to compliance with an effluent limitation, other limitation, prohibition, or standard.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(17). The purpose of a compliance schedule is to facilitate compliance with an effluent limitation by the applicable deadline by inserting interim goals along the way: “[a] definition of effluent limitations has been included so that control requirements are not met by narrative statements of obligation, but rather are specific requirements of specificity as to the quantities, rates, and concentration of physical, chemical, biological and other constituents discharged from point sources. It is also made clear that the term effluent limitation includes schedules and time tables of compliance. The Committee has added a definition of schedules and time-tables of compliance so that it is clear that enforcement of effluent limitations is not withheld until the final date required for achievement.” S. Rep. No. 92-414, at 77, *reprinted in* 1972 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3668 (Oct. 28, 1971) (emphasis added). Thus, Congress authorized compliance schedules, not to extend its deadlines for achievement of effluent limitations, but to facilitate achievement by the prescribed deadlines.

In *United States Steel Corp.*, the industry plaintiff argued that 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C) allows the July 1, 1977, deadline to be met simply by beginning action on a schedule of compliance that eventually would result in achieving the technology- and water quality-based limitations. 556 F.2d at 855. The Court of Appeals disagreed: “[w]e reject this contorted reading of the statute. We recognize that the definition of ‘effluent limitation’ includes ‘schedules of compliance,’ section [1362(11)], which are themselves defined as ‘schedules . . . of actions or operations leading to compliance’ with limitations imposed under the Act. Section [1362(17)]. It is clear to us, however, that section [1311(b)(1)] requires point sources to achieve the effluent limitations

based on BPT or state law, not merely to be in the process of achieving them, by July 1, 1977.”
Id. Thus, compliance schedule may not be used as a means of evading, rather than meeting, the deadline for achieving WQBELs.

Finally, a compliance schedule that extends beyond the statutory deadline would amount to a less stringent effluent limit than required by the CWA. States are explicitly prohibited from establishing or enforcing effluent limitations less stringent than are required by the CWA. *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1370; Water Code §§ 13372, 13377. The clear language of the statute, bolstered by the legislative history and case law, establishes unambiguously that compliance schedules extending beyond the July 1, 1977, deadline may not be issued in discharge permits. The Permit, however, purports to do just that. By authorizing the issuance of permits that delay achievement of effluent limitations for over thirty years beyond Congress’ deadline, the Permit makes a mockery of the CWA section 301(b)(1)(C) deadline and exceeds the scope of the Regional Board’s authority under the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Act. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C).

B. The 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).

The existing NPDES permit (Order No. 5-01-122) for this facility contains Effluent Limitations for settleable solids (SS). The Permit Fact Sheet, page F-65 states that:

“Settleable Solids. Order No. 5-01-122 included numeric monthly average and daily maximum effluent limitations of 0.1 mL/L and 0.2 mL/L, respectively. Settleable solids have not been detected in the effluent based on recent monitoring data conducted between October 2006 through April 2008. Therefore, monitoring data for settleable solids indicates that there is no reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives. Therefore, as described in section IV.D.3, settleable solids effluent limitations have not been retained in this Order.”

However:

Table F-2 of the Permit, Fact Sheet, shows that the existing daily maximum effluent limitation for settleable solids is 0.2 ml/l. The daily maximum discharged concentration of settleable solids was 4.0 ml/l. The date of the maximum violation was not cited.

Table F-3 shows that settleable solids limitations were found to be violated during inspections on 7 February 2004 and 24 July 2004.

The Regional Board has not submitted any argument why the settleable solids violations accrued during the life of the existing NPDES permit would not be valid. There is no cited justification for only using data from 2006 through 2008.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State's water quality standards. 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 valid, reliable, and representative effluent data or instream background data are available they MUST be used in applicable reasonable potential and limits derivation calculations. Data may not be arbitrarily discarded or ignored." The Regional Board has failed to use valid, reliable and representative data in developing limitations, contrary to the cited Federal Regulation. (Emphasis added)

Although not directly applicable to non-priority pollutants; the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries Of California (SIP), Section 1.2 requires that: "When implementing the provisions of this Policy, the RWQCB shall use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the RWQCB. The RWQCB shall have discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing this Policy. Instances where such consideration is warranted include, but are not limited to, the following: evidence that a sample has been erroneously reported or is not representative of effluent or ambient receiving water quality; questionable quality control/quality assurance practices; and varying seasonal conditions." Even though the SIP is not applicable to non-priority pollutants, the Regional Board utilized the SIP procedures in developing water quality based effluent limitations: "The scientific procedures for calculating the individual WQBELs are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on 1 May 2001." (Permit Finding M)

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:

(l) 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 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.

The Discharger did violate the SS limitation during the life of the existing permit, which does not constitute "new" information regarding compliance as proposed by the Regional Board. None of the exemptions from the antibacksliding regulation is applicable and the settleable solids limitations must be restored to the Permit.

C. The Permit moves Effluent Limitations for turbidity to a Special Provisions Section in an attempt to avoid mandatory minimum penalties as required by CWC 13385.

Turbidity limitations are maintained in the Permit but have been moved to "Special Provisions", they are no longer Effluent Limitations. 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 permits to avoid penalties. However CWC 13385 states that: "(c) For the purposes of this section, paragraph (2) of subdivision (f) of Section 13385, and subdivisions (h), (i), and (j) of Section 13385 only, "effluent limitation" means a numeric

restriction or a numerically expressed narrative restriction, on the quantity, discharge rate, concentration, or toxicity units of a pollutant or pollutants that may be discharged from an authorized location. An effluent limitation may be final or interim, and may be expressed as a prohibition. An effluent limitation, for those purposes, does not include a receiving water limitation, a compliance schedule, or a best management practice.” This citation indicates that regardless of the location, the turbidity limitation in the Permit is still covered under the CWC requirements for mandatory minimum penalties.

D. 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 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. Aluminum, iron and manganese limitations in the Permit are based on the secondary drinking water standard (MCL), which is incorporated into the Basin Plan, Chemical Constituents. Iron in the domestic water supply discolors fixtures and clothing during laundering; these impacts occur instantaneously not as an annual average. Taste and odor impacts to drinking water supplies also occur instantaneously. 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.

E. The Permit fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for copper, carbon tetrachloride, chloride, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate, aluminum, boron, iron, lead, manganese, selenium and silver 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. For example; wastewater treatment systems can only meet nitrate limitations if they are properly designed to denitrify. Once ammonia is converted to nitrate; the wastestream must be further treated to remove the nitrate; denitrification. The design parameters to nitrify and denitrify are based on the influent load of ammonia in terms of pounds per day, not concentration. The mass limitations are then implemented to assure that the system is operating according to design and not overloaded with the pollutant.

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 26th 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.

- F. The 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 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 Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

G. The 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).

The 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 Permit contains a narrative Effluent Limitation prohibiting the discharge of chronically toxic substances: however a Compliance Determination has been added to the Permit: “**G. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitation.** 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.

H. The 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)).

The Permit pages F-27 and F-30 states that:

“The effluent hardness ranged from 89 mg/L to 140 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 30 samples from October 2006 to April 2008. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 32 mg/L to 345 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 20 samples from May 2006 to April 2007. Using a hardness of 89 mg/L (as CaCO₃) to calculate the ECA for all Concave Down Metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all potential effluent/receiving water mixing scenarios and under all known hardness conditions, as demonstrated in the example using copper shown in Table F-5, below.”

“The maximum upstream receiving water hardness is 345 mg/L (as CaCO₃), which corresponds to a chronic CTR criterion for total recoverable lead of 15.4 µg/L. Based on 26 samples in the receiving water, the maximum total lead concentration was only 1.52 µg/L, which demonstrates there is assimilative capacity under conditions when the hardness of the receiving water is high. Under these circumstances, the 2006 Study recommends an iterative approach for calculating the ECA assuming some assimilative capacity exists in the receiving water at the higher hardness concentrations. Therefore, the total recoverable lead ECA at the maximum observed receiving water hardness has been iteratively determined assuming the maximum observed upstream receiving water hardness, a maximum upstream total lead concentration of 1.52 µg/L, and the effluent at the minimum observed hardness. This results in a chronic ECA for total recoverable lead of 2.7 µg/L (see Table F-8).

Using Equation 3 to calculate the ECA for all Concave Up Metals, based on the minimum observed upstream receiving water hardness, will result in WQBELs that are protective under all potential effluent/receiving water mixing scenarios and under all known hardness conditions, as demonstrated in Table F-6, for lead. In this example, the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and any mixture of the effluent and receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria. Use of a lower ECA (e.g., calculated based solely on the highest upstream receiving water hardness) is protective, but would lead to unreasonably stringent effluent limits considering the known conditions. Therefore, Equation 3 using the minimum observed upstream receiving water hardness has been used to calculate the ECA for all Concave Up Metals in this Order.”

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 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 18th 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."

On March 24, 2000 the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a biological opinion on the effects of the final promulgation of the CTR on listed species and critical habitats in California in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.; Act). The biological opinion was issued to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, with regard to the "Final Rule for the Promulgation of Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California" (CTR)". The document represented the Services' final biological opinion on the effects of the final promulgation of the CTR on listed species and critical habitats in California in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.; Act). The biological opinion contains the following discussion, beginning on page 205, regarding the use of hardness in developing limitations for toxic metals:

"The CTR should more clearly identify what is actually to be measured in a site water to determine a site-specific hardness value. Is the measure of hardness referred to in the CTR equations a measure of the water hardness due to calcium and magnesium ions only? If hardness computations were specified to be derived from data obtained in site water calcium and magnesium determinations alone, confusion could be avoided and more accurate results obtained (APHA 1985). Site hardness values would thus not include contributions from other multivalent cations (e.g., iron, aluminum, manganese),

would not rise above calcium + magnesium hardness values, or result in greater-than-intended site criteria when used in formulas. In this Biological opinion, what the Services refer to as hardness is the water hardness due to calcium + magnesium ions only.

The CTR should clearly state that to obtain a site hardness value, samples should be collected upstream of the effluent source(s). Clearly stating this requirement in the CTR would avoid the computation of greater-than-intended site criteria in cases where samples were collected downstream of effluents that raise ambient hardness, but not other important water qualities that affect metal toxicity (e.g., pH, alkalinity, dissolved organic carbon, calcium, sodium, chloride, etc.). Clearly, it is inappropriate to use downstream site water quality variables for input into criteria formulas because they may be greatly altered by the effluent under regulation. Alterations in receiving water chemistry by a discharger (e.g., abrupt elevation of hardness, changes in pH, exhaustion of alkalinity, abrupt increases in organic matter etc.) should not result, through application of hardness in criteria formulas, in increased allowable discharges of toxic metals. If the use of downstream site water quality variables were allowed, discharges that alter the existing, naturally-occurring water composition would be encouraged rather than discouraged. Discharges should not change water chemistry even if the alterations do not result in toxicity, because the aquatic communities present in a water body may prefer the unaltered environment over the discharge-affected environment. Biological criteria may be necessary to detect adverse ecological effects downstream of discharges, whether or not toxicity is expressed.

The CTR proposes criteria formulas that use site water hardness as the only input variable. In contrast, over twenty years ago Howarth and Sprague (1978) cautioned against a broad use of water hardness as a “shorthand” for water qualities that affect copper toxicity. In that study, they observed a clear effect of pH in addition to hardness. Since that time, several studies of the toxicity of metals in test waters of various compositions have been performed and the results do not confer a singular role to hardness in ameliorating metals toxicity. In recognition of this fact, most current studies carefully vary test water characteristics like pH, calcium, alkalinity, dissolved organic carbon, chloride, sodium, suspended solid s, and others while observing the responses of test organisms. It is likely that understanding metal toxicity in waters of various chemical makeups is not possible without the use of a geochemical model that is more elaborate than a regression formula. It may also be that simple toxicity tests (using mortality, growth, or reproductive endpoints) are not capable of discriminating the role of hardness or other water chemistry characteristics in modulating metals toxicity (Erickson et al. 1996). Gill surface interaction models have provided a useful framework for the study of acute metals toxicity in fish (Pagenkopf 1983; Playle et al. 1992; Playle et al. 1993a; Playle et al. 1993b; Janes and Playle 1995; Playle 1998), as have studies that observe physiological (e.g. ion fluxes) or biochemical (e.g. enzyme inhibition) responses (Lauren

and McDonald 1986; Lauren and McDonald 1987a; Lauren and McDonald 1987b; Reid and McDonald 1988; Verbost et al. 1989; Bury et al. 1999a; Bury et al. 1999b). Even the earliest gill models accounted for the effects of pH on metal speciation and the effects of alkalinity on inorganic complexation, in addition to the competitive effects due to hardness ions (Pagenkopf 1983). Current gill models make use of sophisticated, computer-based, geochemical programs to more accurately account for modulating effects in waters of different chemical makeup (Playle 1998). These programs have aided in the interpretation of physiological or biochemical responses in fish and in investigations that combine their measurement with gill metal burdens and traditional toxicity endpoints.

The Services recognize and acknowledge that hardness of water and the hardness acclimation status of a fish will modify toxicity and toxic response. However the use of hardness alone as a universal surrogate for all water quality parameters that may modify toxicity, while perhaps convenient, will clearly leave gaps in protection when hardness does not correlate with other water quality parameters such as DOC, pH, Cl- or alkalinity and will not provide the combination of comprehensive protection and site specificity that a multivariate water quality model could provide. In our review of the best available scientific literature the Services have found no conclusive evidence that water hardness, by itself, in either laboratory or natural water, is a consistent, accurate predictor of the aquatic toxicity of all metals in all conditions.

Hardness as a predictor of copper toxicity: Lauren and McDonald (1986) varied pH, alkalinity, and hardness independently at a constant sodium ion concentration, while measuring net sodium loss and mortality in rainbow trout exposed to copper. Sodium loss was an endpoint investigated because mechanisms of short-term copper toxicity in fish are related to disruption of gill ionoregulatory function. Their results indicated that alkalinity was an important factor reducing copper toxicity, most notably in natural waters of low calcium hardness and alkalinity. Meador (1991) found that both pH and dissolved organic carbon were important in controlling copper toxicity to *Daphnia magna*. Welsh et al. (1993) demonstrated the importance of dissolved organic carbon in affecting the toxicity of copper to fathead minnows and suggested that water quality criteria be reviewed to consider the toxicity of copper in waters of low alkalinity, moderately acidic pH, and low dissolved organic carbon concentrations. Applications of gill models to copper binding consider complexation by dissolved organic carbon, speciation and competitive effects of pH, and competition by calcium ions, not merely water hardness (Playle et al. 1992; Playle et al. 1993a; Playle et al. 1993b). Erickson et al. (1996) varied several test water qualities independently and found that pH, hardness, sodium, dissolved organic matter, and suspended solids have important roles in determining copper toxicity. They also suggested that it may be difficult to sort out the effects of hardness based on simple toxicity experiments. It is clear that these studies

question the use of site calcium + magnesium hardness only as input to a formula to derive a criterion for copper because pH, alkalinity, and dissolved organic carbon concentrations are key water quality variables that also modulate toxicity. In waters of moderately acidic pH, low alkalinity, and low dissolved organic carbon, the use of hardness regressions may be most inaccurate. Also, it is not clear that the dissolved organic carbon in most or all waters render metals unavailable. This is because dissolved organic carbon from different sources may vary in both binding capacity and stability (Playle 1998).”

The 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 Permit failure to include Effluent Limitations for metals based on the actual ambient hardness of the surface water is contrary to the cited Federal Regulation and must be amended to comply with the cited regulatory requirement.

I. The 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 µg/l, also above the CTR Water Quality Standard of 1.8 µg/l. Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in the effluent five times with an MEC of 17.5 µg/L, based on seven samples collected between October 2006 and April 2008.

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 Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State's water quality standards. 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 calculations indicate reasonable potential, a specific numeric limit MUST be included in the permit. Additional "studies" or data collection efforts may not be substituted for enforceable permit limits where "reasonable potential" has been determined."

J. The 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 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 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.

K. The 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 Permit fails to contain adequate Effluent Limitations for arsenic, MBAS and zinc 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 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.

L. The Effluent Limitation for copper has been revised to be less stringent based on the incorrect hardness and an undefined “metal translator.”

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 Permit clearly shows that the worst-case ambient hardness of the receiving stream is 32 mg/l as measured on 24 May 2006. Use of the lowest measured hardness of 32 mg/l results in a significantly lower Effluent Limitation for copper than use of the effluent hardness of 89 mg/l. Hardness dependant metals exhibit greater aquatic toxicity at lower hardness levels. Therefore, use of a higher hardness value in developing an Effluent Limitation will not protect the aquatic life beneficial uses of the receiving waters. The Effluent Limitations for copper must be revised to 3.4 ug/l (CCC) and 4.6 ug/l (CMC) based on the lowest recorded “worst case” ambient hardness of the receiving stream (32 mg/l).

The hardness dataset in Attachment H established the lowest “worst case” hardness at 32 mg/l. However, the dataset represents only two years of data. The dataset does sufficiently reflect that the lower harnesses occur during periods of high flow. There are only three recorded data points in Attachment H representing high flow events and there is no indication that the actual highest flows of the receiving stream were measured or sampled. It is reasonable that flows will occur in the receiving stream higher than those recorded and presented in Attachment H. Correspondingly, there is no evidence that 32 mg/l represents the actual lowest “worst case” hardness of the receiving stream. While use of 32 mg/l hardness would be significantly more protective of the aquatic life beneficial uses of the receiving stream than the 89 mg/l used in the Permit; there is no evidence that the “worst case” hardness has been captured.

M. The revised Permit reasonable potential analysis for copper, lead and zinc and the Effluent Limitation for copper are based on a metals translator study that has not been sufficiently defined in accordance with Federal Regulation 40 CFR 124.8.

The Permit revision is incomplete in its discussion of the translators and therefore does not comply with the requirements of Federal Regulation 40 CFR 124.8. On March 24, 2000 the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a biological opinion on the effects of the final promulgation of the CTR on listed species and critical habitats in California in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.; Act). The biological opinion was issued to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, with regard to the “Final Rule for the Promulgation of Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California” (CTR)”. The document represented the Services’ final

biological opinion on the effects of the final promulgation of the CTR on listed species and critical habitats in California in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.; Act). The biological opinion contained the following discussion with regard to Conversion Factors and Translators.

“Conversion Factors and Translators

EPA derived ambient metals criteria from aquatic toxicity tests that observed the dose-response relationships of test organisms under controlled (laboratory) conditions. In most of these studies, organism responses were plotted against nominal test concentrations of metals or concentrations determined on unfiltered samples. Thus, until recently metals criteria have been expressed in terms of total metal concentrations. Current EPA metals policy (USEPA 1993a) and the CTR in particular propose that criteria be expressed on a dissolved basis because particulate metals contribute less toxicity than dissolved forms. EPA formulas for computing criteria thus are adjusted via a conversion factor (CF), so that criteria based on total metal concentrations can be “converted” to a dissolved basis. Metals for which a conversion factor has been applied include arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, silver, and zinc.

The CF is a value that is used to estimate the ratio of dissolved metals to total recoverable metals to adjust the former criteria based on total metal to yield a dissolved metal criterion. A CF based on the premise that the dissolved fraction of the metals in water is the most bioavailable and therefore the most toxic (USEPA 1993a, 1997c). The presumption is that the dose/response relationships found in toxicity tests would be more precise if “dissolved” metal concentrations were determined in test solution samples that have been filtered to remove the larger-sized, particulate metal fraction. The term “total” metal refers to metal concentrations determined in unfiltered samples that have been acidified ($\text{pH} < 2$) before analysis. The term “dissolved” metal refers to metal concentrations determined in samples that have been filtered (generally a 0.45-micron pore size) prior to acidification and analysis. Although it is clear that concentrations determined in a procedurally-defined dissolved sample are not accurate measures of dissolved metals, it may be premature to recommend immediate changes to the current procedure (Chapman 1998). Particulate metals can be single atoms or metal complexes adsorbed to or incorporated into silt, clay, algae, detritus, plankton, etc., which can be removed from the test water by filtration through a 0.45 micron filter. A CF value is always less than 1 (except for As which is currently 1.0) and is multiplied by a total criterion to yield a (lower) dissolved criterion.

For example, CF values for Cd, Cu, Pb, and Zn, are 0.944, 0.960, 0.791, and 0.978 respectively (USEPA 1997c). The CF values approach 100 percent for several metals because they are ratios determined in laboratory toxicity-test solutions, not in natural waters where relative contributions of waterborne particulate metals are much greater. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG 1997) has commented that particulate fractions in natural waters in California are often in the range of 80 percent, which would equate to a dissolved-to-total ratio of 0.2. To convert

metals criteria, EPA reviewed test data that reported both total and dissolved concentrations in their test waters and also conducted simulations of earlier experiments to determine the dissolved-to-total ratios (USEPA 1992, 1995a, 1997c). In this way, the historical toxicity database could be preserved and a large number of new toxicity tests would not have to be performed. Overall, the CFs proposed in the CTR are based upon roughly 10% of the historical database of toxicity tests. CF values for As and Ni were based on only 1 study each, comprising 11 records. CF values for Cr were based on only 2 studies, while the estimated CF for Pb was based on 3 studies, comprised of only 3 records. Although additional confirmatory studies were performed to develop the CFs, the database available appears to be limited and calls into question the defensibility of the CFs determined for these metals.

Ultimately the scientifically most defensible derivation of dissolved metals criteria should be based on reviews of new laboratory investigations because:

1. The several water quality variables that modulate metal toxicity may not have been properly controlled, measured, reported, or manipulated over ranges that are environmentally realistic and necessary to consider if site-specific criteria are to be proposed (see section on hardness);
2. It is likely that most toxicity tests measured organism responses in terms of traditional endpoints such as mortality, growth, reproductive output. These may not be sufficient for determining the toxic effects of metals in test waters manipulated to reflect environmental (site) conditions (see section on hardness);
3. The test waters contained very low contributions from particulate metals to the total metal concentrations. These proportions are not environmentally realistic; and
4. The present EPA criteria for metals lack meaningful input and modification from metals toxicity research done in the last decade.

Points 1 and 2 above are discussed in this final biological opinion in the hardness section dealing with the use of water hardness as a general water quality "surrogate". Point 3 is illustrated by the fact that the CF's proposed in the CTR for several metals are near a value of 1.0. This indicates that the toxicity tests reviewed to derive dissolved-based criteria exposed test organisms in waters that contained very low concentrations of particulate metals. For example, the CF values for Cd, Cu, Pb, and Zn, are 0.944, 0.960, 0.791, and 0.978 respectively (USEPA 1997c), meaning that particulate metal percentages were (on average) 5.6%, 4.0%, 20.9%, and 2.2%. These percentages are much lower than found in many natural waters. The California Department of Fish and Game, in their comments to the EPA on the proposed CTR, has stated that particulate fractions in natural waters in California are often in the range of 80 percent

(CDFG 1997), which would equate to a dissolved-to-total ratio of 0.2. It is clear that the historical toxicity database does not include studies of the toxic contributions of particulate metals under environmentally realistic conditions. Improved assessments are necessary to develop adequately protective, site specific criteria.

The EPA Office of Water Policy and Technical Guidance has noted that particulate metals contribute some toxicity and that there is considerable debate in the scientific community on this point (USEPA 1993a). While the Services agree that dissolved metal forms are generally more toxic, this is not equivalent to saying that particulate metals are non-toxic, do not contribute to organism exposure, or do not require criteria guidance by the EPA. Few studies have carefully manipulated particulate concentrations along with other water constituents, to determine their role(s) in modulating metals toxicity. Erickson et al. (1996) performed such a study while measuring growth and survival endpoints in fish and suggested that copper adsorbed to particulates cannot be considered to be strictly non-toxic. Playle (1997) cautions that it is premature to dismiss particulate-associated metals as biologically unavailable and recommends the expansion of fish gill-metal interaction models to include these forms. The Service is particularly concerned that investigations have not been performed with test waters that contain both high particulate metal concentrations and dissolved concentrations near the CTR-proposed criteria concentrations.

Despite a paucity of information about the aquatic toxicity of particulate metals, the CTR proposes that compliance would be based on removing (filtering) these contaminants from a sample prior to analysis. It would be prudent to first conduct short-term and longer term studies, as well as tests that expose organisms other than fish. Particulates may act as a sink for metals, but they may also act as a source. Through chemical, physical, and biological activity these metals can become bioavailable (Moore and Ramamoorthy 1984). Particulate and dissolved metals end up in sediments but are not rendered entirely nontoxic nor completely immobile, thus they still may contribute to the toxicity of the metal in natural waters.

Particulate metals have been removed from the regulatory "equation" through at least two methods: the use of a CF to determine the dissolved metal criteria, and the use of a translator to convert back to a total metal concentration for use in waste load limit calculations. When waste discharge limits are to be developed and TMDLs are determined for a receiving waterbed, the dissolved criterion must be "translated" back to a total concentration because TMDLs will continue to be based on total metals.

EPA provides three methods in which the translation of dissolved criteria to field measurements of total metal may be implemented. These three methods may potentially result in greatly different outcomes relative to particulate metal loading. These methods are:

1. Determination of a site specific translator by measuring site specific ratios of dissolved metal to total metal and then dividing the dissolved criterion by this translator. As an example: a site specific ratio of 0.4 (40% of the metal in the site water is dissolved) would result in a 2.5 fold increase in the discharge of total metal. The higher the fraction of particulate metal in the site water the greater the allowable discharge of total metal. See the discussion and Table 9 below. This is EPA's preferred method.
2. Theoretical partitioning relationship. This method is based on a partitioning coefficient determined empirically for each metal and when available the concentration of total suspended solids in the site specific receiving water.
3. The translator for a metal is assumed to be equivalent to the criteria guidance conversion factor for that metal (use the same value to convert from total to dissolved and back again).

Since translators are needed to calculate discharge limits they become important in determining the total metals allowed to be discharged (see also loading discussion for individual metals below).

In the economic analysis performed by the EPA and evaluated by the State Board (SWRCB 1997), it was estimated that translators based on site-specific data will decrease dischargers costs of implementing the new CTR criteria by 50 percent. This cost savings is "directly related to the less stringent effluent limitations that result from the use of site-specific translators." This implies a strong economic incentive for dischargers to reduce costs by developing site-specific translators and ultimately being allowed to discharge more total metals. This conclusion regarding the impact of site specific translators is supported by documents received from EPA (USEPA 1997d).

EPA performed a sensitivity analysis on the effect of the site specific translator, which relies on determining the ratio of metal in water after filtration to metal in water before filtration in downstream waters. EPA's analysis indicated that use of a site-specific translators to calculate criteria would result in greater releases of toxic-weighted metals loads above the option where the Cfs are used as the translators. The potential difference was estimated to be between 0.4 million and 2.24 million "toxic weighted" pounds of metals discharged to California waterways.

The Services believe that the current use of conversion factors and site specific translators in formula-based metal criteria are not sufficiently protective of threatened and endangered aquatic species because:

1. Particulate metals have been removed from the regulatory equation even though chemical, physical, and biological activity can subsequently cause these particulate metals to become bioavailable;
2. The criteria are developed using toxicity tests that expose test organisms to metal concentrations with very low contributions from particulate metals;
3. Toxicity tests do not assess whether the toxic contributions of particulate metals are negligible when particulate concentrations are great and dissolved concentrations are at or near criteria levels;
4. This method has the potential to significantly increase the discharge of total metal loads into the environment even though dissolved metal criteria are being met by a discharger; and
5. The premise ignores the fact that water is more than a chemical medium; it also physically delivers metals to the sediments.”

The Services believe that the CTR proposed formula-based metal criteria is not protective of threatened or endangered aquatic species because total metal discharges will likely increase and the criteria development methods do not adequately consider the environmental fate, transport, and transformation of metals in natural environments.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) biological opinion requires that whenever a threatened or endangered species is present downstream from a discharge where a State developed translator will be used, EPA will work with the permitting authority to ensure that appropriate information, which may be needed to calculate the translator in accordance with the applicable guidance, will be obtained and used.

Appropriate information includes:

1. Ambient and effluent acute and chronic toxicity data;
2. Bioassessment data; and/or
3. An analysis of the potential effects of the metals using sediment guidelines, biocriteria and residue-based criteria for shellfish to the extent such guidelines and criteria exist and are applicable to the receiving water body.

EPA, in cooperation with the Services, will review these discharges and associated monitoring data and permit limits, to determine the potential for the discharge to impact federally listed species and/or critical habitats. If discharges are identified that have the potential to adversely affect federally listed species and/or critical habitat, EPA will work with the Services and the

State of California in accordance with procedures agreed to by the Agencies in the draft MOA published in the Federal Register at 64 FR 2755 (January 15, 1999) or any modifications to those procedures agreed to in a finalized MOA.

N. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for zinc as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 and the permit should not be adopted in accordance with California Water Code Section 13377.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that: "Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality." The California Toxics Rule (CTR) Water Quality Standard for zinc is 43 µg/l based on the receiving stream is 32 mg/l as measured on 24 May 2006. The wastewater discharge maximum observed 62.9 was ug/l. Clearly the discharge exceeds the CTR water quality objective. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for zinc.

California Water Code, section 13377, requires that: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the state board and the regional boards shall, as required or authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, issue waste discharge and dredged or fill material permits which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary, thereto, together with any more stringent effluent standards or limitations necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance."

O. The Permit fails to contain an Effluent Limitation for lead in violation of the California Toxics Rule, Federal Regulations (40 CFR 122.44), the California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 and the State's Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP).

The maximum observed effluent (MEC) concentration for lead was 1.4 µg/l, which exceeds the California Toxics Rule (CTR) CCC water quality standard of 0.71 µg/l. The worst case ambient hardness of the receiving stream is 32 mg/l as measured on 24 May 2006.

In accordance with Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44, the Regional Board is required to establish an effluent limitation if a pollutant is measures in the effluent which presents a reasonable potential to exceed a water quality standard of objective. In accordance with the SIP, Section 1.3, since the maximum effluent concentration exceeded a water quality standard, an effluent limitation is required. California Water Code, section 13377, requires that:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the state board and the regional boards shall, as required or authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, issue waste discharge and dredged or fill material permits which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary, thereto, together with any more stringent effluent standards or limitations necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance.”

The maximum measured effluent concentration of lead was 1.4 µg/l which clearly exceeds the CTR water quality standard of 0.71 µg/l and in accordance with Federal and State Regulations and the SIP, effluent limitations are required. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 122.4 (a), (d) and (g) require that no permit may be issued when the conditions of the permit do not provide for compliance with the applicable requirements of the CWA, or regulations promulgated under the CWA, when imposition of conditions cannot ensure compliance with applicable water quality requirements and for any discharge inconsistent with a plan or plan amendment approved under Section 208(b) of the CWA.

P. The Permit grants a mixing zone for Effluent Limitations for human health based criteria 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 Basin Plan.

The Permit would allow two miles of the San Joaquin River to exceed drinking water quality standards.

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. The Permit allows for mixing zones for human health based criteria absent any mixing zone analysis. The SIP also requires that if a Regional Board allows a mixing zone and dilution credit, the permit shall specify the point in the receiving water where the applicable criteria/objectives must be met. In this case, the Permit only “estimates” where water quality objectives must be met.

The Permit states that:

Pages F-33 and 34, “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 based on the harmonic mean flow is not appropriate.”

Page F-34, The Discharger provided a dilution/mixing zone study prepared by Larry Walker Associates on 16 June 2009 (Technical Memorandum entitled “City of Turlock Water Quality Control Facility – San Joaquin River Discharge Mixing Zone Study and Requested Amendment to Tentative Order, NPDES No. CA0078948”). Using the Cornell Mixing Zone Expert System (CORMIX) model, the point of complete mixing downstream of the Discharger’s proposed discharge to the San Joaquin River was estimated. A summary of the primary data inputs to the CORMIX model are provided below: A value of 100 feet (30.5 meters) was estimated for river width; the cross section geometry was estimated using aerial photo width measurements.

Page F-35, For carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane the results of the study indicates that the edge of the mixing zone where complete mixing occurs in the San Joaquin River is 3,048 meters (just under 2 miles) downstream of the proposed discharge point to the San Joaquin River. The width and depth of the mixing zone is approximately 30.48 meters and 0.93 meters, respectively. For nitrate, the results of the study indicates that the edge of the mixing zone where complete mixing occurs is 3,007 meters (almost 1.9 miles) downstream of the proposed discharge point to the San Joaquin River. The width and depth of the mixing zone is approximately 30.48 meters and 0.57 meters, respectively.

The discharge is not completely mixed as defined by the SIP at a point within two stream/river widths from the point of discharge. The Discharger did undertake a mixing zone analysis. However as is stated on page F-101 of the Permit:

“Mixing Zone Study. The Discharger conducted a mixing zone study prior to adoption of this Order to determine the size of the mixing zones for carcinogens and nitrate. Since the outfall to the San Joaquin River had not been constructed and the Facility had not begun discharging, certain assumptions had to be made and the model could not be calibrated or validated. Therefore, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct a mixing zone study following construction and operation of the outfall to the San Joaquin River to verify the results of the mixing zone study. A work plan and schedule for conducting the study shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board within 120 days after initiation of the discharge to the San Joaquin River. The mixing zone study shall be completed and

submitted to the Regional Water Board within one year of approval of the work plan and schedule.”

Permit page F-35 states that:

“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). In an effort to limit the size of the mixing zone, the Discharger has requested that the dilution be based on the design flow of the Facility (20 MGD). 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 the design discharge flow of 20 MGD, a dilution ratio of up to 20:1 may be allowed for the calculation of WQBELs for carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane. Based on the above, the Regional Water Board will apply a dilution factor of 19 for carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane.

For nitrate, the dilution credit is calculated using the 30Q10 (180 cfs or 116 MGD) and the design discharge flow of 20 MGD. Therefore, a dilution ratio of up to 5.8:1 may be allowed for the calculation of WQBELs for nitrate. The Discharger, in its mixing zone study, has requested that the dilution factor be limited to 1.8, which reflects a mixing zone at which a performance-based effluent limitation can be achieved. The edge of the mixing zone representing the dilution factor of 1.8 is 11.7 meters (just under 40 feet) downstream of the confluence of Harding Drain and the San Joaquin River. The width and depth of the mixing zone is approximately 2.79 meters and 0.57 meters, respectively. The Regional Water Board concurs with use of the smaller mixing zone for nitrate that represents the performance of the existing Facility. The observed average effluent concentration for the Facility is 15.5 mg/L nitrate (as N), with a standard deviation of 3.24 mg/L nitrate (as N). The performance-based effluent limitation, 26 mg/L nitrate (as N), was calculated based on the effluent average (15.5 mg/L) plus 3.3 times the standard deviation ($3.3 \times 3.24 \text{ mg/L} = 10.7 \text{ mg/L}$).”

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.

Federal Antidegradation regulations at 40 CFR 131.12 requires 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.”

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.

It is routine in California's Central Valley that wastewater treatment plants nitrify and denitrify their wastestream. Nitrification converts ammonia concentrations to nitrite and nitrate. Denitrification eliminates nitrate. The Discharger's wastewater treatment plant nitrifies but fails to denitrify. Both nitrification and denitrification can be considered BPTC. The Discharger has

failed to provide, and the Regional Board has failed to require BPTC to remove nitrate, instead utilizing the states waters for dilution. Chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane are carcinogens and byproducts of using chlorine as a disinfectant. It is routine in California's Central Valley that wastewater treatment plants use ultraviolet (UV) light to disinfect treated sewage. UV can be considered BPTC. It also appears that the mixing zone analysis was based on one, or two at the most, sampling data point for upstream water conditions to determine assimilative capacity.

Q. The Permit fails to contain an Effluent Limitation for chloride despite clear reasonable potential to exceed a water quality standard and defends discarding data from the reasonable potential analysis based on statistical definitions contrary to Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d) and Section 1.2 of the SIP.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State's water quality standards. 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 valid, reliable, and representative effluent data or instream background data are available they MUST be used in applicable reasonable potential and limits derivation calculations. Data may not be arbitrarily discarded or ignored." The Regional Board has failed to use valid, reliable and representative data in developing limitations, contrary to the cited Federal Regulation.

The Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries Of California (SIP), Section 1.2 requires that: "When implementing the provisions of this Policy, the RWQCB shall use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the RWQCB. The RWQCB shall have discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing this Policy. Instances where such consideration is warranted include, but are not limited to, the following: evidence that a sample has been erroneously reported or is not representative of effluent or ambient receiving water quality; questionable quality control/quality assurance practices; and varying seasonal conditions."

Statistical procedures are valid tools for assessing trends and analyzing data. It must be recognized however that statistical procedures are not scientific laws. In wastewater engineering it is common place for individual data points to be peaks or depressions far from the statistical norm. This is could be attributed to slug load discharges, discharge practices from local industries, or simply the infrequency of sampling wastewater effluents. Wastewater effluent is generally not sampled continuously, in this instance the Permit states that chloride was sampled

32 times over an 18 month period, or less than twice a month. It must also be recognized that wastewater treatment personnel tend to perform their daily functions as a matter of routine, such as sampling the effluent at the same time every day. The likely hood of data peaks being "real" absent erroneously reporting, questionable quality control/quality assurance practices or varying seasonal or daily conditions is more defensible than the data being an "outlier", hence the EPA and SIP requirement that data may not be arbitrarily discarded or ignored.

The Permit must be amended to include an Effluent Limitation for chloride based on the 384 mg/l effluent data point which exceeds the drinking water standard of 250 mg/l.

R. The 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 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 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 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 Permit, not a simple reference to a consultant for the Discharger.

As is shown above the 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 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.

5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED.

CSPA is a non-profit, environmental organization that has a direct interest in reducing pollution to the waters of the Central Valley. CSPA's members benefit directly from the waters in the form of recreational hiking, photography, fishing, swimming, hunting, bird watching, boating, consumption of drinking water and scientific investigation. Additionally, these waters are an important resource for recreational and commercial fisheries. Central Valley waterways also provide significant wildlife values important to the mission and purpose of the Petitioners. This wildlife value includes critical nesting and feeding grounds for resident water birds, essential habitat for endangered species and other plants and animals, nursery areas for fish and shellfish and their aquatic food organisms, and numerous city and county parks and open space areas. CSPA's members reside in communities whose economic prosperity depends, in part, upon the

quality of water. CSPA has actively promoted the protection of fisheries and water quality 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 declining aquatic resources. CSPA member's health, interests and pocketbooks are directly harmed by the failure of the Regional Board to develop an effective and legally defensible program addressing discharges to waters of the state and nation.

6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE STATE OR REGIONAL BOARD WHICH PETITIONER REQUESTS.

Petitioners seek an Order by the State Board to:

- A. Vacate Order No. R5-2010-0002 (NPDES No. CA0078948) and remand to the Regional Board with instructions prepare and circulate a new tentative order that comports with regulatory requirements.
- B. Alternatively; prepare, circulate and issue a new order that is protective of identified beneficial uses and comports with regulatory requirements.

7. A STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION.

CSPA's arguments and points of authority are adequately detailed in the above comments and our 20 November 2009, 11 September 2009, 30 January 2009 and 3 January 2009 comment letters. Should the State Board have additional questions regarding the issues raised in this petition, CSPA will provide additional briefing on any such questions. The petitioners believe that an evidentiary hearing before the State Board will not be necessary to resolve the issues raised in this petition. However, CSPA welcomes the opportunity to present oral argument and respond to any questions the State Board may have regarding this petition.

8. A STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE DISCHARGERS, IF NOT THE PETITIONER.

A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent electronically and by First Class Mail to Ms. Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114. A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent to the Discharger in care of: Mr. Dan Madden, Municipal Services Director, City of Turlock, Water Quality Control Facility 156 S. Broadway, Suite 270, Turlock, CA 95380

9. A STATEMENT THAT THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION WERE

**PRESENTED TO THE REGIONAL BOARD BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD
ACTED, OR AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE PETITIONER COULD NOT
RAISE THOSE OBJECTIONS BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD.**

CSPA presented the issues addressed in this petition to the Regional Board in 20 November 2009, 11 September 2009, 30 January 2009 and 3 January 2009 comment letters that were accepted into the record.

If you have any questions regarding this petition, please contact Bill Jennings at (209) 464-5067 or Michael Jackson at (530) 283-1007.

Dated: 26 February 2010

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Jennings", written in a cursive style.


Bill Jennings, Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2010-0002.

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
 Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
 http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley



**ORDER NO. R5-2010-0002
 NPDES NO. CA0078948**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
 CITY OF TURLOCK
 WATER QUALITY CONTROL FACILITY
 STANISLAUS COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	City of Turlock
Name of Facility	Water Quality Control Facility
Facility Address	901 S. Walnut Road
	Turlock, CA 95380
	Stanislaus County
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a major discharge.	

The discharge by the City of Turlock from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Receiving Water
001	Treated Municipal Wastewater	37° 27' 50"	120° 55' 52"	Harding Drain
002	Treated Municipal Wastewater	37° 27' 47"	121° 01' 57"	San Joaquin River

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on:	28 January 2010
This Order shall become effective on:	19 March 2010
This Order shall expire on:	1 January 2015
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than:	180 days prior to the expiration date

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Order No. 5-01-122 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **28 January 2010**.

Original signed by Kenneth Landau, Asst. E.O.
 for PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

Table of Contents

I.	Facility Information	1
II.	Findings.....	1
III.	Discharge Prohibitions.....	9
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications	10
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 001 (Harding Drain)	10
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 001 (Harding Drain).....	10
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations.....	11
	B. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 002 (San Joaquin River)	11
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 002 (San Joaquin River)	11
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations.....	13
	C. Land Discharge Specifications <i>[NOT APPLICABLE]</i>	13
	D. Reclamation Specifications – Discharge Point Nos. 003 and 004	14
V.	Receiving Water Limitations	14
	A. Surface Water Limitations.....	14
	B. Groundwater Limitations	16
VI.	Provisions.....	17
	A. Standard Provisions.....	17
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements	21
	C. Special Provisions.....	21
	1. Reopener Provisions	21
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	23
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	25
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications	25
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)	26
	6. Other Special Provisions	29
	7. Compliance Schedules	29
VII.	Compliance Determination	30

List of Tables

Table 1.	Discharger Information	Cover
Table 2.	Discharge Location	Cover
Table 3.	Administrative Information	Cover
Table 4.	Facility Information.....	1
Table 5.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	4
Table 6.	Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 001.....	10
Table 7.	Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 002.....	12