

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 Galt Wastewater Treatment Plant; )**  
**California Regional Water Quality Control Board )     **PETITION FOR REVIEW****  
**Central Valley Region Order No. R5-2010-0099; )**  
**– NPDES No. CA0081434 )**  

---

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.

CA0081434) for City of Galt Wastewater Treatment Plant, on 23 September 2010. See Order No. R5-2010-0099. 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. R5-2010-0099, Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0081434) for the City of Galt 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:**

23 September 2010

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

CSPA submitted a detailed comment letter on 8 August 2010. That letter 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 fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlorodibromomethane, Copper, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane, Lead, Nitrate plus Nitrite as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.45(b).**

Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 122.45 (b) requires that in the case of POTWs, permit Effluent Limitations, standards, or prohibitions shall be based on design flow.

Concentration is not a basis for design flow. Mass limitations are concentration multiplied by the design flow and therefore meet the regulatory requirement. Mass limits are critically important to assure that the facility is properly designed and capable of removing individual pollutants and to assure that the treatment facilities are not overloaded with the individual pollutant. The Regional Board's approach to priority pollutants is that treatment plants are designed to remove BOD, TSS and pathogens and that the removal of other priority pollutants is incidental; hence their removal of mass limitations from permits. This approach may have been generally successful prior to adoption of the National and California Toxics Rules which established stringent numerical limitations for priority pollutants. It is easy to recognize the failure of relying on conventional treatment plant design for addressing priority pollutants by the number of Time Schedule Orders and Cease and Desist Orders for noncompliant treatment systems regulated by the Central Valley Regional Board. This is also evidenced by the number of NTR and CTR noncompliant wastewater treatment plants in California's Central Valley. The design flow for priority pollutants is different for each individual pollutant and is different again from the conventional design flow for BOD and TSS. The treatment plant design flow for BOD and TSS removal is not the design flow rate for individual priority pollutants and toxic constituents such as ammonia and aluminum. A prime example of the requirements for individual pollutant removal is ammonia removal or nitrification; the design of activated sludge systems has been modified from simply being designed for BOD removal to achieve nitrification in many cases by providing extended aeration. This is likely why the Permit contains mass limits for ammonia. Failure to include mass limits and design flows for priority pollutants maintains the incidental nature of past compliance and will not reliably achieve compliance with water quality standards for priority pollutants. For Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlorodibromomethane, Copper, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane, Lead and Nitrate plus Nitrite the Permit does not specify the design flow and does therefore not comply with the requirements of 40 CFR 122.45(b).

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:

For pH, temperature, radiation or other pollutants which cannot be expressed by mass;

When applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement; or

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.”

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

It should be noted that the Regional Board does a great disservice to the Dischargers it regulates when they allow new or expanded treatment system to be built that are in immediate noncompliance with discharge limitations; this can be remedied by requiring the submittal of

individual pollutant design parameters be submitted by the design engineers. The Permit must be amended to include mass limitations for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlorodibromomethane, Copper, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane, Lead, Nitrate plus Nitrite. The design flow for each of the listed pollutants should be individually specified in the Permit to confirm compliance with 40 CFR 122.45(b). Failure to include mass limitations for these pollutants will result in another inadequately designed treatment plant that will be noncompliant for the listed pollutants.

**B. Effluent Limitations for Aluminum, Arsenic, 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, Arsenic, Iron and Manganese as an annual average contrary to the cited Federal Regulation. Establishing the Effluent Limitations for EC, iron and manganese in accordance with the Federal Regulation is not impracticable. Proof of impracticability is properly a steep slope and the Regional Board has not presented any evidence that properly and legally limiting Aluminum, Arsenic, Iron and Manganese is impracticable.

**C. The Permit fails to utilize the latest EPA recommended criteria for copper and instead utilized an outdated water quality standard and water effects ration in developing and effluent limitation for copper contrary to Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR which 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.**

EPA has issued revised national recommended freshwater aquatic life criteria for copper (*Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision*). In adopting the copper criteria EPA stated that:

“Copper is an abundant naturally occurring trace element found in the earth’s crust that is also found in surface waters. Copper is a micronutrient at low concentrations and is essential to virtually all plants and animals. At higher concentrations copper can become toxic to aquatic life. Mining, leather and leather products, fabricated metal products, and electric equipment are a few of the industries with copper-bearing discharges that contribute to manmade discharges of copper into surface waters. Municipal effluents may also contribute additional copper loadings to surface waters.

Since EPA published the hardness-based recommendation for copper criteria in 1984, new data have become available on copper toxicity and its effects on aquatic life. The Biotic Ligand Model (BLM) – a metal bioavailability model that uses receiving water body characteristics to develop site-specific water quality criteria – utilizes the best available science and serves as the basis for the new national recommended criteria.

The BLM requires ten input parameters to calculate a freshwater copper criterion (a saltwater BLM is not yet available): temperature, pH, dissolved organic carbon (DOC), calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, sulfate, chloride, and alkalinity. The BLM is used to derive the criteria rather than as a post-derivation adjustment as was the case with the hardness-based criteria. This allows the BLM-based criteria to be customized to the particular water under consideration.

BLM-based criteria can be more stringent than the current hardness-based copper criteria and in certain cases the current hardness-based copper criteria may be overly stringent for particular water bodies. We expect that application of this model will result in more appropriate criteria and eliminate the need for costly, time-consuming site-specific modifications using the water effect ratio.”

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).

On Page 13 (C) and repeated on pages 216 and 232 of the biological opinion it is required that:

“By June of 2003, EPA, in cooperation with the Services, will develop a revised criteria calculation model based on best available science for deriving aquatic life criteria on the basis of hardness (calcium and magnesium), pH, alkalinity, and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) for metals.”

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 solids, 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 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).”

As was required in the biological opinion, EPA has updated the water quality criteria for copper as cited above. Failure to utilize the updated criteria for copper in the Permit conflicts with the requirements of Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR which 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. Both EPA, in adopting the new criteria for copper, and the “Services” in issuing their biological opinion cite that the use of translators and the old hardness based standard for copper is likely not protective of the aquatic life beneficial use.

**D. The Permit misapplies a technical report in developing hardness based effluent limitations for metals; therefore, the effluent limitations developed utilizing this procedure are not protective of water quality and the beneficial uses of the receiving stream as required by 40 CFR 122.44.**

The Permit cites a technical report (page F-19, footnote No. 3, Emerick, R.W.; Borroum, Y.; & Pedri, J.E., 2006. California and National Toxics Rule Implementation and Development of Protective Hardness Based Metal Effluent Limitations. WEFTEC, Chicago, Ill.) as justification for utilizing a hardness other than the upstream ambient hardness in equations for developing effluent limitations for metals. The cited report states that:

“PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION, It is proposed to develop water quality criteria for use in conducting “reasonable potential” analyses for the assignment of effluent

limitations based on the following methodology. It has been demonstrated that the following methodology for setting fixed effluent limitations for hardness dependent metals will always be protective under all flow and mixing conditions (i.e., is independent of 1Q10 and 7Q10 design flows). In situations where maximum receiving water contaminant concentrations are less than water quality objectives or if effluent will never make up 100 percent of the stream flow, these same methodologies can be modified easily to set protective, fixed effluent limitations based on the maximum receiving water contaminant concentration or maximum percentage of effluent that will be present in the receiving water.” (Emphasis added)

The Permit states that:

Page F-26: “c. Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone. **“Laguna Creek is an ephemeral stream with little or no flow at times, therefore, no receiving water dilution is available. Dilution credits have not been allowed in this Order.”**”

Page F-20: “For Concave Down Metals (i.e., chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc) the 2006 Study demonstrates that when the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and the upstream receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria, any mixture of the effluent and receiving water will always be in compliance with the CTR criteria.”

Page F-20: “The effluent hardness ranged from 52 mg/L to 85.1 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 30 samples from April 2004 to March 2008. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 30 mg/L to 117 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 41 samples from April 2004 to February 2008. Using a hardness of 52 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) 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...”

Page F-21: “Using these reasonable worst-case conditions, the discharge can be mixed with the receiving water and a resulting downstream mixed hardness (or metals concentration) can be calculated for all discharge and mixing conditions (e.g., 0% effluent to 100% effluent) based on a simple mass balance as shown in Equation 3, below.”

Page F-21: “As demonstrated in Table F-4, using a hardness of 52 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) to calculate the ECA for chronic cadmium, chromium III, and nickel ensures the discharge is protective under all discharge and mixing conditions.

Page F-22: “Therefore, the 2006 Study provides a mathematical approach to calculate the ECA to ensure that any mixture of effluent and receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria (see Equation 4, below).”

Page F-24: “Using Equation 4 to calculate the ECA for acute cadmium and acute silver 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-5 and F-6, for acute cadmium.”

The effluent hardness ranged from 52 mg/L to 85.1 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 30 samples from April 2004 to March 2008. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 30 mg/L to 117 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 41 samples from April 2004 to February 2008. Metals exhibit greater toxicity in lower hardness water. Effluent imitations based on the lowest observed upstream “ambient” hardness is fully protective of the aquatic life beneficial uses of the receiving stream. The use of a higher hardness can only be utilized if mixing conditions are considered (ie, as the effluent mixes with the receiving stream). The Permit utilizes assimilative capacity within the receiving waters to develop Effluent Limitations for hardness dependant metals despite very clear Findings that the receiving water provides NO assimilative capacity.

**E. The Central Valley Regional Water Board (Region 5) NPDES Permits establish Effluent Limitations for metals based on the hardness of the effluent and/or the downstream water and rarely use the ambient upstream receiving water hardness as required by Federal Regulations, the California Toxics Rule (CTR, 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4)).**

Federal Regulation 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4) states that: “For purposes of calculating freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals from the equations in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/l or less as calcium carbonate, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water shall be used in those equations.” (Emphasis added). The 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. Confirming this definition, the SIP Sections 1.4.3.1 *Ambient Background Concentration as an Observed Maximum* and 1.4.3.2 state in part that: “If possible, preference should be given to ambient water column concentrations measured immediately upstream or near the discharge, but not within an allowed

mixing zone for the discharge. The RWQCB shall have discretion to consider if any samples are invalid for use as applicable data due to evidence that the sample has been erroneously reported or the sample is not representative of the ambient receiving water column that will mix with the discharge.”

The Permit, page F-20 details that: “The effluent hardness ranged from 52 mg/L to 85.1 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 30 samples from April 2004 to March 2008. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 30 mg/L to 117 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), based on 41 samples from April 2004 to February 2008.

The Regional Board has used the effluent hardness and the instream effluent hardness measured immediately downstream of the point of discharge, calling such “ambient”. Ambient is defined as “surrounding”; not “in the middle of”. Regional Board staff have begun to define any hardness used (effluent, upstream and downstream) as being “ambient”. 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 most typical wastewater discharge situation is where the receiving water hardness is lower than the effluent hardness. Metals are more toxic in lower hardness water. For example; if the receiving water hardness is 25 mg/l and the effluent hardness is 50 mg/l a corresponding chronic discharge limitation for copper based on the different hardness’s would be 2.9 ug/l and 5.2 ug/l, respectively. Obviously, the limitation based on the true ambient (upstream) receiving water hardness is more restrictive.

The Regional Board’s use of hardnesses other than the upstream is based on an approach developed by Dr. Robert Emerick, of Eco:Logic Engineers. Dr. Emerick developed a different approach for evaluating hardness-dependent metals that used effluent and downstream hardness values in assessing reasonable potential and developing effluent limits. He subsequently presented his approach at the Water Board’s Training Academy and the Regional Board has adopted this methodology as a defacto policy in developing and issuing wastewater discharge permits. Dr. Emerick’s approach has never been evaluated or adopted through the legally mandated rule-making procedures. Use of the policy has resulted in fewer and less stringent and less protective limits in numerous permits.

The Federal Register, Volume 65, No. 97/Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup> 2000 (31692), adopting the California Toxics Rule in confirming that the ambient hardness is the upstream hardness, absent the wastewater discharge, states that: “A hardness equation is most accurate when the relationship between hardness and the other important inorganic constituents, notably alkalinity and pH, are nearly identical in all of the dilution waters used in the toxicity tests and in the

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

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 solids, and others while observing the responses of test organisms. It is likely that understanding metal toxicity in waters of various chemical makeup 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.

SWRCB presidential Order No. WQ 2008-0008 (Corrected) regarding a petition for consideration of the City of Davis' NPDES Permit states and concludes that:

“Based on the current record, it would be more appropriate to use the lowest reliable upstream receiving water hardness values of 78 mg/l for Willows Slough Bypass and 85 mg/l for Conaway Ranch Toe Drain for protection from acute toxicity impacts, regardless of when the samples were taken or whether they were influenced by storm events. Because high flow conditions may deviate from the design flow conditions for selection of hardness as specified in the CTR, it may not be necessary, in some circumstances, to select the lowest hardness values from high flow or storm event conditions. Regardless of the hardness used, the resulting limits must always be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.”

“**Conclusion:** The Central Valley Water Board was justified in using upstream receiving water hardness values rather than effluent hardness values. However, for protection from acute toxicity impacts in the receiving waters, which can occur in short durations even during storm events, in this case, based on the existing record, the Central Valley Water Board should have used the lowest valid upstream receiving water hardness values of 78 mg/l for Willow Slough Bypass and 85 mg/l for Conaway Ranch Toe Drain. Effluent limitations must protect beneficial uses considering reasonable, worst-case conditions. We recognize that this approach does not necessarily agree with conclusions in other guidance stating that low flow conditions are the “worst-case” conditions. However, nothing in this Order is intended to suggest that low flows are inappropriate for determining the reasonable, worst-case conditions in other contexts.” (Emphasis added)

The Regional Board cited the State Board's Water Quality Order (WQO)(No. 2008 0008) for the City of Davis as allowing complete discretion in utilizing the downstream hardness in deriving limits for toxic metals. WQO 2008 0008 in requiring the Regional Board to modify their permit states: "Revise the Fact Sheet to include a discussion of the appropriate hardness to use to protect from acute toxicity impacts (which can occur in short-term periods including storm events) in the receiving waters. The Fact Sheet should also state that the lowest valid upstream receiving water hardness values of 78 mg/l for Willow Slough Bypass and 85 mg/l for Conaway Ranch Toe Drain should be used to determine reasonable potential for the effluent to exceed the hardness-dependent metal CTR criteria, unless additional evidence and analysis, consistent with this Order, demonstrates that different hardness values are appropriate to use and are fully protective of water quality." The Regional Board did not use the lowest observed upstream hardness as required in WQO 2008 0008. The Regional Board has not provided additional evidence and analysis demonstrating that different hardness is fully protective of beneficial uses. To the contrary, the Regional Board does not address the March 24, 2000 the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) CTR Biological Opinion cited above stating that the use of hardness alone is not protective of beneficial uses and recommending the sole use of the ambient upstream hardness in developing limits for toxic metals.

The Regional Board's arguments with regard to effluent and/or downstream receiving water hardness can only be made if in-stream mixing is considered. Mixing zones may be granted in accordance with extensive requirements contained in the SIP and the Basin Plan to establish Effluent Limitations. Mixing zones cannot be considered in conducting a reasonable potential analysis to determine whether a constituent will exceed a water quality standard or objective. The Regional Board's approach in using the effluent or downstream hardness to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and consequently establish effluent limitations can only be utilized if mixing is considered; otherwise the ambient (upstream) hardness results in significantly more restrictive limitations. A mixing zone allowance has not been discussed with regard to this issue and therefore does not comply with the SIP.

The issue is that the Regional Board fails to comply with the regulatory requirement to use the ambient instream hardness for limiting hardness dependant metals under the CTR. Failure to utilize the upstream ambient hardness for determining reasonable potential and developing limitations results in fewer and less restrictive Effluent Limitations.

**F. The Permit does not comply with the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 27 for the disposal of wastewater and sludge and has possibly degraded groundwater quality contrary to the Antidegradation Policy, Resolution 68-16.**

Groundwater concentrations for TDS, nitrate, and arsenic near the wastewater treatment facility exceed water quality objectives. Wastewater and sludge from the facility contain TDS, nitrate and arsenic. There is no assimilative capacity to allow any degradation for these constituents in accordance with the Antidegradation Policy since objectives are being exceeded. Since arsenic is naturally high in the City of Galt's water supply, the average concentrations of arsenic in the Facility's influent is 13 µg/L and in the effluent is 12.1 µg/L, which is above the water quality objective of 10 µg/L. The Permit establishes groundwater limitations for arsenic, TDS and nitrate but fails to recognize that any increase in applied load will result in continued groundwater degradation.

Sludge is pumped from the sludge lagoons and injected 8 to 18 inches below the surface on the Discharger's agriculture reuse area, or are mechanically dewatered and hauled offsite by a contract company. While domestic wastewater may be exempted from Title 27, under certain circumstances, sludge is not exempt. CCR Title 27, Table 2.1, requires undewatered sewage sludge to be disposed at a Class II surface impoundment and dewatered sludge to be disposed at a Class III landfill. Obviously, unlined storage beds and direct disposal areas, where groundwater has already been degraded by these practices, do not meet the requirements of Title 27.

The Board's Antidegradation Policy, Resolution 68-16, requires the application of best practicable treatment and control (BPTC) of the discharge. The disposal and storage of sludge to unlined drying beds has degraded groundwater. The wastewater industry standard is to mechanically dewater sludge with immediate removal to a proper disposal area, typically a landfill. Dewatering sludge with removal to a landfill is BPTC.

The Permit does not comply with CCR Title 27 and the Antidegradation Policy for the disposal of sludge and must be amended accordingly.

The Regional Board's citation of Title 27 Section 20090(h) for exempting wastewater disposal is also incorrect: as detailed by the State Water Resources Control Board in their Lodi WQ Order this section clearly does not address wastewater disposal.

Wastewater disposal may be exempted if groundwater quality has not been degraded. **Title 27 §20090. SWRCB - Exemptions.** (C15: §2511): The following activities shall be exempt from the SWRCB-promulgated provisions of this subdivision, so long as the activity meets, and continues to meet, all preconditions listed: (a) **Sewage**—Discharges of domestic sewage or treated effluent which are regulated by WDRs issued pursuant to Chapter 9, Division 3, Title 23 of this code, or for which WDRs have been waived, and which are consistent with applicable water quality objectives, and treatment or storage facilities associated with municipal wastewater treatment plants, provided that residual sludges or solid waste from wastewater treatment

facilities shall be discharged only in accordance with the applicable SWRCB-promulgated provisions of this division. (b) **Wastewater**—Discharges of wastewater to land, including but not limited to evaporation ponds, percolation ponds, or subsurface leachfields if the following conditions are met: (1) the applicable RWQCB has issued WDRs, reclamation requirements, or waived such issuance; (2) the discharge is in compliance with the applicable water quality control plan; and (3) the wastewater does not need to be managed according to Chapter 11, Division 4.5, Title 22 of this code as a hazardous waste.

### **Region 5's Basin Plan**

#### **WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR GROUND WATERS**

The following objectives apply to all ground waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, as the objectives are relevant to the protection of designated beneficial uses. These objectives do not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. The ground water objectives contained in this plan are not required by the federal Clean Water Act.

#### **Bacteria**

In ground waters used for domestic or municipal supply (MUN) the most probable number of coliform organisms over any seven-day period shall be less than 2.2/100 ml.

#### **Chemical Constituents**

Ground waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, ground waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B (Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels- Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels- Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain lead in excess of 0.015 mg/l. To protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

*Groundwater concentrations for TDS, nitrate, and arsenic near the wastewater treatment facility exceed water quality objectives.*

#### **Tastes and Odors**

Ground waters shall not contain taste- or odor producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

## **Toxicity**

Ground waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life associated with designated beneficial use(s). This objective applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the interactive effect of multiple substances.

### **G. The Permit fails to contain an Effluent Limitation for aluminum in accordance with Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44, US EPA's interpretation of the regulation, and 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 Basin Plan contains a narrative water quality objective for toxicity that states in part that "[a]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life" (narrative toxicity objective). 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. U.S. EPA developed National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum to prevent toxicity to freshwater aquatic life. The recommended ambient criteria four-day average (chronic) and one-hour average (acute) criteria for aluminum are 87 µg/l and 750 µg/l, respectively.

Aluminum in the effluent has been measured as high as 318 µg/l. Freshwater Aquatic habitat is a beneficial use of the receiving stream.

US EPA's 87 ug/l chronic criterion was developed using low pH and hardness testing. California Central Valley waters, the Sacramento River, at the Valley floor, have been sampled to have hardnesses as low as 39 mg/l CaCO<sub>3</sub> by the USGS in February 1996 for the *National Water Quality Assessment Program*. Contributory streams, especially foothill streams, have also been sampled and shown to contain even lower hardness levels. US EPA recognized in their ambient criteria development document, (Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum, EPA 440/5-86-008) that the pH was in the range 6.5 to 6.6 and that the hardness was below 20 mg/l. Typical values for pH and hardness in the Central Valley alone warrant use of the chronic ambient criteria for aluminum. Despite the hardness and pH values used in the development of the criteria; U.S. EPA's conclusions in their *Ambient Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater*

*Aquatic Life* recommends that application of the ambient criteria as necessary to be protective of the aquatic beneficial uses of receiving waters in lieu of site-specific criteria.

The Regional Board and their Permit cites US EPA's *Ambient Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life for Aluminum* (criteria) as not being representative or necessary because the chronic criteria were based on a low hardness and low pH. The Regional Board cites one section of the criteria development document but ignores the final recommendation to use the recommended criteria absent a site-specific objective for aluminum. The Regional Board then defaults to the US EPA recommended acute criteria of 750 ug/l. The Regional Board's citation of the criteria development document is incomplete its review, for example the *criteria* development document (EPA 440/5-86-008) also cites that:

169 ug/l of aluminum caused a 24% reduction in the growth of young brook trout.

174 ug/l of aluminum killed 58% of the exposed striped bass.

Bioaccumulation factors ranged from 50 to 231 for young brook trout exposed to aluminum for 15 days.

Aluminum at 169 ug/l caused a 24% reduction in the weight of young brook trout.

US EPA recommends that understanding the *Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses* is necessary in order to understand the text, tables and calculations of a criteria document. The Regional Board's assessment of the use of low hardness and low pH clearly shows they did not heed EPA's advice in reviewing the criteria development procedures for water quality criteria or the final recommendations. The Regional Board occasionally cites individual aluminum toxicity testing at Yuba City; again individual testing is not a valid replacement for developing fully protective criteria. A prime example of a state utilizing good water quality standards development techniques for developing a site specific standard for aluminum is the state of Indiana where a final chronic criterion of 174 ug/l was established in 1997. In 2003, Canada adopted pH dependant freshwater aquatic life criteria for aluminum that ranges from 84 ug/l to 252 ug/l. Ignoring the final recommendation of the criteria misses the protective intermediate measures to protect against mortality and reductions to growth and reproduction. The Regional Board's single use of the acute criteria for aluminum is not protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream.

The drinking water maximum contaminant level (MCL), which is included as a Basin Plan Water Quality Chemical Constituents Objective, for aluminum is 1,000 as a primary MCL and 200 µg/l as a secondary MCL.

The effluent data has exceeded EPA's chronic ambient criteria and the drinking water MCL.

Based on information included in analytical laboratory reports submitted by the Discharger, aluminum in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a level necessary to protect aquatic life, and, therefore to violate the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective and the drinking water MCL.

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." 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 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. A water quality standard for Failure to include an effluent limitation for aluminum in the Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**REGION IX**  
**75 Hawthorne Street**  
**San Francisco, CA 94105-3901**

Certified Mail No. 7008 3230 0000 3862 9328  
Return Receipt Requested

**JUN 24 2010**

Pamela Creedon  
Executive Officer  
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Re: Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum and the Placer County Sewer Maintenance  
District 1 WWTP (NPDES Permit No. CA0079316)

Dear Ms. Creedon:

We have reviewed Placer County Department of Facility Services' request, dated June 14, 2010, to relax the aluminum effluent limitations in the proposed NPDES permit. Relaxing the effluent limitations may degrade water quality, adversely affect beneficial uses, and conflict with federal anti-backsliding and/or anti-degradation requirements. These concerns need to be addressed to ensure the permit effectively protects water quality and complies with NPDES permitting requirements.

At its May 27, 2010 meeting, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board considered a proposed renewal of the NPDES permit for the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 1 wastewater treatment plant. During the meeting, the discharger contested the applicability of EPA's National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for aluminum in determining reasonable potential for the discharge to exceed water quality standards and establishing effluent limitations. The discharger contested the use of the chronic aluminum criterion for protection of aquatic life since the criterion is based on a lower hardness than observed in the receiving waters. The 87  $\mu\text{g/l}$  chronic aluminum criterion is based on a toxicity test with striped bass in water at pH between 6.5 and 6.6 standard units and hardness less than 10 mg/l.

The aluminum effluent limitations in the proposed permit were calculated by applying EPA-recommended aluminum criteria as an interpretation of the narrative toxicity standard in the Basin Plan. The effluent limitations were calculated in accordance with procedures described in the State Implementation Policy. The EPA criteria for aluminum were also applied to the existing permit for this facility to establish the average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations.

We understand that the existing maximum daily effluent limitation has been met (with one exception) and the 30-day average effluent limitation has been met approximately 16 months out of 25 from 2006 to 2009. The discharger currently manipulates hardness in the effluent by adding magnesium hydroxide to provide

- 2 -

alkalinity for the nitrification process. Based on data the discharger provided, the upstream receiving water hardness in Rock Creek ranges from 20 to 98 mg/l, but the lowest observed effluent hardness is 141 mg/l. We understand that the reported lowest ambient hardness values (20 mg/l) may actually be a detection limit as that specific value was reported in six consecutive samples taken in 2007. If future modification to the treatment process discontinues or reduces the use of magnesium hydroxide, the effluent hardness may be significantly reduced.

EPA has not formally changed its recommended aluminum criteria; the appropriate aluminum criteria values for higher hardness situations remain uncertain. The existing EPA-recommended chronic aluminum criterion of 87  $\mu\text{g/l}$  is clearly protective of aquatic life and is appropriate for use in evaluating reasonable potential and establishing effluent limitations. As EPA's Charles Delos notes in his 2002 and 2010 letters, it may be reasonable to apply a higher criterion value if the ambient hardness levels are substantially and consistently higher than the values used in deriving the existing chronic criterion value. When considering whether to apply a higher criterion value, the Regional Board should carefully consider whether the high ambient and effluent hardness values asserted by the discharger are accurate and likely to continue in the future.

The Regional Board has discretion in interpreting the Basin Plan narrative toxicity standard and it may be possible to make a different reasonable potential conclusion or derive less stringent effluent limitations than provided in the existing permit. However, a decision to apply a higher criterion and relax or eliminate the effluent limitations imposed by the previous permit would have to be supported by thorough anti-degradation and anti-backsliding analyses. Recent data show that effluent concentrations of aluminum ranged between 12 and 162  $\mu\text{g/l}$ . A decision to eliminate or raise the aluminum effluent limitations above current performance levels would trigger serious anti-degradation and anti-backsliding concerns as that action would, in effect, authorize aluminum discharges above current discharge and ambient levels. The information from Mr. Delos provided by the discharger does not constitute "new information" that provides a basis for backsliding from existing permit limitations as we understand that information was initially provided to Regional Board staff in 2002, prior to issuance of the existing permit.

Given the uncertainty about appropriate aluminum criteria levels for this situation and the need to carefully evaluate anti-degradation and anti-backsliding implications of removing or relaxing the aluminum limitations, EPA Region IX recommends the conservative approach of retaining the existing effluent limitations in the new permit.

If you wish to discuss our recommendations, please contact Elizabeth Sablad of my staff at (415) 972-3044.

Sincerely,

  
Alexis Strauss, Director  
Water Division  
24 June 2010

**G. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for Antimony 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 Water Quality Standard for antimony is 6.0 µg/l. The wastewater discharge maximum observed effluent concentration was 6.7 ug/l. Clearly the discharge exceeds the water quality objective. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for antimony.

The Regional Board in the Permit discards the high data point for antimony as an outlier without any justification. The term outlier has no regulatory meaning.

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.” The Regional Board does not submit any laboratory QA/QC results in support of their action to discard valid data points.

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. 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.

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. In accordance with 40 CFR 122.4 (a), (d) and (g) the Permit may not be adopted for failing to include protective limitations based on valid, reliable and representative data.

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.”

**H. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for Chromium VI 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 Water Quality Standard for chromium VI is 16.0 µg/l. The wastewater discharge maximum observed effluent concentration was 27 ug/l. Clearly the discharge exceeds the water quality objective. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for chromium VI.

The Regional Board in the Permit discards the high data point for chromium VI as an outlier without any justification. The term outlier has no regulatory meaning.

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." The Regional Board does not submit any laboratory QA/QC results in support of their action to discard valid data points.

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. 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.

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. In accordance with 40 CFR 122.4 (a), (d) and (g) the Permit may not be adopted for failing to include protective limitations based on valid, reliable and representative data.

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.”

**I. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for Fluoride 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 Water Quality Standard for fluoride is 2,000 µg/l. The wastewater discharge maximum observed effluent concentration for fluoride was 4,520 ug/l. Clearly the discharge exceeds the water quality objective. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for fluoride.

The Regional Board in the Permit discards the high data point for fluoride as an outlier without any justification. The term outlier has no regulatory meaning.

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.” The Regional Board does not submit any laboratory QA/QC results in support of their action to discard valid data points.

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. 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.

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. In accordance with 40 CFR 122.4 (a), (d) and (g) the Permit may not be adopted for failing to include protective limitations based on valid, reliable and representative data.

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.”

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

There is no Antidegradation Policy discussion with regard to the removal of suspended solids limitations or discussion of the instream levels of suspended solids.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)
- (2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original

issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

- (i) Exceptions--A permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:
  - (A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;
  - (B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);
  - (C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;
  - (D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or
  - (E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).
- (ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain an effluent limitation which is less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time the permit is renewed, reissued, or modified. In no event may such a permit to discharge into waters be renewed, issued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation if the implementation of such limitation would result in a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 applicable to such waters.

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

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

**K. 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.**

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 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).

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.

Any antidegradation analysis must comport with implementation requirements in State Board Water Quality Order 86-17, State Antidegradation Guidance, APU 90-004 and Region IX Guidance. The conclusory, unsupported, undocumented statements in the Permit are no substitute for a defensible antidegradation analysis.

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.

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 discharging to surface waters. Other communities have successfully disposed of wastes without discharging additional pollutants to surface waters. A proper alternatives analysis would cost out various alternatives and compare each of the alternatives' impacts on beneficial uses.

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.

Alternatively, Tier 1 requires that existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected. By definition, any increase in the discharge of impairing pollutants to impaired waterways unreasonably degrades

beneficial uses and exceeds applicable water quality standards. Prohibition of additional mass loading of impairing pollutants is a necessary stabilization precursor to any successful effort in bringing an impaired waterbody into compliance.

The State Board has clearly articulated its position on increased mass loading of impairing pollutants. In Order WQ 90-05, the Board directed the San Francisco Regional Board on the appropriate method for establishing mass-based limits that comply with state and federal antidegradation policies. That 1990 order stated “[I]n order to comply with the federal antidegradation policy, the mass loading limits should also be revised, based on mean loading, concurrently with the adoption of revised effluent limits. The [mass] limits should be calculated by multiplying the [previous year’s] annual mean effluent concentration by the [four previous year’s] annual average flow (Order WQ 90-05, p. 78). USEPA points out, in its 12 November 1999 objection letter to the San Francisco Regional Board concerning Tosco’s Avon refinery, that ‘[a]ny increase in loading of a pollutant to a water body that is impaired because of that pollutant would presumably degrade water quality in violation of the applicable antidegradation policy.’”

The Tentative Permit fails to properly implement the Basin Plan’s Antidegradation Policy. The Permit, page F-53 states that: “In performing the assessments, the analysis focused on a steady state modeling (mass balance) at the appropriate low flow conditions (1Q10 for acute criteria, 7Q10 for chronic criteria, and the harmonic mean for human health criteria). The Permit fails to discuss that the receiving stream is ephemeral and the 7Q10 and 1Q10 values would therefore be zero and the harmonic mean flow rate in an ephemeral stream cannot be defined.

Nitrate and nitrite levels are discussed with regard to drinking water standards but are not discussed with regard to biostimulation. Biostimulatory substances are limited in the Basin Plan.

Salinity is discussed with regard to numeric limitation but not in terms of mass. Salts are conservative and the total mass will contribute to downstream waters.

The discharge contains numerous metals, which are limited in the Permit. Additive toxicity, an analysis is required by the Basin Plan, is not discussed.

Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlorodibromomethane, Copper, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane, Lead, Nitrate plus Nitrite, and the failure of the Permit to limit these constituents for mass is not discussed. Bioaccumulative pollutants are not assessed. Compliance and treatability with the priority pollutants, and the ongoing failure of common tertiary systems to achieve compliance with such constituents, is not addressed.

The Permit, page F-58 states that an increased flow rate is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area. Other than commercial facilities, schools and local government, the City of Galt's web site identifies local employers as:

Cardinal Glass	151	Manufacturing / Flat Glass
Carson's Coatings	71	Manufacturing / Concrete Products
Consolidated Fabricators	46	Manufacturing / Metal Stamping
Calstone Company	32	Manufacturing / Concrete Products
Spaan's Cookie Company	21	Manufacturing / Food Products

It can be assumed, based on the demographics, that Galt is generally a commuter community. Good community planning would eliminate "sprawl" -- a short word for a long list of afflictions, including rapid consumption of open space, prime farmland, forests, historic sites, and scenic landscapes; traffic-clogged highways; urban divestment; and loss of community and quality of life. While the Permit talks about "important economic growth and social development" there is no discussion of "good planning" methodologies to verify that growth in this area and the resulting degradation of water quality is an actual benefit to the people of California.

The Permit, page F-56, states that: "The Facility will discharge Title 22 tertiary treated effluent that will result in minimal water quality degradation, and meet or exceed the highest statutory and regulatory requirements which meets or exceeds best practical treatment or control (BPTC)." However there is no BPTC analysis just this conclusory statement. The discussion does not state how a common tertiary WWTP will comply with limitations for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlorodibromomethane, Copper, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane and Lead. There is also no mention of treatability of antimony, fluoride and chromium VI.

The Permit's Antidegradation Policy discussion does not contain any discussion of the individual beneficial uses of the receiving stream, other than an unsupported conclusory statement that they are protected.

The Permit's Antidegradation Policy discussion does not contain any discussion of the fact that groundwater underlying the site exceeds water quality standards for TDS, nitrate and arsenic and the permit allows for the continued disposal of sludge to land. What are the concentrations of TDS, nitrogen and arsenic in sludge? How will continued migration of pollutants be prevented? Why, if dewatering and hauling to a landfill, is considered BPTC for sludge, is such not being required?

**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. R5-2010-0099 (NPDES No. CA0081434) 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 8 August 2010 comment letter. 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. Gregg Halladay, Public Works Director, City of Galt, 495 Industrial Drive, Galt, CA 95632.

**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 an 8 August 2010 comment letter that was 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: 20 October 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Bill Jennings, Executive Director  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2010-0099