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For Petitioner California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

PETITION FOR REVIEW

In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements For  
Chevron Environmental Management Company,  
ChevronTexaco, Incorporated: And Secor  
International Incorporated, California Regional  
Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley  
Region Order No. R5-2006-0080

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. CA0083429) for Chevron Environmental Management Company, ChevronTexaco, Incorporated; and SECOR International
Incorporated on 3 August 2006. See Order No. R5-2006-0080. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments and direct testimony.

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. R5-2006-0080, Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0083429) for Chevron Environmental Management Company, ChevronTexaco, Incorporated; and SECOR International Incorporated. Copies of the orders adopted by the Regional Board at its 22 June 2006 Board meeting are attached hereto as Attachments A.

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

3 August 2006

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

A. The Order contains compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations for copper, lead and nickel that are contrary to the California Toxics Rule and the Clean Water Act. Each of these pollutants is designated as a “Priority Toxic Pollutant” by the California Toxic Rule, 40 C.F.R. 131.38(b). Interim Limitations must be placed in a separate Time Schedule Order.

The Clean Water Act mandates that: “there shall be achieved . . . not later than July 1, 1977, any more stringent limitations, including those necessary to meet water quality standards, treatment standards, or schedules of compliance, established pursuant to any State law or regulations . . . or any other Federal law or regulation, or required to implement any applicable water quality standard established pursuant to this chapter. CWA § 301(b)(1)(C), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C). Despite this unambiguous, 29-year-old statutory deadline for achieving Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits (WQBELs), the Permit imposes a compliance schedule and interim permit limits far more lenient than
WQBELs. In so doing, the permit provides an extension for meeting WQBELs that extends far beyond the statutory deadline in CWA section 301(b)(1)(C) for achieving WQBELs. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C). This approach is blatantly illegal and, if upheld, would directly undermine the water quality standards that are the heart of the Clean Water Act.

1. Regional Board Authority To Issue Compliance Schedules under the CTR Has Now Lapsed

40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(3) formerly authorized compliance schedules delaying the effective date of WQBELs being set based on the NTR and CTR. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8), however, this compliance schedule authorization expressly expired on May 18, 2005, depriving the State and Regional Boards with any authority to issue compliance schedules delaying the effective date of such WQBELs. Indeed, the EPA Federal Register Preamble accompanying the CTR stated as much, noting, “EPA has chosen to promulgate the rule with a sunset provision which states that the authorizing compliance schedule provision will cease or sunset on May 18, 2005.”

The Regional Board may contend that the EPA Federal Register Preamble has effectively extended this compliance schedule authority when the Preamble observed, “[I]f the State Board adopts, and EPA approves, a statewide authorizing compliance schedule provision significantly prior to May 18, 2005, EPA will act to stay the authorizing compliance schedule provision in today’s rule.” It is true that the State Board subsequently adopted its Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California, enacted by State Board Resolution No. 2000-015 (March 2, 2000) (“State Implementation Plan” or “SIP”) and that the SIP provides for compliance schedules without imposing a May 18, 2005 cutoff. EPA, however, has not acted to stay 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8) by the only means it can lawfully do so: notice and comment rulemaking that amends 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8). Without such a rulemaking, 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8) remains the law and it unequivocally ends authorization to issue compliance schedules after May 18, 2000. See Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Environmental Protection Agency, 446 F.3d 140 (D.C. Cir. 2006).

2. The Regional Boards’ Approach To Compliance Schedules Is Unlawful under the CWA.

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

a. CWA Section 301(b)(1)(C) establishes a firm deadline for complying with WQBELs

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

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

Congress provided no blanket authority in the Clean Water Act for extensions of the July 1, 1977, deadline, but it did provide authority for the States to foreshorten the deadline. CWA section 303(f) (33 U.S.C. § 1313(f)) provides that: “[n]othing in this section [1313] shall be construed to affect any effluent limitations or schedule of compliance required by any State to be implemented prior to the dates set forth in section 1311(b)(1) and 1311(b)(2) of this title nor to preclude any State from requiring compliance with any effluent limitation or schedule of compliance at dates earlier than such dates.”
Because the statute contains explicit authority to expedite the compliance deadline but not to extend it, the Regional Board may not authorize extensions beyond this deadline in discharge permits.

b. The July 1, 1977 deadline for WQBELs applies even where water quality standards are established after that date

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

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

c. Congress has authorized limited extensions of CWA deadlines for specific purposes, precluding exceptions for other purposes

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

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

d. Schedules of compliance may be issued only to facilitate, not to avoid, achievement of effluent limitations by the statutory deadline

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

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

In United States Steel Corp., the industry plaintiff argued that 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C) allows the July 1, 1977, deadline to be met simply by beginning action on a schedule of compliance that eventually would result in achieving the technology- and water quality-based limitations. 556 F.2d at 855. The Court of Appeals disagreed: “[w]e reject this contorted reading of the statute. We recognize that the definition of ‘effluent limitation’ includes ‘schedules of compliance,’ section [1362(11)], which are themselves defined as ‘schedules . . . of actions or operations leading to compliance’ with limitations imposed under the Act. Section [1362(17)]. It is clear to us, however, that section [1311(b)(1)] requires point sources to achieve the effluent limitations based on BPT or state law, not merely to be in the process of achieving them, by July 1, 1977.” Id. Thus, compliance schedule may not be used as a means of evading, rather than meeting, the deadline for achieving WQBELs.

e. States may not issue permits containing effluent limitations that are less stringent than those required by the Clean Water Act

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

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Section 101 (a)(3), states that; “it is the national policy that the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts be prohibited.” Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, non-conventional, 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 Control Plan (Basin Plan) contains a narrative water quality criteria for toxicity, which states, in part: “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.”

Final Effluent Limitation 1.b. states that survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste at Monitoring Location M-001 or M-002 shall be not less than: 70% for any one bioassay or 90% for the median for any three or more consecutive bioassays. Nowhere does the Basin Plan allow 30% or 10% mortality (corresponding to 70% to 90% survival) in a wastewater discharge. Since the discharge is to receiving streams there is no assimilative capacity for dilution, and mixing zones for toxicity are not discussed in the permit, it can therefore be concluded that 10% mortality in the discharge directly translates into 10% mortality in the receiving stream which is contrary to Federal regulations. The 10% and/or 30% toxicity in the discharge also directly violates the permit’s Receiving Water Limitation No. 11.

The Regional Board staff’s response to comments alleged that the 10% to 30% mortality allowable in the bioassays was established to account for chance. Nonsense, 10% and 30% allowable mortality limits were pulled out of a hat years ago and are not based on scientific analysis or any defensible BPJ rationale.

The fact that there is no scientific basis for the 10% and 30% allowable mortality was confirmed through discussion with Dr. Linda Deanovic and Dr. Inge Werner at the UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory, with USEPA Region 9 toxicity expert Dr. Debra Denton and with Dr. John Marshack and Karen Larsen of the Regional Board. The 10% and 30% allowable mortality limits clearly violate the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity provision.

C. The Reasonable Potential Analysis failed to account for variability of pollutants in the effluent in violation of 40 CFR § 131.38(e)(8).
Federal regulations, 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii), state “when determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the permitting authority shall use procedures which account for existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, the variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the effluent, the sensitivity of the species to toxicity testing (when evaluating whole effluent toxicity), and where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.” Emphasis added.

Fact Sheet, Table F-2 page F-21: The reasonable potential analyses for CTR constituents fail to consider the statistical variability of data and laboratory analyses as explicitly required by the federal regulations. For example, a multiplier of 1 was used for CTR constituents instead of a required multiplier of 7.4 to account for the small number of samples. The procedures for computing variability are detailed in Chapter 3, pages 52-55, of USEPA’s *Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control*. The reasonable potential analyses should be recalculated using appropriate methodology and limits for zinc and selenium should be included in the Permit. The fact that the State Implementation Plan ignores requirements to account for pollutant variability in the effluent does not excuse the failure to comply with federal regulations.

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 the compliance schedule in Order No. R5-2006-0080 and remand to the Regional Board with instructions to include appropriate Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations.

B. Vacate the acute toxicity limit in Order No. R5-2006-0080 and remand to the Regional Board to establish a protective and legally defensible acute toxicity limit that complies with the Basin Plan.

C. Vacate Order No. R5-2006-0080 and remand to the Regional Board to establish conduct reasonable potential analyses that account for variability of pollutants in the effluent.

CSPA, however, requests that the State Board hold in abeyance further action on this Petition for up to two years or further notice by CSPA, whichever comes first. CSPA, along with other environmental groups, anticipate filing one or more additional petitions for review challenging NPDES permit decisions by the Regional Boards concerning the issues raised in this Petition in the coming months. For economy of the State Board and all parties, CSPA will request the State Board to consolidate these petitions and/or resolve the common issues presented by these petitions by action on a subset of the petitions. Accordingly, CSPA urges that holding this Petition in abeyance for now is a sensible approach.

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 above and in its 6 June 2006, 22 July 2006 and 26 July 2006 letters that were accepted into the record and its oral testimony presented to the Regional Board on 3 August 2006. 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. Robert D. Mihalovich, Senior Superfund Specialist, Chevron Environmental Management Company, Superfund and Property Management Unit, 6001 Bollinger Canyon Road, K2072, San Ramon, CA 94583-2324 and Mr. Frank Gegunde, Associate Geologist, SECOR International Incorporated, 3475 W. Shaw Avenue, Suite 104, Fresno, CA 93711.

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 live oral testimony at the 3 August hearing on the Order or in letters submitted to the Regional Board on 6 June 2006, 22 July 2006 and 26 July 2006 that were accepted into the record.

If you have any questions regarding this petition, please contact Bill Jennings at (209) 464-5067 or Michael Lozeau at (510) 749-9102.

Dated: 4 September 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Jennings, Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachments:
A. Order No. R5-2006-0080