In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements
For El Dorado Irrigation District Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant; California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region Order No. R5-2008-0173; NPDES No. CA0078662

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 13320 of California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (“CSPA” or “petitioner”) petitions the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review and vacate the final decision of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region (“Regional Board”) in adopting Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078662) for El Dorado Irrigation District Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, on 4 December 2008. See Order No. R5-2008-0173. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments.

1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
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. R5-2008-0173 Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0078662) for the El Dorado Irrigation District Deer Creek 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:

4 December 2008

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 23 October 2008. The 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 Order is improper are:

A. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 124.6 (e), requires that all draft permits shall be accompanied by a statement of basis, shall be based on the administrative record, shall be publicly noticed and made available for public comment. Federal Regulations 40 CFR 124.10 requires notification that a draft permit has been prepared and that at least 30 days are allowed for public comment. Federal Regulations 40 CFR 124.14 contains requirements for reopening the public comment period including reissuance of a draft permit. Significant changes have were made to the proposed Permit for Deer Creek after closure of the public comment period. These changes were not made available for public comment and a new draft permit was not reissued. Specifically:

1.) The Effluent Limitation for electrical conductivity (EC) was relaxed.

2.) The Effluent Limitation for chronic toxicity was modified. We do not object to the actual modification to the Effluent Limitation; however Compliance Determination No. G has been added to page 28 which we believe unreasonably limits any finding of violation against the discharge of chronically toxic substances.
3.) The requirement that monitoring for pH and temperature be conducted by a certified laboratory has been removed from the General Monitoring provisions on page E-1.

4.) Identification of the turbidity monitoring location was altered.

5.) The statement of basis for the ammonia effluent Limitation was modified in the Fact Sheet on page F-21.

6.) A major policy discussion; stating that the Regional Board considers an incremental increase of 500 umhos/cm over the public water supply to be best practicable treatment and control of the discharge for electrical conductivity (EC) was added to the Fact Sheet on page f-29: and

7.) The statement of basis in the Fact Sheet on page f-30 for removal of the Effluent Limitation for settleable solids has been significantly altered containing information which was not previously a part of the record.

Failure to renotice the Permit for public comment denies CSPA the opportunity to submit written and corresponding verbal comments regarding the issues which were modified for consideration by the Regional Board.

**B. The Permit Fails to Include Limitations that are Protective of the Municipal and Domestic Beneficial Uses of the Ephemeral Receiving Stream Contrary to Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.4, 122.44(d), the California Water Code, Section 13377 and the Basin Plan**

The Permit contains Findings that municipal and domestic supply (MUN) are beneficial uses of the receiving stream as designated in the Sacramento San Joaquin River Basins Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). The Permit does not discuss protection of the MUN beneficial use of the receiving stream; specifically for pathogens. The Permit Fact Sheet, page F-7, confirms that the State Water Board has issued water rights to existing water users along Deer Creek and the Cosumnes River downstream of the discharge for domestic and irrigation uses. 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. 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. 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.”

In requiring tertiary treatment the Permit states that: “Title 22 and other recommendations of the California Department of Public Health (PDH; formerly the Department of Health Services) generally recommend that it is necessary to treat wastewater to a tertiary level or provide 20:1 dilution for secondary treated wastewater in order to protect the public health for contact recreational activities or the irrigation of food crops.” The Permit’s Fact Sheet, Pathogens, goes into greater detail in citing the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR), Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22) to protect the public health for the domestic wastewater discharge to surface waters. The Permit does not discuss protection of the MUN beneficial use of the surface water with respect to pathogens.

Direct ingestion is a more sensitive use of water than contact recreation uses or eating food crops irrigated with treated sewage. In 1987 DPH issued the Uniform Guidelines for the Disinfection of Wastewater (Uniform Guidelines) as recommendations to the Regional Water Quality Control Boards regarding disinfection requirements for wastewater discharges to surface waters. The Uniform Guidelines recommend a “no discharge” of treated domestic wastewater to freshwater streams used for domestic water supply. Where is not possible to prevent a wastewater discharge: the Uniform Guidelines recommend that no discharge be allowed unless a minimum of a twenty-to-one in stream dilution is available. The DPH has reiterated the recommendations of the Uniform Guidelines to the Central Valley Regional Board on numerous occasions: specifically a 1 July 2003 letter to the Executive Officer (Thomas Pinkos); a 28 September 2000 Memorandum to regional and district engineers from Jeff Stone; and cite specific recommendations for the City of Jackson’s wastewater discharge. A discharge of tertiary treated domestic wastewater to an ephemeral stream is not protective of the domestic and municipal beneficial uses of the receiving stream.

Instead of protecting the beneficial use by requiring that the facility may only discharge tertiary treated wastes when sufficient dilution is available, the Permit steps further backward by relaxing discharge limitations to secondary treatment standards when a 20-to-1 dilution is available in the receiving stream.

CCR Title 22 is cited in the Permit as the source of information for requiring tertiary treatment to protect the contact recreation and food crop irrigation beneficial uses of the receiving stream. CCR Title 22 does not discuss or provide a level of treatment adequate to protect drinking water. To the contrary, Title 22 contains numerous requirements (60310) to prevent cross connections with potable water supplies, setback requirements from domestic supplies and wells, and warning signs not to drink the water: “RECLAIMED WATER DO NOT DRINK” verifying that tertiary treated domestic wastewater in not fit for human consumption. Tertiary treated wastewater discharged to ephemeral streams is not of adequate quality for municipal use and is therefore not protective of the DOM beneficial use.
The Basin Plan, Implementation, Page IV-24-00, prohibits the discharge of wastewater to low flow streams as a permanent means of disposal and requires the evaluation of land disposal alternatives, Implementation, Page IV-15.00, Policies and Plans (2) Wastewater Reuse Policy. The Basin Plan, Implementation, Page IV-24-00, Regional Water Board prohibitions, states that: “Water bodies for which the Regional Water Board has held that the direct discharge of waste is inappropriate as a permanent disposal method include sloughs and streams with intermittent flow or limited dilution capacity.” The Permit characterizes the receiving stream as low flow, or ephemeral, with no available dilution. The Permit does not discuss any efforts to eliminate the discharge to surface water and compliance with the Basin Plan Prohibition. Federal Regulation 40 CFR 122.4 states that no permit shall be issued for any discharge when the conditions of the permit do not provide for compliance with the applicable requirements of the CWA and are inconsistent with a plan or plan amendment.

The Permit does not protect the drinking water beneficial use of the receiving stream as is required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.4, 122.44(d) and the California Water Code, Section 13377 and in accordance with these requirements cannot be issued. At a minimum, the permit must be amended to require that the Discharger develop a workplan to eliminate the wastewater discharge to surface water in accordance with the Basin Plan.

C. **The Permit fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for zinc 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.

Section 5.7.1 of U.S. EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control* (TSD, EPA/505/2-90-001) states with regard to mass-based Effluent Limits:

“Mass-based effluent limits are required by NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 122.45(f). The regulation requires that all pollutants limited in NPDES permits have limits, standards, or prohibitions expressed in terms of mass with three exceptions, including one for pollutants that cannot be expressed appropriately by mass. Examples of such pollutants are pH, temperature, radiation, and whole effluent toxicity. Mass limitations in terms of pounds per day or kilograms per day can be calculated for all chemical-specific toxics such as chlorine or chromium. Mass-based limits should be calculated using concentration limits at critical flows. For example, a permit limit of 10 mg/l of cadmium discharged at an average rate of 1 million gallons per day also would contain a limit of 38 kilograms/day of cadmium.

Mass based limits are particularly important for control of bioconcentratable pollutants. Concentration based limits will not adequately control discharges of these pollutants if the effluent concentrations are below detection levels. For
these pollutants, controlling mass loadings to the receiving water is critical for preventing adverse environmental impacts.

However, mass-based effluent limits alone may not assure attainment of water quality standards in waters with low dilution. In these waters, the quantity of effluent discharged has a strong effect on the instream dilution and therefore upon the RWC. At the extreme case of a stream that is 100 percent effluent, it is the effluent concentration rather than the mass discharge that dictates the instream concentration. Therefore, EPA recommends that permit limits on both mass and concentration be specified for effluents discharging into waters with less than 100 fold dilution to ensure attainment of water quality standards.”

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.45 (f), states the following with regard to mass limitations:

“(1) all pollutants limited in permits shall have limitations, standards, or prohibitions expressed in terms of mass except:
   (i) For pH, temperature, radiation or other pollutants which cannot be expressed by mass;
   (ii) When applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement; or
   (iii) If in establishing permit limitations on a case-by-case basis under 125.3, limitations expressed in terms of mass are infeasible because the mass of the pollutant discharged cannot be related to a measure of operation (for example, discharges of TSS from certain mining operations), and permit conditions ensure that dilution will not be used as a substitute for treatment.

(2) Pollutants limited in terms of mass additionally may be limited in terms of other units of measurement, and the permit shall require the permittee to comply with both limitations.”

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.45 (B)(1), states the following: “In the case of POTWs, permit effluent limitations, standards, or prohibitions shall be calculated based on design flow.” Traditional wastewater treatment plant design utilizes average dry weather flow rates for organic, individual constituent, loading rates and peak wet weather flow rates for hydraulic design of pipes, weir overflow rates, and pumps. For POTWs priority pollutants, such as metals, have traditionally been reduced by the reduction of solids from the wastestream, incidental to treatment for organic material. Following adoption of the CTR, compliance with priority pollutants is of critical importance and systems need to utilize loading rates of individual constituents in the WWTP design process. It is highly likely that the principal design parameters for individual priority pollutant removal will be based on mass, making mass based Effluent Limitations critically important to compliance.

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

D. The Permit contains an Effluent Limitation for acute toxicity that allows mortality to aquatic life that exceeds the Basin Plan water quality objective and does not comply with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) or the Clean Water Act

Under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), states are required to classify surface waters by *uses* – the beneficial purposes provided by the waterbody. For example, a waterbody may be designated as a drinking water source, or for supporting the growth and propagation of aquatic life, or for allowing contact recreation, or as a water source for industrial activities, or all of the above. States must then adopt *criteria* – numeric and narrative limits on pollution, sufficient to protect the uses assigned to the waterbody. Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), adopted to require implementation of the CWA, require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00), for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. This section of the Basin Plan further states, in part that, compliance with this objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms (toxicity tests).

The Permit requires that the Discharger conduct acute toxicity tests and states that compliance with the toxicity objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms. However, the Tentative Permit contains a discharge limitation that allows 30% mortality (70% survival) of fish species in any given toxicity test. Surely, mortality is a detrimental physiological response to aquatic life.

For an ephemeral or low flow stream, allowing 30% mortality in acute toxicity tests allows that same level of mortality in the receiving stream, in violation of federal regulations and contributes to exceedance of the Basin Plan’s narrative water quality objective for toxicity. In receiving streams where dilution may be available the primary mixing area is commonly referred to as the zone of initial dilution, or ZID. Within the ZID acute aquatic life criteria are exceeded. To satisfy the CWA prohibition against the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts, regulators assume that if the ZID is small, significant numbers of aquatic organisms will not be present in the ZID long enough to encounter acutely toxic conditions. The allowance of 30% mortality will result in acute toxicity within the ZID. Before the discharge can be allowed a complete mixing zone analysis is required in accordance with the Basin Plan and the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (SIP) to show that discharge limitations prevent toxicity; such an analysis has not been completed. 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 SIP and the Regional Board is required to the Policy.

US EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 104, that:

“When setting a whole effluent toxicity limit to protect against acute effects, some permitting authorities use an end-of-pipe approach. Typically these limits are established as an LC50>100% effluent at the end of the pipe. These limits are routinely set without any consideration as to the fate of the effluent and the concentrations of toxicant(s) after the discharge enters the receiving water. Limits derived in this way are not water quality based limits and suffer from significant deficiencies since the toxicity of a pollutant depends mostly upon concentration, duration of exposure, and repetitiveness of the exposure. This is especially true in effluent dominated waters. For example, an effluent that has an LC50=100% contains enough toxicity to be lethal up to 50% of the test organisms. If the effluent is discharged to a low flow receiving waterbody that provides no more than a three fold dilution at the critical flow, significant mortality can occur in the receiving water. Furthermore, such a limit could not assure protection against chronic effects in the receiving waterbody. Chronic effects could occur if the dilution in the receiving water multiplied by the acute to chronic ratio is greater than 100 percent. Therefore, in effluent dominated situations, limits set using this approach may be severely underprotective. In contrast, whole effluent toxicity limits set using this approach in very high receiving water flow conditions may be overly restrictive.”

Following US EPA’s rationale the limitations of allowing 70% survival (30% mortality) in acute toxicity tests, as is the case in the cited LC50, will result in the allowance of toxic discharges to ephemeral streams, which is representative of the receiving waters at Davis. While the State and Regional Board’s method of prescribing an effluent limitation of 70% percent survival may be protective in waterbodies with significant dilution; such a limitation should be subject to a complete mixing zone analysis. For an ephemeral receiving stream a mixing zone analysis would not be applicable under worst case dry stream conditions. The Order should be revised to require the Regional Board to prohibit acute toxicity (100% survival as compared to the laboratory control) in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i).

With regard to WET testing variability; US EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 11, that:

“In summary, whole effluent toxicity testing can represent practical tests that estimate potential receiving water impacts. Permit limits that are developed correctly from whole effluent toxicity tests should protect biota if the discharged effluent meets the limits. *It is important not confuse permit limit variability with toxicity test variability*” (emphasis added)
The Permit must be revised to prohibit acute toxicity, require 100% survival in toxicity tests, in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), the CWA, the SIP, the CWC and the Basin Plan.

E. **The Permit replaces Effluent Limitations for turbidity which were present in the existing permit; contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1)**

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 (l)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

(A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;

(B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical
mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);

(C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;

(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or

(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (l)(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 Permit Fact Sheet discusses Pathogens and states that the previous Order established Effluent Limitations for turbidity. Turbidity limitations are maintained in the Permit but have been moved; they are no longer Effluent Limitations. The Fact Sheet Pathogen discussion states that infectious agents in sewage are bacteria, parasites and viruses and that tertiary treatment is necessary to effectively remove these agents. This discussion also states that turbidity limitations were originally established: “…to ensure that the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for total coliform organisms. This discussion is incorrect. First; coliform organism limitations are also an indicator parameter of the effectiveness of tertiary treatment. The coliform limitations in the proposed and past Permit are significantly lower than the Basin Plan Water Quality Objective and are based on the level of treatment recommended by the California Department of Public Health (DPH). Second; both the coliform limitations and turbidity are recommended by DPH as necessary to protect recreational and irrigated agricultural beneficial uses of the receiving water. Turbidity has no lesser standing than coliform organisms in the DPH recommendation. 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. There are no limitations for viruses and parasites in the Permit which the Regional Board has indicated are necessary to protect the contact recreation and irrigated agricultural uses of the receiving water. Both coliform and turbidity limitations are treatment effectiveness indicators that the levels of bacteria viruses and parasites are adequately removed to protect the beneficial uses.
The Permit also contains complex receiving water limitations for turbidity based on the turbidity performance of the wastewater treatment plant. Effluent Limitations are necessary to assure compliance with the water quality objective for turbidity. Provisions are not Effluent Limitations as required by the Federal Regulations. The turbidity Effluent Limitations must be restored in accordance with the Clean Water Act and Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1).

F. The Permit contains no Effluent Limitations for settleable solids and is less stringent than the existing permit contrary to the Antidegradation requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1)

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 (l)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

(A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;
(B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);
(C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;
(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or
(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).
(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (l)(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 (R5-2002-0212) for this facility contained 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. 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.

G. The Permit establishes Effluent Limitations for metals based on the hardness of the effluent as opposed to the ambient upstream receiving water hardness as required by Federal Regulations, the California Toxics Rule (CTR, 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4))
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Federal Regulation 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4) states that: “For purposes of calculating freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals from the equations in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/l or less as calcium carbonate, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water shall be used in those equations.” (Emphasis added). The Permit, however states that the effluent downstream hardness was used to calculate Effluent Limitations for metals. Ambient is defined as “surrounding” not “in the middle of” as interpreted by Regional Board staff. The Regional Board staff has chosen to deliberately ignore Federal Regulations placing themselves above the law. There are procedures for changing regulations if peer reviewed science indicates the need to do so, none of which have been followed. The Permit failure to include Effluent Limitations for metals based on the actual ambient hardness of the surface water is contrary to the cited Federal Regulation and must be amended to comply with the cited regulatory requirement.

H. 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

Aluminum in the effluent has been measured as high as 150 µg/l. Aluminum has been shown to be toxic to freshwater aquatic life. Freshwater Aquatic habitat is a beneficial use of the receiving stream. 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). U.S. EPA developed National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum. The recommended four-day average (chronic) and one-hour average (acute) criteria for aluminum are 87 µg/l and 750 µg/l, respectively.

The argument has been repeatedly made that US EPA’s 87 µg/l chronic criterion was developed using low pH and hardness testing and should not be used. As is stated in EPA’s development document, (Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum, EPA 440/5-86-008) the pH was in the range 6.5 to 6.6. The hardness was below 20 mg/l; however the Permit does not contain a discharge limitation for hardness and numerous effluents and receiving waters within the Central Valley experience hardnesses at or below this level. Despite the Regional Board’s contention that Valley waters have elevated hardness, the Sacramento River, at the Valley floor, has been sampled to have hardnesses as low as 39 mg/l CaCO₃ by the USGS in February 1996 for the National Water Quality Assessment Program. A hardness of 39 mg/l is “low” as is a pH of 6.5; both of which are allowable under the Permit. Simply based on these facts; the discharge presents a reasonable potential to exceed water quality criteria. Despite the hardness and pH values used in the development of the criteria; the simple fact is that U.S. EPA 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 effluent data has exceeded the chronic ambient water quality criteria of 87 µg/l. There is a reasonable potential for the discharge to exceed the criteria and cause toxicity
within the receiving stream. An Effluent Limitation based on the chronic criteria is mandated by the Federal Regulations.

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.

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.

I. The Permit fails to contain an Effluent Limitation for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate despite a clear reasonable potential to exceed waste quality standards in violation of Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44

Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate exceeds the CTR Water Quality Standard of 1.8 µg/l. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate has been detected in the wastewater effluent at 2.1 µg/l, also above the CTR Water Quality Standard. The Permit Fact Sheet states that the receiving water sampling data for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is subject to error and is being discarded without any supporting documentation from the laboratory quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) documents. To the contrary, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is used in the formation of plastics and has been documented in the available literature to be present in plastic pipes, bottles, bags and widely distributed throughout the environment. The Regional Board total disregards scientific methods, specifically sampling and laboratory QA/QC methodologies, in throwing out data points that would lead to a reasonable potential for a pollutant to exceed water quality standards when the burden should properly be placed on wastewater Dischargers to conduct proper sampling and analysis. The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: “…the state board or the regional boards shall…issue waste discharge requirements…which apply and ensure compliance with …water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses…” Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based
effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Failure to include an effluent limitation for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate in the Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

J. The Permit does not contain an enforceable Effluent Limitation for chronic toxicity and therefore does not comply with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) and the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP)

The Permit, Fact Sheet page F-33 Chronic Aquatic Toxicity Table F-8, shows that the discharge caused chronic toxicity by reduced survival, inhibited growth and reduced reproduction on 23 October 2007 and 20 November 2007; and reduced survival and inhibited growth on 15 January 2008. The discharge was toxic on these occasions. The Regional Board did not take any enforcement action since there are no Effluent Limitations preventing toxicity in the NPDES permit. The Permit fails to require a toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) despite the toxic discharges. The Permit was modified by late revision to include an Effluent Limitation for chronic toxicity. However, an additional late revision to the Permit, Compliance Determination No. G, page 28, was added to the Permit which in substance states that the Effluent Limitation cannot be modified so long as the Discharger conducts additional monitoring and complies with the TRE requirements of the Permit. The Compliance Determination in fact nullifies the Effluent Limitation.

The Permit, State Implementation Policy states that: “On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.”

The SIP, Section 4, Toxicity Control Provisions, Water Quality-Based Toxicity Control, states that: “A chronic toxicity effluent limitation is required in permits for all dischargers that will cause, have a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to chronic toxicity in receiving waters.” The SIP is a state Policy and CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy.

Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be
discharged at a level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality. There has been no argument that domestic sewage contains toxic substances and presents a reasonable potential to cause toxicity if not properly treated and discharged. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/ San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00) for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. The Permit states that: “…to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, the discharger is required to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing…” However, sampling does not equate with or ensure compliance. The Tentative Permit requires the Discharger to conduct an investigation of the possible sources of toxicity if a threshold is exceeded. This language is not a limitation and essentially eviscerates the Regional Board’s authority, and the authority granted to third parties under the Clean Water Act, to find the Discharger in violation for discharging chronically toxic constituents. An effluent limitation for chronic toxicity must be included in the Order. In addition, the Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series should bracket the actual dilution at the time of discharge, not use default values that are not relevant to the discharge.

The Permit is quite simply wrong; by including an unenforceable effluent limitations for chronic toxicity and the resulting Permit does not “…implement the SIP” or comply with the Federal regulatory mandate to include an effluent limitation. The Regional Board has commented time and again that no chronic toxicity effluent limitations are being included in NPDES permit until the State Board adopts a numeric limitation. The Regional Board explanation does not excuse the Permit’s failure to comply with Federal Regulations, the SIP, the Basin Plan and the CWC. The Regional Board’s Basin Plan, as cited above, already states that: “…waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses…” Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to prohibit chronic toxicity (mortality and adverse sublethal impacts to aquatic life, (sublethal toxic impacts are clearly defined in EPA’s toxicity guidance manuals)) by eliminating the corresponding Compliance Determination in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) and the Basin Plan and the SIP.

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

The antidegradation analysis in the Permit is not simply deficient, it is literally nonexistent. To the contrary, as is stated above: the Permit, Fact Sheet page F-33 Chronic Aquatic Toxicity Table F-8, shows that the discharge caused chronic toxicity by reduced survival, inhibited growth and reduced reproduction on 23 October 2007 and 20 November 2007; and reduced survival and inhibited growth on 15 January 2008. The discharge was toxic on these occasions. The brief discussion of antidegradation requirements, in the Findings and Fact Sheet, consist only of skeletal, unsupported,
undocumented conclusory statements totally lacking in factual analysis. The Tentative Permit fails to properly implement the Basin Plan’s Antidegradation Policy.

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).


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/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 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.

There is nothing in the Permit resembling an analysis that ensures that existing beneficial uses are protected. While the Permit identifies the constituents that are included on the 303(d) list for downstream waters as impairing receiving waters, it fails to discuss how and to what degree the identified beneficial uses will be additionally impacted by the discharge. Nor does the Permit analyze the incremental and cumulative impact of increased loading of non-impairing pollutants on beneficial uses. In fact, there is almost no information or discussion on the composition and health of the identified beneficial uses. Any reasonably adequate antidegradation analysis must discuss the affected
beneficial uses (i.e., numbers and health of the aquatic ecosystem; extent, composition and viability of agricultural production; people depending upon these waters for water supply; extent of recreational activity; etc.) and the probable effect the discharge will have on these uses.

L.  The Permit does not contain an Effluent Limitation for oil and grease in violation of Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 and California Water Code, Section 13377

The Permit is for a domestic wastewater treatment plant. Domestic wastewater treatment plants, by their nature, receive oil and grease in concentrations from home cooking and restaurants that present a reasonable potential to exceed the Basin Plan water quality objective for oil and grease (Basin Plan III-5.00). Confirmation sampling is not necessary to establish that domestic wastewater treatment systems contain oil and grease in concentrations that present a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objective. It is not unusual for sewerage systems to allow groundwater cleanup systems, such as from leaking underground tanks, to discharge into the sanitary sewer. Groundwater polluted with petroleum hydrocarbons can also infiltrate into the collection system as easily as sewage exfiltrates. The Central Valley Regional Board has a long established history of including oil and grease limitations in NPDES permits at 15 mg/l as a daily maximum and 10 mg/l as a monthly average, which has established BPTC for POTWs.

The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: “…the state board or the regional boards shall…issue waste discharge requirements…which apply and ensure compliance with …water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses…” Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established, 40 CFR §122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be established using USEPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), proposed State criteria or a State policy interpreting narrative criteria supplemented with other relevant information, or an indicator parameter. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (FactSheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that “where the preponderance of evidence clearly indicates the potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of State water quality standards (even though the data may be sparse or absent) a limit MUST be included in the permit.” Failure to include an effluent limitation for oil and grease in the Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

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. R5-2008-0173 (NPDES No. CA0078662) 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 23 October 2008 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: Ms. Vickie Caulfield, Division Manager, El Dorado Irrigation
District, 1565 Deer Creek Road, Cameron Park, CA 95682.

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 a 23 October 2008 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: 2 January 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Jennings, Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2008-0173