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For Petitioner California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements For City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant; California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region Order No. R5-2008-0177; NPDES No. CA0079901

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. CA0079901) for City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant, on 4 December 2008. See Order No. R5-2008-0177. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments.

1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:
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. R5-2008-0177, Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0079901) for the City of Nevada City 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. Those letters and the following comments set forth in detail the reasons and points and authorities why CSPA believes the Order fails to comport with statutory and regulatory requirements. Nevada City discharges into Deer Creek which flows into Lake Wildwood. Lake Wildwood is surrounded by residential development and the reservoir is heavily used for contact recreation. Water is also appropriated from Lake Wildwood by water purveyors. It is unusual for wastewater discharges into reservoirs since there is possibly little dispersion for pollutants including pathogens. The Permit fails to adequately discuss the downstream uses of the receiving stream. The specific reasons the adopted Orders are 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 publically 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 were made to the proposed Permit for Nevada City after closure of the public comment period. Since significant changes were made following the close of the public comment period a statement of basis for these specific items was not made available for 30-days and proper public comment was denied. The draft permit was not reissued for public comment. Specifically:
a. Effluent Limitations for cyanide were removed from the proposed Permit.
b. The Effluent Limitations for ammonia were relaxed.
c. The Effluent Limitation for pH was altered.
d. The Effluent Limitation for chronic toxicity has been modified. We did not object to the actual modification to the Effluent Limitation; however Compliance Determination No. E was added to page 28 which we believe unreasonably limits any finding of violation against the discharge of chronically toxic substances.
e. An averaging period for pH shift was added to the Receiving Water Limitation relaxing the limitation.
f. Monitoring requirements for turbidity, BOD, total suspended solids, and total coliform organisms were significantly relaxed. The effluent dissolved oxygen monitoring was removed altogether and a receiving water monitoring station with the associated monitoring was deleted; and
g. The fact sheet basis for salinity limitations was completely replaced and each salinity constituent discussion has been altered.

B. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 and the permit should not have been adopted in accordance with California Water Code Section 13377

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” The CTR Water Quality Standard for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is 1.8 µg/l. The wastewater discharge maximum observed concentration was 4.0 µg/l. The maximum observed upstream receiving water bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate concentration was also 4 µg/L; there is no assimilative capacity. Clearly the discharge exceeds the water quality objective. The proposed Order failed to include an effluent limitation for Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State’s water quality standards. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that “where calculations indicate reasonable potential, a specific numeric limit MUST be included in the permit. Additional “studies” or data collection efforts may not be substituted for enforceable permit limits where “reasonable potential” has been determined.”

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.”

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

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” Using the worst-case measured hardness from the receiving water of 15 mg/L, the applicable chronic criterion (maximum four-day average concentration) is 0.34 µg/L and the applicable acute criterion (maximum one-hour average concentration) is 10.78 µg/L, as total recoverable. The maximum observed effluent concentration for total lead was 0.5 µg/L, based on 5 samples collected between May 2002 and June 2004. The maximum observed upstream receiving water total lead concentration was 0.7 µg/L, based on 5 samples collected between May 2002 and June 2004. Clearly the discharge exceeds the water quality objective and there is no assimilative capacity for lead. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for lead.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State’s water quality standards. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that “where calculations indicate reasonable potential, a specific numeric limit MUST be included in the permit. Additional “studies” or data collection efforts may not be substituted for enforceable permit limits where “reasonable potential” has been determined.”

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.”

D. The Permit fails to include an Effluent for Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 and the permit should not be adopted in accordance with California Water Code Section 13377
Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” Aldrin, alpha-BHC (alphabenzene hexachloride), beta-BHC, lindane (gamma-BHC), delta-BHC, 4,4'-DDT, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDD, dieldrin, alpha-endosulfan, beta-endosulfan, endosulfan sulfate, endrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide were detected in the effluent in concentrations as high as 0.115 µg/L, 0.15 µg/L, 0.05 µg/L, 0.22 µg/L, 0.189 µg/L, 0.43 µg/L, 0.33 µg/L, 0.4 µg/L, 0.2 µg/L, 0.11 µg/L, 0.32 µg/L, 0.37 µg/L, 0.35 µg/L, 0.33 µg/L, and 0.15 µg/L, respectively. Each of these constituents is a chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticide. These constituents are persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. The Basin Plan requires that no individual pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses; total chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at detectable concentrations; and pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies. The CTR also contains numeric criteria for Aldrin, alpha-BHC (alpha-benzene hexachloride), beta-BHC, lindane (gamma-BHC), 4,4'-DDT, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDD, dieldrin, alpha-endosulfan, beta-endosulfan, endosulfan sulfate, endrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d), requires that limits must be included in permits where pollutants will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of the State’s water quality standards. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that “where calculations indicate reasonable potential, a specific numeric limit MUST be included in the permit. Additional “studies” or data collection efforts may not be substituted for enforceable permit limits where “reasonable potential” has been determined.” These tenets also 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.”

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.”

E. Mass limits have been removed contrary to Antibacksliding Regulations 40 CFR 122.44(l) and 122.62(a)(16) from the Permit which also fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for copper, zinc, cyanide, carbon tetrachloride,
dichlorobromomethane, ammonia and nitrate + nitrite as required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.45(b)

Antibacksliding regulations 40 CFR 122.44(l) and 122.62(a)(16) prohibit the removal of Effluent Limitations in terms of mass for ammonia, nitrate and nitrite, the permit has been relaxed without any of the required justification.

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

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

When attempting to backslide from WQBELs under either the antidegradation rule or an exception to the antibacksliding rule, relaxed permit limits must not result in a violation of applicable water quality standards. The general prohibition against backsliding found in §402(o)(1) of the Act contains several exceptions. Specifically, under §402(o)(2), a permit may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant if: (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation; (B)(i) information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy [(e.g., Acts of God)]; (D) the permittee has received a permit modification under section 1311(c), 1311(g), 1311(h), 1311(i), 1311(k), 1311(n), or 1326(a) of this title; or (E) the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent
limitations in the previous permit, and has properly operated and maintained the facilities, but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

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

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

(l) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation 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.

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:

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

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

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.45 (B)(1), states the following: “In the case of POTWs, permit effluent limitations, standards, or prohibitions shall be calculated based on design flow.”

Traditional wastewater treatment plant design utilizes average dry weather flow rates for organic, individual constituent, loading rates and peak wet weather flow rates for hydraulic design of pipes, weir overflow rates, and pumps.

Increased wet weather flow rates are typically caused by inflow and infiltration (I/I) into the sewer collection system that dilutes constituent loading rates and does not add to the mass of wastewater constituents.

For POTWs priority pollutants, such as metals, have traditionally been reduced by the reduction of solids from the wastestream, incidental to treatment for organic material. Following adoption of the CTR, compliance with priority pollutants is of critical importance and systems will need to begin utilizing loading rates of individual constituents in the WWTP design process. It is highly likely that the principal design parameters for individual priority pollutant removal will be based on mass, making mass based Effluent Limitations critically important to compliance. The inclusion of mass limitations will be of increasing importance to achieving compliance with requirements for individual pollutants.

As systems begin to design to comply with priority pollutants, the design systems for POTWs will be more sensitive to similar restrictions as industrial dischargers currently face where production rates (mass loadings) are critical components of treatment system design and compliance. Currently, Industrial Pretreatment Program local limits are frequently based on mass. Failure to include mass limitations would allow industries to discharge mass loads of individual pollutants during periods of wet weather when a dilute concentration was otherwise observed, upsetting treatment processes, causing effluent limitation processes, sludge disposal issues, or problems in the collection system.

In addition to the above citations, on June 26th 2006 U.S. EPA, Mr. Douglas Eberhardt, Chief of the CWA Standards and Permits Office, sent a letter to Dave Carlson at the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board strongly recommending that NPDES permit effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass as well as concentration.
F. The Permit contains Effluent Limitations requiring the percentage removal for BOD and TSS less stringent than the existing permit contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1)

The existing NPDES permit states that: “BOD and TSS—40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 133.102 contains regulations describing the minimum level of effluent quality— for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and total suspended solids (TSS)—attainable by secondary treatment.

The WWTP is required to comply with effluent limitations appropriate for treatment systems providing tertiary or equivalent treatment. Effluent limitations for both BOD and TSS have been established at 10 mg/l, as a 30-day average, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system. In addition, 40 CFR 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. If 85 percent removal of BOD and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by a tertiary (i.e., treatment beyond secondary level) treatment plant. The report of waste discharge indicated that the plant’s design percent removal of BOD and TSS is 95 percent.”

The Permit reports that the percent removal was an error and replaces the 95% percent removal with 85%. The existing permit is quite clear that the 95% percent removal was based on the design of the wastewater treatment plant as reported in the Report of Waste Discharge. The Permit is incorrect, inclusion of the requirement for 95% removal of BOD and TSS was not in error and must be retained in accordance with the Federal Antidegradation and antibacksliding regulations.

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 antidegradation and antibacksliding rules clearly spell out the interest of Congress in achieving the CWA’s goal of continued progress toward eliminating all pollutant discharges. Congress clearly chose an overriding environmental interest in clean water through discharge reduction, imposition of technological controls, and adoption of a rule against relaxation of limitations once they are established.

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

When attempting to backslide from WQBELs under either the antidegradation rule or an exception to the antibacksliding rule, relaxed permit limits must not result in a violation of applicable water quality standards. The general prohibition against backsliding found in §402(o)(1) of the Act contains several exceptions. Specifically, under §402(o)(2), a permit may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant if: (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred
after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation; (B)(i) information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy [(e.g., Acts of God)]; (D) the permittee has received a permit modification under section 1311(c), 1311(g), 1311(h), 1311(i), 1311(k), 1311(n), or 1326(a) of this title; or (E) the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit, and has properly operated and maintained the facilities, but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

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

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

(l) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)

(2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

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

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (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.

G. 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:

(l) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)

(2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

(i) Exceptions--A permit with respect to which paragraph (l)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

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

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

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

(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or
(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (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 to “Special Provisions”, 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. Special 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).

H. The Permit establishes Effluent Limitations for metals based on the hardness of the effluent as opposed to the ambient upstream receiving water hardness as required by Federal Regulations, the California Toxics Rule (CTR, 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4)).

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). For the reasonable potential analysis the effluent downstream hardness was used to calculate Effluent Limitations for the Permit. Ambient is defined as “surrounding”, not “in the middle of”.

The Regional Board staff have chosen to deliberately ignore Federal Regulations placing themselves above the law. There are procedures for changing regulations if peer reviewed science indicates the need to do so, none of which have been followed. The Permit failure to
include Effluent Limitations for based on the actual ambient hardness of the surface water is contrary to the cited Federal Regulation and must be amended to comply with the cited regulatory requirement.

I. The Permit 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.

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).

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, Compliance Determination No. E, states that: “Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE provisions of Provision VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with effluent limitation IV.A.1.h for chronic effluent toxicity.” This language usurps the 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.

Permit is quite simply wrong; by failing to include enforceable effluent limitations prohibiting chronic toxicity the Permit does not “…implement the SIP”.

K. 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.

L. **The Permit contains an inadequate reasonable potential by using incorrect statistical multipliers.**

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

The reasonable potential analyses fails to consider the statistical variability of data and laboratory analyses as explicitly required by the federal regulations. The procedures for computing variability are detailed in Chapter 3, pages 52-55, of USEPA’s Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control.

The reasonable potential analyses is flawed and must be recalculated. The fact that the SIP illegally ignores this fundamental requirement does not exempt the Regional Board from its obligation to consider statistical variability in compliance with federal regulations.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” The use of proper statistical multipliers would likely have resulted in Effluent Limitations for iron, manganese and toluene.

M. **Effluent Limitations for specific conductivity (EC) is improperly regulated as an annual average contrary to Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.45 (d)(2) and common sense.**

Federal Regulation 40 CFR 122.45 (d)(2) requires that permit for POTWs establish Effluent Limitations as average weekly and average monthly unless impracticable. The Permit establishes Effluent Limitations for EC as an annual average contrary to the cited Federal Regulation. Establishing the Effluent Limitations for EC in accordance with the Federal Regulation is not impracticable, to the contrary the Central Valley Regional Board has a long history of having done so. Proof of impracticability is properly a steep slope and the Regional Board has not presented any evidence that properly and legally limiting EC is impracticable.

N. **The Permit contains an inadequate antidegradation analysis that does not comply with the requirements of Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act, Federal Regulations 40 CFR § 131.12, the State Board’s Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) and California Water Code (CWC) Sections 13146 and 13247.**
CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy. The State Board has adopted the Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16), which the Regional Board has incorporated into its Basin Plan. The Regional Board is required by the CWC to comply with the Antidegradation Policy.

Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the basis for the antidegradation policy, states that the objective of the Act is to “restore and maintain the chemical, biological and physical integrity of the nation’s waters.” Section 303(d)(4) of the CWA carries this further, referring explicitly to the need for states to satisfy the antidegradation regulations at 40 CFR § 131.12 before taking action to lower water quality. These regulations (40 CFR § 131.12(a)) describe the federal antidegradation policy and dictate that states must adopt both a policy at least as stringent as the federal policy as well as implementing procedures.

California’s antidegradation policy is composed of both the federal antidegradation policy and the State Board’s Resolution 68-16 (State Water Resources Control Board, Water Quality Order 86-17, p. 20 (1986) (“Order 86-17”; Memorandum from Chief Counsel William Attwater, SWRCB to Regional Board Executive Officers, “federal Antidegradation Policy,” pp. 2, 18 (Oct. 7, 1987) (“State Antidegradation Guidance”)). As a state policy, with inclusion in the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), the antidegradation policy is binding on all of the Regional Boards (Water Quality Order 86-17, pp. 17-18).


The Regional Board must apply the antidegradation policy whenever it takes an action that will lower water quality (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 3, 5, 18, and Region IX Guidance, p. 1). Application of the policy does not depend on whether the action will actually impair beneficial uses (State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 6). Actions that trigger use of the antidegradation policy include issuance, re-issuance, and modification of NPDES and Section 404 permits and waste discharge requirements, waiver of waste discharge requirements, issuance of variances, relocation of discharges, issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, increases in discharges due to industrial production and/or municipal growth and/or other sources, exceptions from otherwise applicable water quality objectives, etc. (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 7-10, Region IX Guidance, pp. 2-3). Both the state and federal policies apply to point and nonpoint source pollution (State Antidegradation Guidance p. 6, Region IX Guidance, p. 4).

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.
The antidegradation analysis in the Permit is not simply deficient, it is literally nonexistent. The brief discussion of antidegradation requirements, in the Findings and Fact Sheet, consist only of skeletal, unsupported, undocumented conclusory statements totally lacking in factual analysis. NPDES permits must include any more stringent effluent limitation necessary to implement the Regional Board Basin Plan (Water Code 13377). The Tentative Permit fails to properly implement the Basin Plan’s Antidegradation Policy.

5. **THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED.**

CSPA is a non-profit, environmental organization that has a direct interest in reducing pollution to the waters of the Central Valley. CSPA’s members benefit directly from the waters in the form of recreational hiking, photography, fishing, swimming, hunting, bird watching, boating, consumption of drinking water and scientific investigation. Additionally, these waters are an important resource for recreational and commercial fisheries. Central Valley waterways also provide significant wildlife values important to the mission and purpose of the Petitioners. This wildlife value includes critical nesting and feeding grounds for resident water birds, essential habitat for endangered species and other plants and animals, nursery areas for fish and shellfish and their aquatic food organisms, and numerous city and county parks and open space areas. CSPA’s members reside in communities whose economic prosperity depends, in part, upon the quality of water. CSPA has actively promoted the protection of fisheries and water quality throughout California before state and federal agencies, the State Legislature and Congress and regularly participates in administrative and judicial proceedings on behalf of its members to protect, enhance, and restore declining aquatic resources. CSPA member’s health, interests and pocketbooks are directly harmed by the failure of the Regional Board to develop an effective and legally defensible program addressing discharges to waters of the state and nation.

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

Petitioners seek an Order by the State Board to:

A. **Vacate Order No. R5-2008-0177 (NPDES No. CA0079901) 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: Mr. James Wofford, Plant Supervisor, City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Facility, 317 Broad Street, Nevada City, CA 95959.

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,

[Signature]

Bill Jennings, Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2008-0177