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In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements For University of California, Davis Campus Main Wastewater Treatment Plant; California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region Order No. R5-2008-0183; NPDES No. CA0077895 ) PETITION FOR REVIEW

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. CA0077895) for University of California, Davis Campus Wastewater Treatment Plant, on 5 December 2008. See Order No. R5-2008-0183. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments.

1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:

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

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

Petitioner seeks review of Order No. R5-2008-0183, Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0077895) for the University of California, Davis Campus 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:

5 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 27 October 2008. This letter and the following comments set forth in detail the reasons and points and authorities why CSPA believes the Order fails to comport with statutory and regulatory requirements. The specific reasons the adopted Orders are improper are:

A. The Permit fails to contain a final Effluent Limitation for electrical conductivity (EC) despite clear reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objective and contains an Interim Limitation for EC that is not protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream contrary to Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i) and interpretation of the regulatory requirement for Effluent Limitations by US EPA. The failure to include an Effluent Limitation for EC also constitutes backsliding in accordance with Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l) and 122.62(a)(16)

The Permit contains an Interim Effluent Limitation for electrical conductivity (EC) of 1400 umhos/cm as a monthly average; significantly less stringent that the existing NPDES permit EC limitation of 900 umhos/cm. The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Central Valley
Region, Water Quality Objectives, page III-3.00, contains a Chemical Constituents Objective that includes Title 22 Drinking Water Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) by reference. The Title 22 MCLs for EC are 900 \( \mu \text{mhos/cm} \) (recommended level), 1,600 \( \mu \text{mhos/cm} \) (upper level) and 2,200 \( \mu \text{mhos/cm} \) (short term maximum). The Basin Plan states, on Page III-3.00 Chemical Constituents, that “Waters shall not contain constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan’s “Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives” provides that in implementing narrative water quality objectives, the Regional Board will consider numerical criteria and guidelines developed by other agencies and organizations. This application of the Basin Plan is consistent with Federal Regulations, 40CFR 122.44(d). The inclusion, as a late revision, of a mass limitation for TDS is based on the current flow rates and is not a replacement for a protective Effluent Limitation for EC.

For EC, Ayers R.S. and D.W. Westcott, Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations – Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1, Rome (1985), levels above 700 \( \mu \text{mhos/cm} \) will reduce crop yield for sensitive plants. The University of California, Davis Campus, Agricultural Extension Service, published a paper, dated 7 January 1974, stating that there will not be problems to crops associated with salt if the EC remains below 750 \( \mu \text{mhos/cm} \). In a Biological Significance document, dated November 1\textsuperscript{st} 2006, James M. Harrington, Staff Water Quality Biologist with the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), citing McKee and Wolf (1971 Water Quality Criteria) wrote that: “Surveys of inland fresh waters indicates that good mixes of fish fauna are found where conductivity values range between 150 and 500 umhos/cm. Even in the most alkaline waters, the upper tolerance limit for aquatic life is approximately 2000 umhos/cm.” Putah Creek has been well documented by researchers and students at the University to support cold water endangered fish species. In 1995, 1997 and 1998, University of California, Davis students under the direction of Dr. Peter Moyle observed juvenile and adult salmon in the South Fork Putah Creek. Some salmon were observed spawning in December and January 1997/1998. The wastewater discharge monthly average is 1,091 umhos/cm with a maximum measured value of 1,679 umhos/cm exceeds the level DFG considers to support a good mix of aquatic life and approaches the upper tolerance limit for fish. EC clearly threatens to degrade the aquatic life beneficial use of Putah Creek and exceeds the applicable water quality standards and objectives.

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.” Despite these clear rules the Permit also contains a *Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (Salinity Plan)*. This also ignores the fact that the existing Permit required completion of the same study which was submitted in July 2004. The study *An Approach to Develop Site-Specific Criteria for Electrical Conductivity to Protect Agricultural Beneficial Uses that Accounts for Rainfall* concluded that there were only three years where the seasonal mean EC exceeded 1100 umhos/cm when the simulation was run for the 53-year period with EC of 1100 umhos/cm. All three years occurred during the drought period in the 1970s. The three outliers translated into crop yield reductions in the potential yield of 2, 4 and 6%. The study did not present a recommendation for EC that was 100% protective, without any crop yield reductions, but is valuable in showing crop yield reductions using 1,100 umhos/cm EC irrigation water during periods of low rainfall. In September 2008, in consideration of a petition for the University of California, Davis Campus’ NPDES Permit, swreb/occ file no. A-1894, the State Board concluded that it was appropriate for the Central Valley Water Board to consider whether the results from the City of Woodland’s site-specific salinity study could be used to determine appropriate electrical conductivity level in the receiving waters for protection of beneficial uses, and to calculate a final effluent limitation for electrical conductivity. If the Regional Board could not develop an acceptable limitation for EC based on Woodland’s cite specific study; the State Board required that an adequate and detailed explanation be provided. It is unimaginable that the Regional Board would ignore this recent State Board decision regarding the same type of EC study at issue here.

Clearly the discharge presents a reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objective. The proposed EC limitation clearly exceeds the drinking water MCL, the agricultural water quality goal and threatens to exceed the level necessary to protect aquatic life for EC. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for EC that are protective of the beneficial uses. The wastewater discharge increases concentrations of EC to unacceptable concentrations adversely affecting the beneficial uses. The available literature regarding safe levels of EC for irrigated agriculture mandate that an Effluent Limitation for EC is necessary to protect the beneficial use of the receiving stream in accordance with the Basin Plan and Federal Regulations. Failure to establish effluent limitations for EC that are protective of the Chemical Constituents water quality objective blatantly violates the law.

The Order Interim Effluent Limitation for EC of 1,400 umhos/cm as a monthly average exceeds the recommended levels necessary to protect beneficial uses of drinking water, irrigated agriculture (700 umhos/cm) and is within statistical variability (40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii)) of the upper tolerance limit for aquatic life (2000 umhos/cm) exceeding the Basin Plan Chemical Constituents water quality standard, that “Waters shall not contain constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.”
Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” The Basin Plan states, on Page III-3.00 Chemical Constituents, that “Waters shall not contain constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan’s “Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives” provides that in implementing narrative water quality objectives, the Regional Board will consider numerical criteria and guidelines developed by other agencies and organizations. This application of the Basin Plan is consistent with Federal Regulations, 40CFR 122.44(d).

**EC Backsliding**

The existing NPDES permit (R5-2003-0003) for UCD contains an Effluent Limitation for EC of 900 umhos/cm as a monthly average. The Permit contains a less stringent Interim Effluent Limitation for electrical conductivity (EC) of 1400 umhos/cm as a monthly average. Federal Regulation 40 CFR 122.44(l) requires that for reissued permits interim limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations in the previous permit. The Permit does not meet the test for any exception for including a less stringent limitation for EC.

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 proposed EC limitation clearly exceeds the drinking water MCL, the agricultural water quality goal and threatens to exceed the level necessary to protect aquatic life for EC. The proposed Order fails to establish an effluent limitation for EC that are protective of the beneficial uses.

B. The Interim Effluent Limitation for electrical conductivity (EC) will cause violation of the Toxicity Receiving Water Limitation contrary to federal regulation and state law
A discharge and the subsequent reuse for irrigated agriculture of wastewater at the level included in the Order Interim Effluent Limitation for EC of 1,400 umhos/cm will cause violation of the Toxicity Receiving Water Limitation. The use of this water for irrigation, a designated beneficial use, will produce detrimental physiological response in plants resulting in reduced crop yield.

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.”

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.

C. Existing Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. R5-2003-0003 contained Reclamation Requirements for the discharge of reclaimed water to the Arboretum Waterway which have been removed from the Permit making it less stringent contrary to the Antibacksliding Regulations

The Discharger discharges tertiary treated wastewater to the Arboretum Waterway. The Arboretum Waterway is a closed original north branch of Putah Creek. The Arboretum Waterway has been dammed on both ends and is fully contained on the University of California Davis Campus. The Discharger has full control of the Arboretum Waterway, which is used as a stormwater retention basin and a “recreational impoundment” (F-5). Stormwater is pumped from the Arboretum Waterway to the South Fork of Putah Creek. Existing Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. R5-2003-0003 contained Reclamation Requirements for the discharge of reclaimed water to the Arboretum Waterway in compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 22 Reclamation Criteria, as follows:

“C. Water Reclamation Requirements

1. Disinfected tertiary treated wastewater for unrestricted use shall be continuously sampled for turbidity using a continuous turbidity meter and recorder at a point prior
to filtration and again following filtration. Turbidity measurements shall be based on a reading and recording of the turbidity strip charts or computer records at four-hour intervals at least once per day. Compliance with the daily average operating turbidity shall be determined by averaging the results of all four-hour turbidity samples read during the day. The results of the daily average turbidity determinations shall be reported monthly to the Board, except non-compliance shall be reported immediately. The turbidity of the filter effluent shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, nor 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period. At no time shall the turbidity exceed 10 NTU. Reclaimed water in excess of the turbidity limits shall not enter the reclamation distribution system. An automated distribution system bypass shall be installed.

2. Neither the treatment nor the use of reclaimed water shall cause a pollution or nuisance as defined by Section 13050 of the CWC.

3. The use of reclaimed water shall not cause degradation of groundwater or any water supply.

4. Reclaimed water shall be managed in conformance with the regulations contained in Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3, CCR.

5. All reclamation equipment, pumps, piping, valves, and outlets shall be appropriately marked to differentiate them from potable facilities. In accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 116815 all reclamation distribution system piping installed after 1 June 1993 shall be purple.

6. Perimeter warning signs indicating that reclaimed water is in use shall be posted as prescribed in the User’s Reclamation Plan that is subject to approval by the Board and the Department of Health Services.

7. Reclaimed water shall not be allowed to escape from the authorized use areas by airborne spray or by surface flow except in minor amounts such as that associated with good irrigation practices.

8. There shall be at least a ten-foot horizontal and one foot vertical separation at crossings between all pipelines transporting reclaimed water and those transporting domestic supply, with the domestic supply above the reclaimed water pipeline, unless approved by the Department.

9. There shall be no cross-connection between potable water supply and piping containing reclaimed water. Supplementing reclaimed water with potable water shall
not be allowed except through an air-gap separation, or if approved by the Department, a reduced pressure principle backflow device.

10. Areas with reclaimed water shall be managed to prevent ponding and conditions conducive to the proliferation of mosquitoes and other disease vectors, and to avoid creation of a public nuisance or health hazard. The following practices shall be implemented, at a minimum:

   a. Ditches receiving irrigation runoff, not serving as wildlife habitat, shall be maintained free of emergent, marginal, and floating vegetation.

   b. Low-pressure and unpressurized pipelines and ditches accessible to mosquitoes shall not be used to store recycled water. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,

   c. An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.

   d. Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

11. The reclaimed water piping system shall not include any hose bibs, except at the treatment plant, on hose bibs with appropriate signage.

12. Disinfection of tertiary treated wastewater shall be accomplished by a ultraviolet light when combined with filtration has been demonstrated to inactivate and/or remove 99.999 percent of the plaque-forming units of F-specific bacteriophage MS2, or polio virus in the wastewater.

13. The coagulation system shall be used whenever the plant is producing tertiary treated wastewater for unrestricted use. For the purpose of maintenance and repair of the system, the Discharger is allowed to have the coagulation system off-line for short periods of time (up to 30 minutes for each occurrence), when the turbidity of the influent to the tertiary treatment plant is less than 5 NTU.”

The Reclamation Criteria have been removed from the Permit without explanation. Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The previous Order included
technology-based effluent limitations based on tertiary treatment requirements that meet both the technology-based secondary treatment standards for POTWs and more stringent Title 22 Reclamation Criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

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. The Permit removes standards and conditions, without explanation, which were included in the existing NPDES permit for the protection of contact recreational uses within the Arboretum Waterway.

D. The Discharge of treated domestic wastewater from the Arboretum Waterway to the South Fork of Putah Creek constitutes a wastewater discharge which must comply with water quality standards and objectives in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44 and be fully monitored for compliance in accordance with Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.41, 122.48 and 122.44. The discharge from the Arboretum Waterway constitutes a “new” discharge which must be fully in compliance upon initiation of the discharge (SIP 2.1)

The discharge of waste into the Arboretum Waterway cannot constitute a discharge into a water of the State or the United States. Putah Creek originally flowed through the University of California, Davis Campus where the University is located. To prevent flooding, the City created South Fork Putah Creek and damming what is now known as the North Branch Putah Creek (arboretum). The point of compliance must be where the wastewater discharge enters Putah Creek following commingling with stormwater in the Arboretum Waterway, based on the facts that:

- The waterway is used by the Discharger as a storm water retention basin (F-5). A water of the state could not be utilized as a private stormwater retention basin.
- The waterway is used by the Discharger as a Recreational Impoundment. WDR Order No. R5-2003-0003, adopted by the Regional Board in 2003, issued CCR Title 22
Reclamation Criteria based limitations for the wastewater discharge into the Arboretum Waterway. Title 22 Reclamation Criteria are not applicable to surface water discharges.

• Mr. Kenneth Landau, Assistant Executive Officer for the Regional Board, issued a letter: “approved the rerouting of Title 22 quality water, via the Arboretum Waterway, to South Fork of Putah Creek, as a means to improve the water quality of the existing stormwater discharge into the South Fork of Putah Creek. The letter required the rerouting of Title 22 wastewater flow via the Arboretum Waterway be in accordance with the existing effluent limitations in the existing Order at the time the letter was sent to the Discharger.” (F-5)

• Existing WDRs Order No. R5-2003-0003, Finding No. 5 states that: “The discharge of reclaimed water from the North Branch Putah Creek to the South Fork of Putah Creek may constitute a wastewater discharge and may require an NPDES permit. A decision on the requirement of an NPDES permit other than a storm water discharge permit will be made at a later date.”

The discharge of domestic wastewater, now commingled with stormwater, is wastewater. The wastewater discharge must be held to the same limitations as it enters the south fork of Putah Creek from the Arboretum Waterway. However, the stormwater adds additional pollutants to the now commingled wastewater. The Permit proposed that compliance at the point of discharge be conducted at sampling point 001, the discharge point from the wastewater treatment plant directly to Putah Creek. This sampling point is not representative of the discharge of wastewater from the Arboretum Waterway and is not capable of determining compliance with permit limitations as required by Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44.

The Permit as currently written allowing the commingling of domestic wastewater and stormwater is in direct conflict with Discharge Prohibition No. D. This Prohibition prohibits rainfall to be discharged into the disposal system in amounts that diminish the system’s capability to comply with Effluent Limitations.

The discharge from the Arboretum Waterway constitutes a “new” discharge which must be fully compliance upon initiation of the discharge (SIP 2.1). The Interim Limitations for aluminum and mercury do not constitute full compliance; final Effluent Limitations must be implemented.

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

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 Regional Board’s response that there are not drinking water intakes in the vicinity of the discharge does not address the beneficial use of
the receiving water. 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.

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.
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.

F. 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). The Permit states that the effluent hardness and the downstream hardness were used to calculate Effluent Limitations for metals. The definition of ambient is “in the surrounding area”, “encompassing on all sides”, not
“in the middle of” as the Regional Board’s use would imply. It has been the Region 5, Sacramento, NPDES Section, in referring to Basin Plan objectives for temperature, to define ambient as meaning upstream. It is reasonable to assume, after considering the definition of ambient, that EPA is referring to the hardness of the receiving stream before it is potentially impacted by an effluent discharge. It is also reasonable to make this assumption based on past interpretations and since EPA, in permit writers’ guidance and other reference documents, generally assumes receiving streams have dilution, which would ultimately “encompass” the discharge. Ambient conditions are in-stream conditions unimpacted by the discharge.

The Permit goes into great detail citing the Federal Regulation requiring the receiving water hardness be used to establish Effluent Limitations. The comparative Effluent Limitation values presented to defend the unsupported statements regarding which is more protective. Once again the public is subject to a bureaucrat “knowing better” and simply choosing to ignore very clear regulatory requirements. The Regional Board staff have chosen to deliberately ignore Federal Regulations placing themselves above the law. There are procedures for changing regulations if peer reviewed science indicates the need to do so, none of which have been followed. The Permit failure to include Effluent Limitations for metals based on the actual ambient hardness of the surface water is contrary to the cited Federal Regulation and must be amended to comply with the cited regulatory requirement.

G. 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. USEPA 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.

H. The Permit fails to contain mass-based effluent limits for aluminum and cyanide 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.

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.

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

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 (R5-200-) for this facility contains Effluent Limitations for settleable solids (SS). The most important physical characteristic of wastewater is its total solids content. SS are an approximate measure of the quantity of sludge that will be removed by sedimentation. Low, medium and high strength wastewaters will generally contain 5 ml/l, 10 ml/l and 20 ml/l of SS, respectively. Knowledge of SS parameters is critical for proper wastewater treatment plant design, evaluating sludge quantities, operation and troubleshooting. Excessive SS in the effluent discharge are typically indicative of process upset or overloading of the system. Failure to limit and monitor for SS limits the regulators ability to assess facility operations and determine compliance. Settleable matter is a water quality objective in the Basin Plan. Failure to include an Effluent Limitations for SS threatens to allow violation of the settleable matter receiving water limitation. 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.
J. 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 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).

The only rational that can explain moving the turbidity from Effluent Limitations to Provisions is to protect Dischargers from mandatory minimum penalties as prescribed by the California Water Code, Section 13385. It is doubtful that it was intent of the legislature in adopting the mandatory penalty provisions to have the Regional Boards delete Effluent Limitations from permit to avoid penalties.

K. 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.

L. 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 252 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 mg/l and 750 mg/l, respectively.

The argument has been repeatedly made that US EPA’s 87 ug/l chronic criterion was developed using low pH and hardness testing and should not be used. The state of Idaho is cited as not using the chronic criterion for aluminum; however Idaho is not required to comply with the
Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. We are also not certain that the characterization of Idaho as the leader in water quality is either a correct assumption or relevant. 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’s conclusions in their Ambient Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life recommends that application of the ambient criteria as necessary to be protective of the aquatic beneficial uses of receiving waters in lieu of site-specific criteria.

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.
M. The Permit contains Effluent Limitations less stringent than the existing permit for aluminum, copper, dichloromethane, Dioxins/Furans, and lead contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1)

The Permit either relaxes or removes Effluent Limitations for aluminum, copper, dichloromethane, Dioxins/Furans, and lead. The Permit cites infrequent sampling, as compared to the duration of the discharge, as new information. This is not “new” information as prescribed by regulation; there has been no change in treatment processes, practices or the character of the wastestream. The use of data from the existing waste discharge requirements where a reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards and or objectives is valid data and must continue to be used in accordance with the SIP and Federal Regulations. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that; although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that “where valid, reliable, and representative effluent data or instream background data are available they MUST be used in applicable reasonable potential and limits derivation calculations. Data may not be arbitrarily discarded or ignored.” The Regional Board has failed to carry forth and use valid, reliable and representative data from the existing NPDES permit in developing limitations, contrary to the cited Federal Regulation.

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:

(I) 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.

N. The Permit is either based on an incomplete RWD contrary to Federal Regulations and the CWC or the Fact Sheet is incomplete in accordance with federal regulations

Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 122.21(e) states in part that “The Director shall not issue a permit before receiving a complete application for a permit except for NPDES general permits. In accordance with 40 CFR 122.21 (e) and (h) and 124.3 (a)(2) the Regional Board shall not adopt
the Permit without first a complete application.” State Report of Waste Discharge form 200 is required as a part of a complete Report of Waste Discharge. Form 200, part VI states that: “To be approved, your application must include a complete characterization of the discharge.” The Federal Report of Waste Discharge forms also require a significant characterization of a wastewater discharge. The California Toxics Rule (CTR)(40 CFR 131, Water Quality Standards) contains water quality standards applicable to this wastewater discharge. The final due date for compliance with CTR water quality standards for all wastewater dischargers in California is May 2010. The State’s Policy for Implementation of Toxics standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP), Section 1.2, requires wastewater dischargers to provide all data and other information requested by the Regional Board before the issuance, reissuance, or modification of a permit to the extent feasible. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 122.21(e) states in part that: “The Director shall not issue a permit before receiving a complete application for a permit except for NPDES general permits.” California Water Code, section 13377, requires that: “Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the state board and the regional boards shall, as required or authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, issue waste discharge and dredged or fill material permits which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary, thereto, together with any more stringent effluent standards or limitations necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance.” The application for permit renewal is incomplete and in accordance with 40 CFR 122.21(e) the Regional Board should not issue a permit. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 124.8, requires that Fact Sheets contain the basis for the permit conditions. The Permit also fails to comply with the State Board’s precedential Order for Yuba City which required the Fact Sheet contain the complete data set which was the basis for effluent limitations, in that case for EC. The Fact Sheet contains no information which supports that a complete RWD has been submitted and that the wastewater discharge has been adequately characterized for priority and conventional pollutants. Either the Discharger has failed to submit a complete RWD contrary to the cited laws and regulations or the Fact Sheet is incomplete. The Permit cannot be adopted if the RWD was incomplete or must be amended to include a summary of the data characterizing the discharge.

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. R5-2008-0183 (NPDES No. CA0077895) 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 27 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. Michael Fan, Facilities Management: Utilities, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616.

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 27 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. R5-2008-0183