



## California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

*"An Advocate for Fisheries, Habitat and Water Quality"*

3536 Rainier Avenue, Stockton, CA 95204

Tel: 209-464-5067, Fax: 209-464-1028, E: [deltakeep@aol.com](mailto:deltakeep@aol.com)

26 July 2006

Mr. Robert Schneider, Chairman  
Ms. Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer  
Mr. Kenneth Landau, Assistant Executive Officer  
Mr. Matthew Scroggins  
Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Central Valley Region  
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6144

VIA: Electronic Submission  
Hardcopy If Requested

RE: Second-Set Supplemental Comments, Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0083429) for Chevron Environmental Management Company; CHEVRONTEXACO, Incorporated; and Secor International Incorporated; Purity Oil Sales Superfund Site, Fresno County

Dear Messrs Schneider, Landau, Scroggins and Ms. Creedon;

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Watershed Enforcers and San Joaquin Audubon (hereinafter "CSPA") submits this second-set of supplemental comments on the tentative NPDES permit (hereinafter "Order" or "Permit") for Chevron Environmental Management Company; CHEVRONTEXACO, Incorporated; and Secor International Incorporated; Purity Oil Sales Superfund Site, Fresno County (hereinafter "Discharger").

We reiterate our previous comments that 40 CFR § 124.12(c) extends an NPDES comment period until at least the close of the hearing and any state modification of the federal provisions, pursuant to 40 CFR § 123.25, are permissible only if the state modifications are at least as stringent as the federal provisions. Consequently, the administrative record for this proceeding remains open. Alternatively, CSPA submits this second-set of supplemental comments as a courtesy heads-up of arguments we will be orally presenting at the hearing.

The purpose of this second-set of supplemental comments is to clarify and augment arguments that the Regional Board has no authority to issue compliance schedules and that proposed compliance schedules and interim effluent limits illegally delay achievement of water quality standards.

The Clean Water Act mandates that: "there shall be achieved . . . not later than July 1, 1977, any more stringent limitations, including those necessary to meet water

quality standards, treatment standards, or schedules of compliance, established pursuant to any State law or regulations . . . or any other Federal law or regulation, or required to implement any applicable water quality standard established pursuant to this chapter. CWA § 301(b)(1)(C), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C). Despite this unambiguous, 29-year-old statutory deadline for achieving Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits (WQBELs), the Permit omits water quality-based effluent limits on parameters and instead imposes a compliance schedule and interim permit limits far more lenient than WQBELs. In so doing, the permit provides an extension for meeting WQBELs that extends far beyond the statutory deadline in CWA section 301(b)(1)(C) for achieving WQBELs. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C). This approach is blatantly illegal and, if upheld, would directly undermine the water quality standards that are the heart of the Clean Water Act.

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

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

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

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

Even if 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(8) did not preclude issuing compliance schedules which delay the effective date of WQBELs set under the NTR and CTR, the

CWA itself precludes such compliance schedules—and any compliance schedule which delays the effective date of WQBELs past 1977.

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

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

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

Congress provided no blanket authority in the Clean Water Act for extensions of the July 1, 1977, deadline, but it did provide authority for the States to foreshorten the deadline. CWA section 303(f) (33 U.S.C. § 1313(f)) provides that: “[n]othing in this section [1313] shall be construed to affect any effluent limitations or schedule of compliance required by any State to be implemented prior to the dates set forth in section 1311(b)(1) and 1311(b)(2) of this title nor to preclude any State from requiring compliance with any effluent limitation or schedule of compliance at dates earlier than such dates.”

Because the statute contains explicit authority to expedite the compliance deadline but not to extend it, the Regional Board may not authorize extensions beyond this deadline in discharge permits.

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

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

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

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

In the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1977, Congress provided limited extensions of the July 1, 1977, deadline for achieving WQBELs. In CWA section 301(i), Congress provided that “publicly-owned treatment works” (“POTWs”) that must undertake new construction in order to achieve the effluent limitations, and need Federal funding to complete the construction, may be eligible for a compliance schedule that may be “in no event later than July 1, 1988.” 33 U.S.C. § 1311(i)(1) (emphasis added). Congress provided for the same limited extension for industrial dischargers that discharge into a POTW that received an extension under section 1311(i)(1). *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1311(i)(2). In addition, dischargers that are not eligible for the time extensions provided by section 1311(i) but that do discharge into a POTW, may be eligible for a compliance schedule of no later than July 1, 1983. *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1319(a)(6).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Finally, a compliance schedule that extends beyond the statutory deadline would amount to a less stringent effluent limit than required by the CWA. States are explicitly prohibited from establishing or enforcing effluent limitations less stringent than are required by the CWA. *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1370; Water Code §§ 13372, 13377. The clear

language of the statute, bolstered by the legislative history and case law, establishes unambiguously that compliance schedules extending beyond the July 1, 1977, deadline may not be issued in discharge permits. The Permit, however, purports to do just that. By authorizing the issuance of permits that delay achievement of effluent limitations for over thirty years beyond Congress' deadline, the Permit makes a mockery of the CWA section 301(b)(1)(C) deadline and exceeds the scope of the Regional Board's authority under the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Act. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C).

The Regional Board must include immediately effective WQBELs in the Permit. Thank you for considering these second supplemental comments. If you have questions or require clarification, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

*Original signed by Bill Jennings*  
Bill Jennings, Executive Director  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance