3152 Shad Court
Simi Valley, CA 93063
October 30, 2008

State Water Resources Control Board
Jeanine Townsend, Clerk to the Board
1001 I Street, 24th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: "Comment Letter - Bacterial Standards for REC-1 Waters."

Dear Members of the Board:

These are my comments on the INFORMATIONAL DOCUMENT dated September 2008.

INFORMATIONAL DOCUMENT

Element 1: Bacterial Indicators

Alternative 8 - Combination of Alternatives 2 and 3(New).

Element 2: Level of Protection for Water Contract Recreation

Alternative 4 - Adopt risk level more stringent than U.S. EPA recommendation. Please note that I based my decision on the greater risk to children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the HIV/AIDS afflicted population discussed in Chapter 5 of the *Report of the Experts Scientific Workshop On Critical Research Needs for the Development Of New Or Revised Recreational Water Quality Criteria*.

Element 3: Calculation of Effluent Limits

Choosing one of the three alternatives was extremely difficult. Alternative 1(No action)

does not provide information if compliance is ensured, or what is or not achieved. Then too, Alternative 2, while I understand from the many documents I read relative to bacteria and water quality standards(WQS) that there is effluent variability, there can also be differences in the amount of bacteria and type of, and the season that the readings take place can be later or sooner than the set timeframe. Also, Alternative 3, the end-of-pipe criteria can apply to a facility, or as in the case of the brine pipeline from Simi Valley to the Pacific Ocean. More information should have been provided for readers who did not attend the scoping meetings in order to identify "the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and potential significant environmental effects to be analyzed in-depth in the development of this CEQA project"(Page 2 of the NOTICE OF CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT SCOPING MEETINGS: STATEWIDE BACTERIAL OBJECTIVE FOR WATER CONTACT RECREATION IN FRESH WATERS OF CALIFORNIA, under SUBMISSION OF CEQA SCOPING COMMENTS paragraph, second sentence).

Element 4: Mixing Zones

Alternative 3 - Do not allow mixing zones.

Element 5: Averaging Periods

Alternative 4 - Specify geometric mean(New).

Element 6: Effluent Monitoring and Reporting

Alternative 2 - Establish monitoring frequencies for all dischargers.

Element 7: Analytical Methods

Alternative 2 - Specify analytical methods for receiving waters and various effluents.

Element 8: Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements

It was difficult to choose between Alternative 1

and Alternative 2. Alternative 1(No action) does not provide information if compliance is ensured, or what is or not achieved. Then, Alternative 2's allowing up to two-year compliance schedules may be too long. I am not supportive at all of Alternative 3 which allows up to two-year compliance schedules with Regional Water Board discretion to establish compliance schedules up to five years.

Element 9: Site-Specific Objectives

Alternative 2 - Do not allow calculation of site-specific SSMs. Even though it is stated in the USEPA's Website's Single Sample Maximum Fact Sheet: *Using Single Sample Values in State Water Quality Standards*(August 2006) section that "States, however, retain the discretion to determine whether and how to use the SSM in other Clean Water Act programs"(under What is EPA's current position on using the SSM in BEACH Act waters?), and Table 1. U.S. EPA Bacterial Indicator Criteria Recommendation includes SSM calculations, I am opposed to SSMs since under the USEPA's Website's section Final Nationwide Bacteria Standards Fact Sheet: *Nationwide Bacteria Standards Protect Swimmers at Beaches*(November 2004) section it is stated under "What this rule does" that California is a state that has "Adopted criteria 'as protective as' EPA's recommended criteria for some waters", and the SWRCB's Informational Document did not include a Table with all of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards' current bacteria objectives(Page 3, Element 1).

Element 10: Implementation of Bacterial Objectives in Regards to TMDLs

Deciding among the alternatives was extremely difficult since Alternatives 2 and 3 deal with "reference system/antidegradation approach or natural sources exclusion approach" yet the discussion mentions nothing about reference system/antidegradation approach. Then, Alternative 1(No action) does not provide information if compliance is ensured, or what is or not achieved. It is unfortunate because under the discussion it is stated "...a certain frequency of exceedance of the single sample objective would be permitted based on the residual exceedance frequency in the specific water body" which I am opposed to.

JORDAN QUESTIONS

1. Why was an Element dealing with "Modeling" to assess compliance not included?

2. Will there be a Definitions Element in the future?

Members of the Board, the Bacterial Standards CEQA Scoping Meetings Informational Document was a half-hearted commitment to the "public involvement" process.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Teresa Jordan

Mrs. Teresa Jordan