

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

STAFF SUMMARY REPORT (Ann M. Powell)
MEETING DATE: May 19, 2004

ITEM: 6

SUBJECT: U.S. Navy, Naval Support Facility, Treasure Island, San Francisco
County – Reissuance of NPDES Permit

CHRONOLOGY: June 1995 – Permit reissued

DISCUSSION: The attached Tentative Order (Appendix A) would reissue the Treasure Island Waste Water Treatment Plant’s (Plant) permit with requirements similar to those the Board has previously adopted for other treatment plants.

The Navy owns the Plant, which is located on the north side of Treasure Island. The Plant provides secondary-level treatment for domestic wastewater from the former Naval Support facilities on Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands. The City and County of San Francisco (City) operates the Plant under a 1997 Cooperative Agreement between the Navy and the City. Pursuant to this Agreement, the City operates and maintains utility systems at Treasure Island, including the Plant, while the Navy retains ownership. It is anticipated that ownership of the Plant will transfer to the City after the property is conveyed in 2005.

We received comments on the draft Tentative Order from both the Navy and the City. The Navy’s comments focused mainly on no longer wanting to be named as the discharger for the Plant’s permit. The City’s comments focused mainly on the dilution allowed the Plant discharge. Our response to all the comments is in Appendix C, with summaries of the major ones below. Both the Navy and the City are likely to testify at the hearing.

The Navy requests that the City be named as the discharger. Board staff believes it remains appropriate to continue to name the Navy for the following reasons:

- 1) the Navy owns the Plant;
- 2) the Navy submitted the application for permit renewal, and has made no effort to withdraw the application or to apply for termination of the existing permit;
- 3) the Cooperative Agreement between the Navy and the City indicates that “the Navy will retain Environmental Permits until such time as the City assumes them,” yet the City has not “assumed” this permit and objects to being named discharger on the permit; and

Deleted: and

- 4) the City is not bound by the the existing Cooperative Agreement with the Navy. The City could terminate the Agreement at any time, leaving the Board with no entity to hold liable for permit compliance.

The City submitted a dilution study with its comments on the draft Order. Based on the study, it contends that the discharge should be granted a higher dilution credit than the 10:1 we proposed in the draft Order. A higher dilution credit would translate into higher, less stringent, effluent limits. Despite the short time the City provided us to review their study, in our preliminary review, we discovered too many deficiencies in the assumptions used to be able to accept the study's results. Many of the assumptions the City used did not reflect worse case conditions. We believe worse case conditions need to be evaluated to ensure protection of water quality standards at all times. As such, we do not recommend granting a higher dilution credit in this permit. We have encouraged the City to review our comments and update the study, so we can consider it during the coming permit cycle.

**RECOMMEN-
DATION:**

Adoption of the Tentative Order

File Number:

2169.6013 (AMP)

Appendices:

- A. Tentative Order
- B. Comments Received
- C. Response to Comments

APPENDIX A

Tentative Order

APPENDIX B

Comments Received

APPENDIX C

Response to Comments