


City of Encinitas

Public Comment
Sanitary Sewer System WDR
Deadline: 5/13/11 by 12 noon

May 4, 2011

Via email: commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

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



Subject: Comment Letter – SSS WDRs Review & Update

Dear Ms. Townsend:

The City of Encinitas appreciates the opportunity to comment on the State Water Quality Control Board's proposed revisions to the Sanitary Sewer System Waste Discharge Requirements (SSS WDRs).

The City of Encinitas is located along six miles of Pacific coastline in northern San Diego County. The City maintains approximately 122 miles of gravity sewer pipelines, 6.1 miles of force main pipelines and 4 sewer pump stations. The responsibility for maintaining and repairing private sewer laterals is solely, that of the enrollee or private property owner.

The proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs represent a major departure from the program that has been successfully implemented under the existing SSS WDRs. While we appreciate the State Water Board's efforts to address certain issues associated with the existing WDRs, our agency is very concerned about a number of the proposed revisions, especially those related to reporting of private lateral sewage discharges (PLSDs), and onerous additions to sewer system management plan (SSMP) requirements that should not be mandated unless State Water Board guidance and funding is made available. As requirements become more complicated and confusing, more agency staff time is directed towards preparing reports and re-organizing information and operating procedures, and less time is spent actually managing or conducting the appropriate operations and maintenance (O&M) activities to prevent sewer sanitary overflows (SSOs) and properly maintain the collection system.

Also, we strongly oppose any kind of national pollution discharge elimination system (NPDES) permitting approach.

1. Sanitary sewer system regulations should not be adopted under a two-tiered WDRs and NPDES permit.

We strongly oppose the two-tiered WDRs and NPDES permit alternative, whereby an SSO occurring previously or in the future would trigger the requirement to apply for an NPDES permit, and agree with several points included in the Staff Report also opposing an NPDES permit. Since the existing SSS WDRs and the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs do not

authorize sanitary-sewer overflows (SSOs) to waters of the United States, there is no need for an NPDES permit. The result of triggering an NPDES permit would subject local public agencies to additional and more egregious non-governmental organization (NGO) lawsuits and higher administrative penalties with absolutely no demonstration that this would improve water quality or further reduce SSOs.

As described in the Staff Report, this alternative would also require significant additional Water Board staff resources to track and implement the different permit tiers. We understand that these staff resources are limited, and believe that they should instead be used to further improve SSO reduction efforts under the existing SSS WDRs.

2. The basis for mandatory reporting of Private Lateral Sewage Discharges (PLSDs) is not justified and creates an inappropriate burden for public agency staff.

The SSS WDR would require enrollees to report spills from privately owned laterals when they become aware of them. Such reporting is currently voluntary. Water Board staff has not provided adequate justification nor has it thoroughly considered the staffing and financial resources necessary to require public agencies to report PLSDs that are not affiliated with the collection system agency.

The justification offered for this change is simply that the State Water Board wants to "get a better picture of" the magnitude of PSLDs and better identify collection systems with "systemic issues" with PSLs.

The Staff Report includes a reference to a study that indicated that the total volume of sewage from private laterals is about 5% of the total volume from SSOs, almost all of which never pose a threat to waters. Requiring public agencies to provide detailed information regarding such a small percentage of overflow volumes from parts of the system over which they have no control is not appropriate and would divert limited staff resources from higher priority issues that actually protect waters.

As to the goal of generating better information regarding PSL spills, we do not believe that the burden of requiring enrollees to report information or face being in noncompliance with the SSS WDR bears a reasonable relationship to the need for the information and the benefits to be obtained. Enrollees reporting spills may be liable to the property owner for errors in reporting, and property owners may claim they are entitled to compensation from the local agency for repair or replacement costs stemming from the reported spill. Under the current voluntary reporting scheme, the enrollee can weigh these factors in deciding whether to report PSL spills or not.

Furthermore, if enrollees are required to report spills whether or not they occur within the enrollee's system, multiple entities (city, county, POTW, etc.) could all be required to report a single PSL spill with potentially differing estimates of volume and other information. Rather than enhance the Board's knowledge base, this will actually lead to greater confusion and require additional resources to sort out and match up the multiple reports.

We recommend that the State Water Board first work with the California Department of Public Health and local environmental health officers to determine if the desired information can be

obtained through mutual agency cooperation. We believe that public health agencies have the best knowledge of overflows from laterals on private property, and are, in most instances, the most appropriate agencies to respond to these events.

3. It is essential that State and Regional Water Board staff consider the reasons for each SSO in any enforcement action.

The existing SSS WDRs included language in Provision D.6 that provided some reassurance that, in the case of an SSO enforcement action, the State and/or Regional Water Board would consider why the SSO might have occurred and to what extent it would have been reasonably possible for the Enrollee to prevent it.

Existing language read: "*In assessing these factors, the State and/or Regional Water Boards will also consider whether...*"

In the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs, this language was changed to read: "*In assessing these factors, the State and/or Regional Water Boards may also consider whether...*"

The proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs would transform the existing enforcement discretion language, which expresses a clear statement of the State Board's intent regarding enforcement priorities and responses, into a purely advisory provision, which individual regional boards are free to follow or ignore as they choose. The factors described in (a) through (g) of Provision D.6 are highly relevant to the Enrollee's efforts to properly manage, operate and maintain its system and these factors should definitely be considered in enforcement actions.

It is imperative that the existing language be retained. Enrollees should not be made to suffer consequences for conditions that are outside their reasonable control.

4. Significant additional Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP) requirements should not be mandated until the State Water Board provides guidance and funding.

The proposed "Risk and Threat Analysis" and "Staff Performance Assessment Program" are vague, not statistically supported, unnecessarily complicated, and overly prescriptive.

The proposed Risk and Threat Analysis of all sanitary sewer assets would be complex and resource-intensive, and would not provide incrementally more benefit than that provided by an otherwise well-operated and managed system. It is not appropriate to require every agency to implement this requirement unless the Water Board can demonstrate that those agencies complying with current requirements have been ineffective in reducing SSOs. This program should also only be required if and when adequate Water Board guidance has been developed and funding is provided.

Requiring development and implementation of the proposed Staff Assessment Program on an agency-by-agency basis is unrealistic. The expectations outlined in the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs suggest that agency staff would be responsible for developing a program similar to the existing Technical Certification Program offered by the California Water Environment

Association, which would require a substantial investment of resources to do redundant work at each agency. It is also not appropriate to require public agencies to train contractors (which are separate, private entities).

The Water Board should not implement these new requirements until detailed program guidance is provided. Also, Water Board staff has not demonstrated that the current training requirements are deficient.

5. SSMP sections (i) and (j) should be combined, because otherwise the requirements for routine review and revisions of the SSMP are redundant and contradictory.

SSMP Section (i) *Performance Targets and Program Modifications* and Section (j) *SSMP Program Audits* both require the Enrollee to evaluate the effectiveness of the SSMP and correct or update the document as necessary. Section (i) indicates that this process is to occur on an annual basis, while Section (j) specifies a minimum frequency of once every two years. We recommend that Water Board staff combine these two sections and clarify the requirements.

The findings include several incorrect statements about PLSDs.

Finding 7 in the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs includes the statement: "SSOs and PLSDs may pollute surface or ground waters, threaten beneficial uses and public health," We disagree that PLSDs are in the same category as SSOs from mainline sewers in terms of water quality impacts. These overflows are very small in volume individually, and overall. The words "...and PLSDs..." should be removed.

Finding 9 in the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs includes the statement: "Major causes of SSOs and PLSDs include but are not limited to: grease blockages, root blockages, debris blockages, sewer line flood damage, manhole structure failures, pipe failures, vandalism, pump station mechanical failures, power outages, excessive storm or ground water inflow/infiltration, sanitary sewer age, construction and related material failures, lack of proper operation and maintenance, insufficient capacity, and contractor-caused damages. Many SSOs and PLSDs can be prevented by having adequate facilities, source control measures, and proper operation and maintenance of the sanitary sewer system." Including PLSDs in these descriptions is incorrect: many of the items on the first list are not causes of PLSDs, and many PLSDs cannot be prevented as described in the second sentence. References to PLSDs should be removed.

Requiring de-chlorination of clean-up water is counter-productive.

Prohibition C.3 indicates that potable water would have to be de-chlorinated before it could be used for spill clean-up (in the event water used for clean-up is not fully recovered). Putting restrictions on the use of potable water in cleaning up an SSO that is otherwise likely to violate either of the first two prohibitions simply adds further unnecessary challenges. In addition, the amount of potable water used, combined with the distance it would have to travel to reach a

surface water (so the chlorine would readily degrade) does not warrant the additional on-site operational difficulty in dechlorination.

It is inappropriate to use incomplete information about PLSDs to characterize sanitary sewer system condition and management.

We do not believe that meaningful statistics could be derived from data collected only for those PLSDs that an agency becomes aware of, and we do not support the idea that Water Board staff would decide that collection systems have "systemic issues" based on these incomplete data sets.

The requirement for Enrollees to report PLSDs they become aware of should be removed from Provision 4.

Provision 8 includes an incorrect assumption regarding sanitary sewer system replacement.

Provision 8 suggests that sanitary sewer systems will need replacing within the timeframe of these WDRs. The reference to "eventual replacement" should be removed because the need to replace sewers is dependent on several factors such as; cleaning frequency required to adequately maintain, type of pipe material, past history of blockages or related issues, flows and capacity rates, and the overall condition of the sewer line. Sewers should not be replaced automatically when they reach a certain age, especially when they are in good condition and functioning as designed. This would not be a good use of limited public resources. For example, the useful life of certain types of high strength plastic pipe has yet to be determined.

Revisions to SSMP requirements are premature.

We are concerned that the proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs include *significant* changes to SSMP program requirements. We strongly urge that the existing SSMP requirements be preserved as in the existing SSS WDRs. As the Staff Report indicates, development and implementation of SSMPs by SSS WDRs enrollees has just been completed and these plans need to be fully implemented so their effectiveness can be properly identified. Further, it is recognized that dramatically changing SSMP requirements before full implementation will likely lead to confusion regarding the SSMP requirements among enrollees, the public, and Water Board staff.

The four-year board re-certification requirement is excessive.

The proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs would also require each agency to bring its SSMP before its governing board for re-certification at a minimum every four years. This frequency is excessive considering that infrastructure projects typically occur over a longer timeframe. We request a re-certification every 5-10 years.

Notification requirements need to be clarified.

We support the Staff Report's indication that only Cal EMA would need to be notified when spills to surface water of any volume occur. However, Paragraph G.4 indicates that Enrollees are

to provide immediate notification of SSOs to the local health officer or the local director of environmental health, contrary to the instructions indicated in Section A of the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the Staff Report. Please clarify that notification shall only to be made to Cal EMA, and indicate that Cal EMA will notify other agencies.

Providing whole SSMPs in an electronic form is not always practical.

Not every agency has their SSMP in one electronic document, and, in many cases, the SSMP makes reference to other documents which may only exist in hard copy form. These issues would make it difficult or impossible for some agencies to provide the whole SSMP in an electronic format.

In general, it is our view that significant proposed revisions to the SSS WDRs are premature and overly burdensome. Implementation of the existing permit has already successfully resulted in reduced impacts of SSOs on surface water. Additional improvements are expected as capital improvements identified under the current permit are completed. It would be frustrating to have invested significant resources in meeting the current requirements only to have them change before our current efforts have come to fruition. We believe that it would be more productive for the Water Board to focus on bringing all agencies into compliance with the current permit rather than initiating sweeping revisions that would apply to all agencies, regardless of compliance history or the effectiveness of current programs.

The City of Encinitas hopes that the State Water Resources Control Board will take these comments under serious consideration.

Sincerely,

Lawrence A. Watt
Director of Public Works