



Department of Public Works  
Larry A. Patterson, P. E., Director

330 West 20th Avenue  
San Mateo, California 94403-1388  
Telephone (650) 522-7300  
FAX: (650) 522-7301  
www.cityofsanmateo.org

August 21, 2012

*Via email:* [commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov)

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



**Subject: Draft Policy for Toxicity Assessment and Control**

Dear Ms. Townsend:

The City of San Mateo (City) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the State Water Resource Control Board's (State Water Board) Draft Policy for Toxicity Assessment and Control (Policy). The City owns and operates the San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), a secondary and advanced secondary wastewater treatment plant, and its conveyance system. The San Mateo WWTP transports and treats domestic, commercial, and industrial wastewater from a service area with a population of approximately 137,000. The City of San Mateo, City of Foster City, City of Hillsborough, City of Belmont and San Mateo County contribute to influent flows to the San Mateo WWTP.

The City appreciates the State Water Board's goal of state-wide consistency in toxicity monitoring and enforcement, as well as the efforts that have already gone into this Policy. However, this Policy, if adopted in its current form, will have significant impacts on our agency. We support the letter submitted by the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies, which comments on region-wide impacts of the Policy, and would like to share our concerns about the specific burdens that will fall on our agency pertaining to increased costs and increased violations.

**Violations based on a single test result.** Permit violations impose significant costs on public agencies such as ours: financially, legally, and in public trust. The current draft policy contains a Maximum Daily Effluent Limit that would assess a permit violation as a result of a single test result. Even though the MDEL involves a higher effect level, our agency believes that the use of a single toxicity test result to assess a permit violation is inappropriate.

The result of a single bioassay is not a conclusive demonstration that a sample is toxic, since there are numerous sources of uncertainty in toxicity testing. EPA guidance and approved methods note the variability and occasional anomalous results inherent in biological testing, and the TST method itself has a built-in allowance for a 5% false positive rate. Analysis of past EPA inter-laboratory

data by the TST method indicates that the false positive rate may be even higher for some test species.

The City strongly recommends that the WET Policy, if it must include numeric effluent limits, include average, median, or other percentile limits that require more than one test result to assess a permit violation.

**Increased costs of routine testing.** We understand that the Policy will result in required monthly chronic toxicity testing, which will increase our frequency from twice per year. This alone will cost at least an additional \$17,765 in laboratory costs over our 5-year permit cycle. These costs assume additional monthly monitoring 3 times per 5-year permit cycle due to the minimal false determination of toxicity rate of 5%, which is built into the TST method.

While the Policy only requires testing at a single concentration, performing additional test replications can help us avoid false determinations of toxicity. If our agency determines that additional replicates are needed to avoid falsely determined violations, then the routine monitoring will cost our agency an additional \$80,764 in laboratory costs over a 5-year permit cycle. Costs for a reference toxicant tests to assure data quality are not included in the Staff Report, and are in addition to this amount.

Savings resulting from termination of acute toxicity testing requirements are not assured by this proposed policy. The Economic Impacts analysis in Appendix H of the Staff report bases a large part of the estimated cost saving on the assumption that acute toxicity will no longer be required. However, since this is ultimately left to the discretion of the Regional Boards, we have to assume that Region 2 could continue to require acute testing. Furthermore, we have already invested significant resources into developing acute toxicity testing capability in-house, so even if the acute toxicity testing is not required, we will not realize the savings described in the Staff report.

**Inconclusive TREs/TIEs.** We are concerned that the Policy fails to differentiate real, persistent toxicity from episodic low-level toxic events and the false determinations of toxicity that are built in to the TST method. Costs associated with conducting Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs) and Toxicity Identification Evaluations (TIEs) can be high and long lasting, as can be the cost associated with unnecessary treatment upgrades in response to false determinations of toxicity.

**Increased costs due to violations.** The cost of increased violations were not considered in the Economic Impacts Analysis in the Staff Report. A major difference between this Policy and how toxicity is currently managed is that exceedences of acute and chronic toxicity limits are Clean Water Act violations subject to State penalties of up to \$10,000 per day or \$10.00 per gallon, and federal penalties of up to \$37,500 per day per violation. The Policy does not dictate over what time period these penalties are assessed. For example, in a worst-case scenario, the penalty could be assessed over the time period of accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE investigations, which is 6 months under the Policy. In addition, our agency would still be subject to third party lawsuit and attorney fee liability, particularly if regulators decide to take no enforcement actions.

The City is concerned that the rate of false determination of toxicity that is built in will lead to a possible violation within the 5-year NPDES permit cycle that is not related to actual toxicity.

The City of San Mateo hopes that the State Water Resources Control Board will take these comments under serious consideration. The additional costs due to the Policy will be burdensome for our agency. Even in the absence of these cost increases, we are concerned about the increase of violations that are corollary to this Policy. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Linda Candelaria', with a large, stylized flourish extending to the right.

Linda Candelaria  
Laboratory Supervisor