12345

SEP 2006 SWRCB

Executive Ofc.



Leaders of Environmental Responsibility

September 1, 2006

Ms. Song Her, Clerk of the Board State Water Resources Control Board P.O. Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

RE: Comments on Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to

**Stormwater Discharges** 

Dear Ms. Her:

Thank you again to the State Water Resources Control Board for the opportunity to provide comment on the issue of feasibility of numeric effluent limits for stormwater discharges. Our organization participated in and provided comment for the record at the two workshops in Sacramento and Los Angeles. We felt much valuable input and technical expertise was provided during both of those sessions detailing why numeric effluent limits are not appropriate, not feasible and not practical at this time.

With imposition of numeric limits, industrial facilities would become responsible for urban area and highway stormwater runoff and stormwater contributions, including aerial deposition, natural sources, animal waste, irrigation, water residues and other typical urban contributions, beyond their control. From our past experience, in order for a company to comply with the immediate imposition of numeric effluent limits, the only option available is to berm the perimeter of the facility, re-engineer the operations, build capture and treatment systems and then discharge the stormwater to the sanitary sewer system. We feel this is an overly burdensome and very costly method to dispose of urban stormwater runoff with negligible environmental benefit.

Furthermore, there has been no evaluation of the impact of diverting this massive volume of stormwater to sanitary sewers and POTWs (publicly-owned treatment works.) Language excerpted from one of our local wastewater authority's pretreatment ordinance reads as follows:

"Groundwater or surface runoff shall not be discharged to the system except under the authority of a special use discharge permit, which is subject to pretreatment standards and pretreatment requirements."



This is consistent with U.S. EPA's guidance found in EPA's model pretreatment ordinance:

"Specific Prohibitions: No user shall introduce or cause to be introduced into the POTW the following pollutants, substances, or wastewater: . . . stormwater, surface water, ground water, artesian well water, roof runoff, subsurface drainage, swimming pool drainage, condensate, deionized water, noncontact cooling water, and unpolluted wastewater, unless specifically authorized by the Superintendent."

We believe the far better approach, as stated in our workshop comments, is to support the plan put forward by the California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies (CASQA) to incrementally achieve numeric limits over an extended period of time with interim action levels leading to improved BMP performance and stormwater discharge quality.

Our impression at the conclusion of the last workshop in Los Angeles was that much more work needed to be done to identify areas of common ground and concepts for a framework to move forward amongst the diverse stakeholder interests.

In conclusion, we continue to have serious objections to the application of numeric effluent limits on regulated industrial facilities for urban area and highway stormwater runoff and believe an ongoing process is warranted before any decisions are made to institute the use of numeric limits for municipal, construction and industrial permits.

Sincerely,

Patti Krebs

**Executive Director** 

Patti Frebs