California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Francisco Bay Region

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

On the Tentative Order for
Raymond A. Boege Alvarado Wastewater Treatment Plant
Old Alameda Creek Intermittent Wet Weather Discharge

The Regional Water Board received written comments from the Union Sanitary District on a tentative order distributed for public comment. The comments are summarized below in *italics* (paraphrased for brevity) and followed by a staff response. For the full content and context of the comments, please refer to the comment letter. To request a copy of the comment letter, see the contact information provided in Fact Sheet section VIII.G of the Revised Tentative Order.

Revisions are shown with ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and <u>underline</u> for additions.

Comment 1: *The District requests we simplify Provision VI.C.4.c to clarify annual reporting requirements.*

Response
We agree and revised Provision VI.C.4.c of the Tentative Order as follows:

> **Wet Weather Discharge Annual Technical Report.** The Discharger shall submit a summary of all wet weather discharges that occurred during the preceding year in its annual self-monitoring report (see MRP section V.B.2). The Discharger shall include a description of how the Facility was operated to ~~fully optimize operations to~~ minimize the need to discharge to Old Alameda Creek.

Comment 2: *The District has requested Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program certification for Escherichia Coliform Bacteria (E. coli) testing and expects certification by the end of September 2020. However, if that certification is delayed, the District requests the option to demonstrate compliance with the E. coli effluent limitation by using a fecal coliform analysis. Because E. coli is a subset of fecal coliform, fecal coliform results below the E. coli effluent limitation would demonstrate compliance.*

Response
We agree and revised Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) Table E-2, Footnote 2, and Table E-3, Footnote 1, as follows:

> Results may be reported as either MPN/100 mL if the laboratory method used provides results in MPN/100 mL or CFU/100 mL if the laboratory method used provides results in CFU/100 mL. <u>The Discharger may use fecal coliform bacteria monitoring results to evaluate compliance with the Escherichia coliform bacteria effluent limitation until its laboratory is certified to analyze for Escherichia coliform bacteria. If doing so, a fecal coliform bacteria result above the Escherichia coliform bacteria effluent limitation shall be considered a violation of the Escherichia coliform bacteria limitation.</u>

Comment 3: *The District's routine effluent monitoring and reporting are conducted under a separate permit, NPDES Permit No. CA0037869 (currently Order No. R2-2017-0016), that covers discharges to the East Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA) common outfall. The District's required effluent monitoring frequencies for pH and ammonia are higher under the EBDA permit than this Tentative Order. The District requests clarification that these water quality monitoring results do not need to be submitted to the California Integrated Water Quality System database twice.*

Response
We agree and revised Monitoring and Reporting Program Table E-4, Footnote 3, as follows:

> Monitoring and reporting conducted at Monitoring Location EFF-002D in accordance with NPDES Permit No. CA0037869 (for the EBDA common outfall) may be used to satisfy these sampling requirements.

Comment 4: *The District requests that the description of the Hayward Marsh restoration project be corrected for accuracy. The East Bay Regional Parks District plans to restore portions of the marsh to muted (i.e., reduced) tidal action instead of full tidal action.*

Response
We agree and revised Fact Sheet (Attachment F) section II.B, fourth paragraph, as follows:

> Due to the high projected cost of dredging the sediment and the need for continual maintenance, routing wastewater to Hayward Marsh is no longer practical. During this Order term, the East Bay Regional Parks District plans to restore the ~~entire~~ marsh to establish a ~~full~~ tidal connection to San Francisco Bay. Hayward Marsh discharges will be re-routed to the EBDA common outfall, except when peak wet weather capacity constraints require discharge through the wet weather outfall.

Comments 5 and 6: *The District requests that the operational link between the Hayward Marsh outfall and the Old Alameda Creek outfall be clarified. Only Hayward Marsh's wet weather capacity affects the District's discharge frequency to Old Alameda Creek.*

The District also requests revisions clarifying changes to its future flow capacity in the EBDA system. The District's current contract flow capacity with EBDA extends past the Tentative Order's proposed five-year term, and the EBDA member agencies would need to ratify any change in flow capacity.

Response
We agree and revised Fact Sheet section IV.A.1.b as follows:

> **Discharge Prohibition III.B (No discharge except during peak wet weather):** This prohibition ensures that discharges to Old Alameda Creek occur only during peak wet weather when the maximum capacity available in the EBDA pipeline is fully utilized or when exercising the discharge flap gate. When wet weather discharges to Hayward Marsh ~~discharges~~ cease, peak wet weather ~~discharges~~ flows are expected to exceed the available capacity in the EBDA pipeline approximately 3 times per year on average. After plant upgrades (see Fact Sheet section II.E), the

> Discharger's allocated discharge flow to the EBDA common outfall ~~will~~ is anticipated to be reduced from 42.9 MGD to 36 MGD. This lower threshold will reduce the Discharger's wet weather reliance on the EBDA pipeline. …

Comment 7: *The District requests that the description of the hardness calculation better reflect the statistical method used. The receiving water hardness value used is based on an adjusted geometric mean, not the standard geometric mean.*

Response
We agree. We used the adjusted geometric mean to project a representative receiving water hardness value to calculate the applicable freshwater water quality objectives. This method is described in some older, expired orders, including Order No. R2-2005-0008 for the Napa Sanitation District (see Fact Sheet section I.6) and Order No. R2-2003-0072 for the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (see Fact Sheet section II.3). Therefore, we revised Fact Sheet (Attachment F) section IV.C.2.f as follows:

> **Receiving Water Hardness.** Ambient hardness data were used to calculate freshwater water quality objectives that are hardness dependent. The Discharger collected receiving water hardness data between March 2009 and December 2016. Within this data set, eight data points reflect freshwater conditions (salinity less than or equal to 1 ppt). The adjusted geometric mean of these eight data points is 133 mg/L. This value was used to calculate the objectives.

Comment 8: *The District requests that the description of its maximum discharge capacity to the EBDA common outfall be revised to clarify that there is no limitation to the duration of its discharge.*

Response
We agree and revised Fact Sheet section IV.D.1, second paragraph, as follows:

> The first factor is an updated Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement with EBDA and its member agencies that allots 42.9 MGD, on a 3-hour average basis, of capacity in the EBDA outfall pipeline to the Discharger. This new contract is more restrictive than the contract during the previous order term because it limits the Discharger's maximum discharge capacity to a 3-hour average ~~duration~~ value, regardless of the actual hydraulic capacity available in the pipeline. The second factor is the impending loss of the Hayward Marsh outfall, which is owned and operated by the East Bay Regional Parks District. …

Comment 9: *The District requests that we update the Regional Standard Provisions (Attachment G) to reflect the most recent version as seen in the East Bay Municipal Utility District's (EBMUD's) recently published draft permit (NPDES No. CA0037702). The proposed new version includes minor numbering corrections and revisions to the Table B footnotes (e.g., Table B should begin with Footnote 1).*

Response
Table B begins with Footnote 2 because Footnote 1 begins in Attachment G section V.E.2. We are transitioning to a new permit format, which can be observed in EBMUD's draft permit. The

new format has a slightly different footnote numbering convention for Table B than that in the Tentative Order. Besides Footnote 8, there is no substantive difference between the Table B footnotes in the Tentative Order and those in EBMUD's draft permit. Therefore, we revised Footnote 8 in Attachment G Table B as follows:

> [8] ~~Measurement for 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine may use azobenzene as a screen: if azobenzene is measured at >1 ug/l, then the Discharger shall analyze for 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine~~ Detected as azobenzene.

Comment 10: *The District requests correction of minor typographical errors.*

Response

We agree and revised Fact Sheet section IV.B.1 as follows:

> CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting technology-based requirements, at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. …Basin Plan Table 4-2 imposes additional technology-based requirements.

We revised Fact Sheet Table F-5 as follows:

Table F-5. Reasonable Potential Analysis

CTR No.	Pollutants	C or Governing Criterion or Objective (µg/L)	MEC or Minimum MDL (µg/L) [1][2]	B or Minimum MDL (µg/L) [1][2]	RPA Results [3]
1	Antimony	4,300	0.40 DNQ	0.39 DNQ	No
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	4,300	<0.091	<0.095	No
72	4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	No Criteria	<0.11	<0.011	U
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
81	Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	12,000	<0.079	0.48 DNQ	No
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	9.1	<0.12	≤0.12	No
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	No Criteria	<0.14	~~<~~0.45 DNQ	U
84	Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	No Criteria	0.59 DNQ	≤0.090	U
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	0.54	Unavailable	Unavailable	No
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
126	Toxaphene	0.0002	<0.0691	<.072	No