

## ATTACHMENT I

### RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY AND CHANGES FOR THE FOLLOWING DRAFT PERMITS

**Mameyes Arriba WTP (PR0025224)**  
**Enrique Ortega WTP (PR0022616)**  
**Añasco WTP (PR0022924)**  
**Vega Baja WTP (PR0024104)**  
**Adjuntas (Garzas) WTP (PR0025739)**  
**Barrio Nuevo WTP (PR0026301)**  
**Lares Nueva (Espino) WTP (PR0026701)**  
**Minillas WTP (PR0026794)**  
**Aguas Buenas WWTP (PR0020273)**  
**Ciales WWTP (PR0020427)**  
**Jayuya WTP (PR0024121)**  
**Ciales WTP (PR0024180)**  
**Mameyes Abajo WTP (PR0025208)**  
**Cayey RWWTP (PR0025536)**  
**Vieques WWTP (PR0025453)**  
**Patillas WTP (PR0025526)**  
**Caguas RWWTP (PR0025976)**  
**Culebra WWTP (PR0026549)**

On **August, 8, 2016**, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for Water Treatments Plants (WTP's) and a Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) owned by the Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority (PRASA) listed above.

According to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §124.17, at the time that any final permit decision is issued under §124.15, EPA shall issue a response to comments. This response shall (1) specify which provisions, if any, of the draft permit have been changed in the final permit decision and the reasons for the change; and (2) briefly describe and respond to all significant comments on the draft permit raised during the public comment period, or during any hearing.

Comments on behalf of PRASA were received from the following addresses:

Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority  
PO Box 7066  
Barrio Obrero Station  
San Juan, PR 00916

All the comments received have been reviewed and considered in this final permit decision. A summary of and response to the comments received follows:

**A. GENERAL COMMENT**

In its comment letter PRASA has raised a number of issues, many of which address inclusion in the permit of conditions contained in the Water Quality Certificate (WQC) issued by EQB.

Response 1:

EPA is providing a generalized response to PRASA's comments which relate to requirements in EQB's WQCs.

Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that there be achieved effluent limitations necessary to assure that a discharge will meet Water Quality Standards (WQS) of the applicable State and Federal laws and regulations where those effluent limitations are more stringent than the technology-based effluent limitations required by Section 301(b)(1)(A) of the CWA. Section 401(a)(1) of the CWA requires that the State certify that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306 and 307 of the CWA. Pursuant to Section 401(d) of the CWA any certification shall set forth any effluent limitations and other limitations, and monitoring requirements necessary to assure that any applicant for a Federal permit will comply with any applicable effluent limitations and other limitations under section 301 or 302 of the CWA, and with any other appropriate requirement of State law set forth in such certification. Also, 40 C.F.R. 122.44(d) requires that each NPDES permit shall include requirements which conform to the conditions of a State Certification under Section 401 of the CWA that meets the requirements of 40 C.F.R. 124.53. Similarly, 40 C.F.R. 124.55 requires that no final NPDES permit shall be issued unless the final permit incorporates the requirements specified in the certification under 124.53.

Concerning the certification requirements in 40 C.F.R. 124.53(e)(1), they specify that all Section 401(a)(1) State certifications must contain conditions which are necessary to assure compliance with the applicable provisions of CWA sections 208(e), 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 and with appropriate requirements of State law.

EQB issued final WQCs certifying that pursuant to Section 401(a)(1) of the CWA, after due consideration of the applicable provisions established under Sections 208(e), 301, 302, 303, 304(e), 306 and 307 of the CWA concerning water quality requirements, there is reasonable assurance that the discharge will not cause violations to the applicable WQs, provided that the effluent limitations set forth in the WQCs are met by the above facility.

The effluent limitations (where more stringent than technology-based effluent limitations), monitoring requirements and other appropriate requirements of State law (including footnotes, Special Conditions, etc.) specified in the final WQC issued by the

EQB were incorporated by EPA into the NPDES permit as required by Section 301(b)(1)(C) and 401(d) of the CWA and the applicable regulations. Therefore, concerns and comments regarding the WQC must be directed to EQB or to the Superior Court.

Also, in the event that EPA receives a revised or modified WQC, we would consider modification of this permit, subject to all applicable federal requirements, to include revised WQC requirements and conditions.

**B. MAMEYES ARRIBA WTOP COMMENTS (PR0025224)**

**1) Comment 1: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** Acronym has been corrected.

**2) Comment 2: Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement indicating the facility does not discharge to an impaired water must be corrected.

**Response:** Statement has been corrected and proper parameter has been added.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitation Table, Color**

EPA must explain why footnote (4) applies to this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, footnote (4) was removed as a requirements of the color parameter.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitation Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

Dashes (---) needs to be included in the “Average monthly” and “Average weekly” columns.

**Response:** Table has been revised accordingly.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitation Table, Nitrogen Total (NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub>, TKN) & Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

These parameters must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes included in the 3 columns there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for these parameter. However, if the parameters need to stay in the permit, in order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.” Also, the word “Monitor” must be included in the Maximum daily column.

**Response:** The dashes in the Maximum daily column for this parameter were a typographical error. The table was revised to read “Monitor”.

The monitoring frequency column will remain as “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitation Table, Total Phosphorous (P)**

Dashes (---) needs to be included in the “Average monthly and “Average weekly” columns.

**Response:** Table has been revised accordingly.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it makes reference to comply “with permit limits for bacterial indicator(s). However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** Footnote (2) has been deleted.

**C. ADJUNTAS WTP COMMENTS (PR0025739)**

**1) Comment 1: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronyms TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**2) Comment 2: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes included in the 3 columns there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter. However, if the parameter needs to stay in the permit, in order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.” Also, the word “Monitor” must be included in the Maximum daily column.

**Response:** The dashes in the Maximum daily column for this parameter were a typographical error. The table was revised to read “Monitor”.

The monitoring frequency column will remain as “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as Total Ammonia which means the concentration of only ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>). However, EQB’s 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) as the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations.” Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>)”.

**Response:** EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

**5) Comment 5: Special Condition, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing**

This item requires that the Permittee conduct Quarterly acute toxicity tests on a 24-hour composite effluent sample. As you now, the NPDES permits for PRASA’s WTPs requires monitoring using only gram samples. That’s the reason why our WTPS has never had an auto sampler, different from our wastewater treatment plants.

Based on the above, PRASA requests that this special condition be modified to require only grab samples in the Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing.

**Response:** This permit does not require composite sample for its toxicity testing.

**D. ENRIQUE ORTEGA WTP COMMENTS (PR0022616)**

**1) Comment 1: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronyms TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**2) Comment 2: Effluent Limitations Table, BOD**

PRASA does not understand why EPA is requiring 24 Hr Composite sample type. This is a filtration facility not a POTW.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The sample type now reads Grab.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Flow**

The reference to footnote (2) must be deleted.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Residual Chlorine**

The maximum daily limitation must be corrected to 11 µg/L which is the amended applicable water quality standards. Please refers to other draft permits and to EQB's WQSR . Also reference to footnote (4) must be added.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, the limit of Residual Chlorine was revised and the footnote were revised.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of "1/Month" must be deleted. The following wording could be used; "1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual". Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: "Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter."

**Response:** The monitoring frequency column will remain "1/Month" in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA's notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as the sum of NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub>. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as "Total Nitrogen (TKN, NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>)".

Also, to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of "1/Month" must be deleted. The following wording could be used; "1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual". Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: "Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter."

**Response:** The name of the parameter was revised. Nevertheless, the monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

This footnote must be delete since it does not apply to any parameter.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

**9) Comment 9: Special Conditions B.1. 14**

This special condition is redundant with the requirements included in Part IV. B.2. Whole effluent Toxicity Testing. To avoid confusion, PRASA requests its deletion.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, the condition was deleted.

**10) Comment 10: Special Conditions B. 2, Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing**

This item requires that the Permittee must conduct Quarterly acute toxicity tests on a 24 hour composite effluent sample. As you know, the NPDES permits for PRASA’s WTPs requires monitoring using only grab samples. That’s the reason why our WTP’s has never had an auto sampler, different form our WWTPS.

**Response:** Condition was revised to require Grab sampling.

**E. AÑASCO WTP COMMENTS (PR0022924)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected thru the entire permit. It is noted that numbering is inconsistent after page 4.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. Page numbering was corrected

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations, 2-Methyl-4,6Dinitrophenol, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Pentachlorophenol, and Total Phosphorous (P)**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.”

**Response:** The monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 4. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations, Sulfates (SO4)**

This parameter does not have a monitoring requirement in the effluent limitations table. Therefore it should be deleted”

**Response:** This was an omission by the permit writer. Based on EQB’s final WQC this parameter should have indicated a monitoring requirement of once a month for a period of one year. This requirement has been added to the final permit.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations, Sulfide (undissociated H2S)**

This parameter was wrongly written. EPA must correct it.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as the sum of NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub>. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as “Total Nitrogen (TKN, NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>)”.

**Response:** The name of the parameter was revised.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Notes, Footnotes and Abbreviations**

Footnote (2) – It must be modified. As written it makes reference to comply “with permit limits for bacterial indicator(s)”. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** Footnote (2) has been eliminated.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations, Special Conditions, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing**

This item requires that the Permittee must conduct Quarterly acute toxicity tests on a 24 hour composite effluent sample. As you know, the NPDES permits for PRASA’s WTPs



requires monitoring using only grab samples. That's the reason why our WTP's has never had an auto sampler, different from our WWTPS.

**Response:** Condition was revised to require Grab sampling.

**F. VEGA BAJA WTP COMMENTS (PR0024104)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym TBELS does not require to have the "S" at the end. The acronym used for the "Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

Waste Load Allocation must be defined.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronym has been defined.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

The symbol greater than or equal must be attached to the effluent lamination to request results higher than or equal to 5.0 mg/L. It should read as > 5.0.

**Response:** The language was revised for clarification purposes.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Flow**

PRASA does not understand why EPA is requiring Monitoring Only for the Average Monthly and Average Weekly columns. This is a filtration facility no a POTW. Therefore, PRASA requests that dashes must be included in both columns.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, dashes were include in both columns.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes included in the 3 columns there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter. However, if the parameter needs to stay in the permit, in order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of "1/Month" must be deleted. The following wording could be used; "1<sup>st</sup> year

Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.” Also, the word “Monitor” must be included in the Maximum daily column.

**Response:** The dashes in the Maximum daily column for this parameter were a typographical error. The table was revised to read “Monitor”.

The monitoring frequency column will remain as “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfide**

Based on EQB’s Final WQC of June 24, 2016 and the reference to footnote (7), EPA must identify correctly this parameter as Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**Response:** Parameter name was revised to read Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**8) Comment 8: Total Dissolved Solids**

Dashes needs to be included in the “Average Monthly” and Average weekly” columns.

**Response:** Dashes were included in both columns as requested by PRASA.

**9) Comment 9: Total Phosphorus**

Dashes needs to be included in the “Average Monthly” and Average weekly” columns.

**Response:** Dashes were included in both columns as requested by PRASA.

**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Nitrogen**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (5), the minimum sampling frequency of 1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1st year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.”

Response: The monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**11) Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table, Whole Effluent Toxicity**

**Dashes needs to be included in the “Average Monthly” and Average weekly” columns.**

**Response:** Dashes were included in both columns as requested by PRASA.

**12) Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (3)**

It must be modified to reference Special Conditions e & f instead of g & h.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The correct reference have been made in the final permit.

**13) Comment 13: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (6)**

It must be modified to reference Special Condition i instead of k.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The correct reference has been made in the final permit.

**G. BARRIO NUEVO COMMENTS WTP (PR0026301)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronyms TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement that indicates that TMDLs have been developed and approved by the EPA for to BOD, Copper and Ammonia does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Reports published by EQB. EPA must revise the statement to indicate the correct parameters. Also WLA must be defined.

**Response:** The language was revised and now states that the TMDL was approved by Fecal Coliform, according to EQB’s 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Report. Also, WLA was defined in this section of the final NPDES permit.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.”

**Response:** The monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

EPA must clarify why footnote (3) apply to this parameter. Also, dashes needs to be included in the Average monthly and Average Weekly columns according to the first footnote that establishes that dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** Footnote (3) does not apply to this parameter, the permit was revised to reflect this. Also, dashes were added to in the Average Monthly and Weekly columns for Dissolved Oxygen.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as Total Ammonia which means the concentration of only ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>). However, EQB’s 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) as the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations.” Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>)”.

**Response:** EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

**H. LARES NUEVA (ESPINO) COMMENTS WTP (PR0026701)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronyms TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads**

The title section is repeated. Also, the acronym WLA must be defined.

**Response:** The language was revised.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes included in the 3 columns there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter. However, if the parameter needs to stay in the permit, in order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.” Also, the word “Monitor” must be included in the Maximum daily column.

**Response:** The dashes in the Maximum daily column for this parameter were a typographical error. The table was revised to read “Monitor”.

The monitoring frequency column will remain as “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Pentachlorophenol**

Dashes needs to be included in the Average Monthly columns.

**Response:** Dashes were included in the final NPDES permit.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

### **7) Comment 7: Special Condition, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing**

This item requires that the Permittee conduct Quarterly acute toxicity tests on a 24-hour composite effluent sample. As you now, the NPDES permits for PRASA's WTPs requires monitoring using only grab samples. That's the reason why our WTPS has never had an auto sampler, different from our wastewater treatment plants.

Based on the above, PRASA requests that this special condition be modified to require only grab samples in the Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing.

**Response:** This permit does not require composite sample for its toxicity testing.

## **I. MINILLAS WTP COMMENTS (PR0026794)**

### **1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

### **2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym TBELS does not require to have the "S" at the end. The acronym used for the "Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

### **3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

### **4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (3)**

It must be modified to reference Special Conditions 7 & 8 instead of 5 &6.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The correct reference have been made in the final permit.

**J. AGUAS BUENAS WTP COMMENTS (PR0020273)**

**1) Comment 1, GENERAL COMMENTS**

Cover Page – The municipality, state and zip code (Aguas Buenas, PR 00703) are repeated.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The address has been corrected.

**2) Comment 2, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronyms TBEL, QBEL and CFR must be defined before they are used. Also the acronym TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQSR)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3, BACKGROUND, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement that indicates that “TMDLs have been developed and approved by EPA for the following parameters: BOD5, Copper and Ammonia” does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b)/303(d) Integrated reports published by the Environmental Quality Board (EQB). EPA must revise the statement to indicate the correct parameters. Also, the acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

**Response:** This was a typographical error and the parameters have been modified. The WLA acronym has been defined.

**4) Comment 4, Public Participation**

EPA must explain the reason to include the following sentence at the end of this section: “There were no comments received during the public comment period.”

**Response:** The Public Participation statement was modified.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, BOD**

“The “Minimum sampling frequency” for the minimum % removal must be modified to “1/Month”. Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as “1/Month”, as established in the others draft permits already issued. The “2/Month” term can be erroneously interpreted that the BOD<sub>5</sub> % removal must be calculated twice in a month.

**Response:** The 2/Month term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made twice in a month and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, TSS**

The “Minimum sampling frequency” for the minimum % removal must be modified to “1/Month”. Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as “1/Month”, as established in the others draft permits already issued. The “2/Month” term can be erroneously interpreted that the TSS % removal must be calculated twice in a month.

**Response:** The 2/Month term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made twice in a month and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

In order to avoid confusion, the following new footnote (8) must be added to clarify the dissolved oxygen limitation: “(8) The Dissolved Oxygen limit is an instantaneous minimum”

**Response:** Footnote 8 was added.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100 ml corresponds to a geometric mean. The following language used in other permits recently issued could be also added to the enterococci’s footnote (4): “This average monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean”.

**Response:** Footnote 4 was modified.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as “Total Ammonia” which means that concentration of only Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) (See plant’s existing permit). However, EQB’s 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN)” as “the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations”. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, NH<sub>3</sub>)”.

**Response:** (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, NH<sub>3</sub>) was added as identification for the parameter Total Ammonia Nitrogen.



**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (4)**

The word “geometric” is repeated. It must be corrected to read as established I EQB’s Final WQC of June 24, 2016: “The enterococci density geometric mean...”

**Responses**: Those were typographical errors and footnote (4) was added.

**11) Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (6)**

It must be modified to read as follows: “See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j of this permit”.

**Responses**: Those were typographical errors and footnote (6) were corrected.

**12) Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (8)**

Based on the previous comment to Dissolved Oxygen the following note must be added: “(8) The Dissolved Oxygen limit is an instantaneous minimum”.

**Responses**: Those were typographical errors and footnotes (8) was added.

**K. CIALES WWTP COMMENTS (PR0020427)**

**1) Comment 1, GENERAL COMMENTS**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response**: Acronym has been corrected.

**2) Comment 2, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronyms TBEL, WQBEL and CFR must be defined before they are used. Also the acronym TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section and the following ones where it is used.

**Response**: Regarding the PRWQS acronym, this was a typographical error. All other acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3, BACKGROUND, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement that indicates that “This facility does not discharge to an impaired water” does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b)/303(d) Integrated Reports published by the Environmental Quality Board (EQB). EPA must revise the statement.

Response: The statement was corrected to say: “This facility **does discharge to an** impaired water.”

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Influent BOD<sub>5</sub> & Influent TSS**

PRASA does not understand why it is required to sampling 1/Week the influent BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS while the effluent is required to monitor 1/Month.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS Influent and Effluent are required to be sampled once per week.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100 ml corresponds to a geometric mean. The following language used in other permits recently issued could be also added to the enterococci’s footnote (2): “This average monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean.”

**Response:** Footnote (2) was revised. The following language was added: “This average monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean.”

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>)**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as “Total Ammonia” which means the concentration of only Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) (See the plant’s existing permit). However, EQB’s 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN)” as the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations”. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be defined as “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) according to EQB’s WQSR.

**Response:** This parameter (Total Ammonia Nitrogen) was revised at the table to include NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. Now it reads as follows: “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>).

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

The beginning of this footnote is confusing and redundant in its language since the word “geometric” is repeated. It must be corrected to read as established in EQB’s Final WQC of June 24, 2016: “The enterococci density geometric mean...”

**Response:** Footnote (2) was revised. The beginning of the Footnote (2) now reads as follows: “The enterococci density geometric mean...” as established in EQB’s Final WQC of June 24, 2016.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (3)**

Footnote 3- the word “indicator(s)” at the end of the footnote must be corrected.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The word “indicator” at the end of the Footnote 3 was corrected.

**L. JAYUYA WTP COMMENTS (PR0024121)**

**1) Comment 1, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** The acronym has been corrected.

**2) Comment 2: Effluent Limitations Table, Flow**

Dashes (--) need to be included in the Average Monthly and Average Weekly columns.

**Response:** The typographical error has been corrected.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent BOD<sub>5</sub>**

The reference to footnote (1) must be moved from the Minimum Sampling Frequency column to the Footnotes column.

**Response:** The typographical error has been corrected.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Color**

Dashes (--) need to be included in the Average Monthly and Average Weekly columns.

**Response:** The typographical error has been corrected.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

The symbol greater than or equal must be attached to the effluent limitation to request results higher than or equal to 5.0 mg/L. Also, in order to avoid confusion, the following footnote must be added to clarify the dissolved oxygen limitation.

“The Dissolved Oxygen limit is an instantaneous minimum.”

**Response:** A footnote has been added to clarify the limitation and the result requirements.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Suspended, Colloidal or Settleable**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three columns (Average Monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum Daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** The Footnote Column references specifies that the parameter has a narrative limitation.

**7) Comment 2: Effluent Limitations Table. Temperature**

PRASA requests that EPA provide the alternative to report this parameter in Celsius degrees as done in other permits.

**Response:** The alternative has been added.

8) **Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table 8.** “Total Ammonia Nitrogen” - This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three columns (Average Monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum Daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised to clarify that a monitoring program has been established for this parameter.

9) **Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table** Total Dissolved Solids” This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three columns (Average Monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum Daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised to clarify that a monitoring program has been established for this parameter.

10) **Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfate**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three columns (Average Monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum Daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised to clarify that a monitoring program has been established for this parameter.

11) **Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table 1, Turbidity**

The reference to footnote (1) must be deleted. This footnote does not apply to turbidity.

**Response:** The typographical error has been corrected.

12) **Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table.** “Whole Effluent Toxicity” - Dashes (--) need to be included in the Average Monthly and Average Weekly columns. Also, the reference to footnote (7) must be deleted. This footnote does not exist.

**Response:** There is no parameter included in the table for the above.

13) **Comment 13: Effluent Limitations May Table, Footnote and Abbreviations.**

**Interim Effluent Limitations** – Not Applicable. PRASA understands that this footnote is unnecessary. It could be confusing since PRASA has negotiated with EPA a Consent Decree (Civil Case No. 3:15-CV-02283 (JAG)) in which the facility is included and for which interim limits were negotiated.

**Response:** The note has been eliminated.

M. **CIALES WTP COMMENTS (PR00324180)**

1) **Comment 1: PERMIT COVER PAGE**

The name of the ward must be corrected to Cordillera Ward.

**Response:** The typographical error, the wared name has been corrected.

2) **Comment 2, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** The acronym has been corrected throughout the permit.

3) **Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

The symbol greater than or equal must be attached to the effluent limitation to request results higher than or equal to 5.0 mg/L. Also, in order to avoid confusion, the following footnote must be added to clarify the dissolved oxygen limitation.

“The Dissolved Oxygen limit is an instantaneous minimum.”

**Response:** A footnote has been added to clarify the limitation and the result requirements.

4) **Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three columns (Average Monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum Daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised to clarify that a monitoring program has been established for this parameter.

5) **Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Temperature**

PRASA requests that EPA provide the alternative to report this parameter in Celsius degrees as done in other permits.

**Response:** The alternative has been added.

**6) Comment: Special Conditions 3, Notes, Footnotes and Abbreviations,**  
PRASA understands that this footnote is unnecessary. It could be confusing since PRASA has negotiated with EPA a Consent Decree (Civil Case No. 3:15-CV-02283 (JAG)) in which the facility is included and for which interim limits were negotiated.

**Response:** The note has been eliminated.

N. **MAMEYES ABAJO WTP (PR0025208)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section and the following ones where it is used.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3, BACKGROUND, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement indicating that “This facility does not discharge to an impaired water” does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b)/303(d) Integrated Reports published by the Environmental Quality Board (EQB). EPA must revise the statement.

**Response:** We do recognize that TMDLs were developed for the Limón River. The language was revised in the final permit to read: “This facility **discharges to** an impaired water. TMDLs have been developed and approved by EPA Fecal Coliforms. The effluent limitations in this permit are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any WLA assigned to the Permittee [40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)].”

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent BOD<sub>5</sub>**

Reference to footnote (5) must be added. The EQB in its Final Water Quality Certificate (WQC) issued on June 24, 2015 added this parameter to the list of parameters with “No Net Addition Limitation” as requested by PRASA on May 26, 2016.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO4)**

This parameter must be deleted from the table. According to the dashes (--) included in the three (3) columns (Average monthly, Average Weekly, Maximum daily) there are no effluent limitations or monitoring for this parameter.

However, if the parameter needs to stay in the permit, in order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4) (e.g. monthly for one (1) year and then annually), the minimum sampling frequency of "1/Month" must be deleted. The following wording could be used; "1<sup>st</sup> yr. Monthly then Annual". Dashes (--) cannot be used since according to the first footnote; "Dashes (--) indicate there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter." Also, the word "Monitor" must be included in the Maximum daily column.

**Response:** The dashes in the Maximum daily column for this parameter were a typographical error. The table was revised to read "Monitor".

The monitoring frequency column will remain as "1/Month" in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA's notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**O. CAYEY RWWTP COMMENTS (PR0025536)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected thru the entire permit. It is noted that the pagination is inconsistent.

**Response:** Page numbering has been corrected

**2) Comment 2, BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The acronym PRWQS used for the "Water Quality Standards Regulation" is incomplete.

**Response:** Acronym has been corrected.

**3) Comment 3, BACKGROUND, Water Quality Certificate**

The date of the Environmental Quality Board's (EQB's) Final Water Quality Certificate (WQC) must be corrected to June 24, 2016.

**Response:** Corrected to reflect EQB's Final WQC issuance date.

**4) Comment 4, BACKGROUND, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement indicating that "This facility does not discharge to an impaired water" does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305 (b)/303(d) Integrated Reports published by EQB.

**Response:** Corrected to reflect a TMDL.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100ml corresponds to a geometric mean.

**Response:** The following statement was added to footnote (2): “This average monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric mean”.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Chromium**

This parameter must be identified as Chromium VI (Cr<sup>+6</sup>).

**Response:** The parameter was identified accordingly.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Copper**

Dashes (--) must be included in the Average monthly and Average Weekly columns.

**Response:** Dashes were added accordingly.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Free Cyanide**

The reference footnote (6) must be corrected to footnote (7).

**Response:** Footnote was corrected.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Dissolved Oxygen**

In order to avoid confusion, the following footnote must be added to clarify the dissolved oxygen limitation: “The Dissolved Oxygen limit is an instantaneous minimum”

**Response:** A footnote has been added.

**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Residual Chlorine**

The maximum daily limitation must be corrected to 11 µg/L as established by EQB in its final WQC of June 24, 2016. Also, the reference to footnote (3) must be deleted and a reference to footnote (5) must be added.

**Response:** Maximum daily limitation and the footnote were corrected.

**11) Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfide**

The reference to footnote (5) must be corrected to footnote (6)

**Response:** Footnote was corrected.



**12) Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates**

The minimum sampling frequency 1/Month must be deleted and/or change to 1/Month first and then 1/Annual.

**Response:** Not granted. The footnote (8), clearly indicates the monitoring frequency.

**13) Comment 13: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia**

The draft WQC of June 24 2015 requires monthly monitoring. PRASA requests that this requirement be changed from 1/Daily to **1/Month** as stated by EQB in the draft WQC.

**Response:** Corrected to reflect EQB's Final WQC issuance date.

**14) Comment 14: Effluent Limitations Table, Notes, Footnotes and Abbreviations Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it makes reference to comply "with permit limits for bacterial indicator(s)". However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** The permit includes Enterococci parameter, for this reason footnote (2) is necessary.

**P. VIEQUES WWTP COMMENTS (PR0025453)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym used for the "Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent BOD5, minimum % removal**

The "Minimum Sampling Frequency" for the minimum % removal must be modified to "1/Month". Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as "1/Month", as established for the parameter of TSS. The "2/Month" term can be erroneously interpreted that the BOD5 % removal must be calculated weekly.

**Response:** The 2/Month term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made twice in a month and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Cyanide**

EPA must explain why footnote (3) applies to this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, the footnote that applies to Cyanide in this permit is footnote (4). The table was revised in the final permit.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100 ml corresponds to a geometric mean, the following language used in other permits recently issued could be also added to the enterococci' footnote (2): "This geometric monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean."

Also, EPA must explain why footnote (4) applies to this parameter.

**Response:** The language on footnote (2) was revised for clarification purposes to read: "The enterococci density geometric mean....".

Footnote (4) was a typographical error, the footnote that applies to Enterococci in this permit is footnote (3). The table was revised in the final permit.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Mercury**

EPA must explain why footnote (3) applies to this parameter.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, the footnote that applies to Mercury in this permit is footnote (4). The table was revised in the final permit.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as the sum of NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub>. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as "Total Nitrogen (TKN, NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>)".

**Response:** EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent TSS, minimum % removal**

The "Minimum Sampling Frequency" for the minimum % removal must be modified to "1/Month". Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as "1/Month", as established for the parameter of TSS. The "2/Month" term can be erroneously interpreted that the TSS % removal must be calculated twice in a month.

**Response:** The 2/Month term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made twice in a month and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Acute Whole effluent Toxicity**

PRASA requests that the maximum daily limit of Monitor be established as done for the other draft permits issued. Special Condition 2.a.4, clearly indicates that there is not acute WET effluent limitation. The 0.3TUa in an acute WET trigger condition not a numerical limit.

**Response:** Water quality based permitting requirements at 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) require EPA and delegated states to evaluate each National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the potential to exceed state numeric or narrative water quality standards, including those for toxics, and to establish effluent limitations for those facilities with the "reasonable potential" to exceed those standards. Federal regulations require both chemical specific limits, based on the state numeric water quality standards or other criteria developed by EPA, and whole effluent toxicity effluent limits if reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards is determined.

EPA examined the results submitted by PRASA for their potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of the Puerto Rico water quality criterion for chronic and acute toxicity. And the results showed that no effluent limitation is needed since the results were greater than 100% survival for acute toxicity, which corresponds to less than 1.0 acute toxic units (TUa). EPA has chosen to continue to require monitoring to ensure that there is no unacceptable toxicity or reasonable potential to exceed the water quality standard of 0.3 TUa. For this reason, we are keeping the WET condition as established in the draft permit. Language in Special Condition 2.a.4 was revised on the final permit.

**10) Comment 10: Footnote (1)**

EPA must re-phrase this footnote since as it is written it can be confused with the plant potable water supply.

**Response:** The language on footnote (1) refers to the Influent parameters, so it refers to municipal water supply influent for BOD and TSS. No revisions are needed at this moment.

**11) Comment 11: Footnote (2)**

The beginning of this footnote is confusing and is redundant in its language since with work geometric is repeated.

**Response:** The language on footnote (2) was revised for clarification purposes to read: "The enterococci density geometric mean....".

**12) Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (3)**

The word indicators at the end of the footnotes must be corrected.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The word “indicator” was spell corrected in the final permit.

**Q. PATILLAS WTP COMMENTS (PR0025526)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected thru the entire permit. Some pages indicated that the document has a total of 12 pages but in others indicate a total of 16 pages.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. Page numbering was corrected

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3, BACKGROUND, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement that indicates that TMDLs have been developed and approved by the EPA for to BOD, Copper and Ammonia does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Reports published by EQB. EPA must revise the statement to indicate the correct parameters. Also WLA must be defined.

**Response:** The language was revised and now states that the TMDL was approved by Fecal Coliform, according to EQB’s 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Report. Also, WLA was defined in this section of the final NPDES permit.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Cyanide, Free (CN)**

Reference to footnote (5) must be added

**Response:** Reference to footnote (5) added.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO4)**

This parameter does not have a monitoring requirement in the effluent limitations table. Therefore it should be deleted”

**Response:** This was an omission by the permit writer. Based on EQB's final WQC this parameter should have indicated a monitoring requirement of once a month for a period of one year. This requirement has been added to the final permit.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S)**

This parameter was wrongly written. EPA must correct it.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The table was revised.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as the sum of NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub>. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as "Total Nitrogen (TKN, NO<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>)".

**Response:** The name of the parameter was revised.

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Turbidity**

The minimum sampling frequency must be corrected from 1/Month to 1/Quarter based on EQB's final water quality certificate.

**Response:** Sampling frequency was modified to 1/Quarter.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Whole Effluent Toxicity**

Dashes (--) needs to be included in the "Average monthly" and "Average weekly" columns.

**Response:** Dashes (--) were added to both columns.

**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Notes, Footnotes and Abbreviations**

It must be modified. As written it makes reference to comply "with permit limits for bacterial indicator(s)". However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** Footnote (2) has been eliminated.

**11) Comment 11: Special Conditions B. 2, Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing**

This item requires that the Permittee must conduct Quarterly acute toxicity tests on a 24 hour composite effluent sample. As you know, the NPDES permits for PRASA's WTPs requires monitoring using only grab samples. That's the reason why our WTP's has never had an auto sampler, different from our WWTPS.

**Response:** Condition was revised to require Grab sampling.

**R. CAGUAS RWWTP COMMENTS (PR0025976)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: Rationale for Permit Requirements.**

The acronym TBELS does not require to have the “S” at the end. The acronym used for the “Puerto Rico Water Quality Standards Regulation (PRWQS)” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to PRWQSR thru the entire permit.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The acronyms have been corrected thru the entire permit.

**3) Comment 3: Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

The statement that indicates that TMDLs have been developed and approved by the EPA for to BOD, Copper and Ammonia does not concur with the Puerto Rico 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Reports published by EQB. EPA must revise the statement to indicate the correct parameters. Also WLA must be defined.

**Response:** The language was revised and now states that the TMDL for Fecal Coliform was also approve according to EQB’s 305(b) / 303 (d) Integrated Report. Also, WLA was defined in this section of the final NPDES permit.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent BOD5, minimum % removal**

The “Minimum Sampling Frequency” for the minimum % removal must be modified to “1/Month”. Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as “1/Month”, as established for the parameter of TSS. The “1/Week” term can be erroneously interpreted that the BOD5 % removal must be calculated weekly.

**Response:** The 1/Week term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made “Weekly” and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100 ml corresponds to a geometric mean, the following language used in other permits recently issued could be added to the enterococci’ footnote (2): “This geometric monthly effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean.”

**Response:** The language on footnote (2) was revised for clarification purposes to read: “The enterococci density geometric mean....”.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Chromium**

In order to avoid confusion PRASA requests that this parameter appear as Chromium VI. EQB regulates in its WQSTR two forms of Chromium. EPA must specify which chromium must be monitored in this plant.

**Response:** EPA understand there is no need for clarification, the parameter was expressed in the draft and final permit as it is in the WQC, Chromium (Cr <sup>+6</sup>). EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfide**

Based on EQB's Final WQC of June 24, 2016 and the reference to footnote (7), EPA must identify correctly this parameter as Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**Response:** Parameter name was revised to read Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as Total Ammonia which means the concentration of only ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>). However, EQB's 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) as the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations." Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as "Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>)".

**Response:** EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Whole Effluent Toxicity**

Dashes needs to be include in the "Average monthly" and "Average weekly" columns.

**Response:** As requested, dashes were included in the "Average monthly" and "Average weekly" columns.

**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.

**11) Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (3)**

The word indicators at the end of the footnotes must be corrected.

**Response:** This was a typographical error. The word “indicator” was spell corrected in the final permit.

**12) Comment 12: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (5)**

This footnote must be deleted. None of the parameters refers to it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly to avoid any confusion. We would like to clarify that the original Footnote (5) could have been left in the final permit, if it was not refer for any of the parameter there was nothing for PRASA to do with the footnote’s request.

**S. CULEBRA WWTP COMMENTS (PR0026549)**

**1) Comment 1: GENERAL**

The page numbering needs to be corrected through the entire permit.

**Response:** The pages in the permit were revised.

**2) Comment 2: PERMIT COVER PAGE**

The word “wart” must be corrected to read as “San Isidro ward...”.

**Response:** This was a typographical error, the word was revised.

**3) Comment 3: BACKGROUND, Intent to Issue a WQC**

This section must be corrected to WQC and the date of the issuance must also be corrected. The acronym PRWQS used is incomplete, EPA must correct to read PRWQSR.

**Response:** The final permit was revised as recommended.

**4) Comment 4: Effluent Limitations Table, Effluent BOD5, minimum % removal**

The “Minimum Sampling Frequency” for the minimum % removal must be modified to “1/Month”. Since this is a calculation (not a sampling) and it is calculated every month, PRASA understands that it must appear as “1/Month”, as established for the parameter of TSS. The “1/Week” term can be erroneously interpreted that the BOD5 % removal must be calculated weekly.

**Response:** The 1/Week term should be interpreted that the calculation should be made “Weekly” and be kept at the plant. This information should be helpful to PRASA in understanding the operation of their facility.

**5) Comment 5: Effluent Limitations Table, Enterococci**

A footnote must be added to clearly indicate that the value of 35 colonies/100 ml corresponds to a geometric mean, the following language used in other permits recently issued could be also added to the enterococci’ footnote (2): “This geometric monthly



effluent limitation is expressed as a geometric (or log) mean.”

**Response:** The language on footnote (2) was revised for clarification purposes to read: “The enterococci density geometric mean....”.

**6) Comment 6: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by the footnote (4), the minimum sampling frequency of “1/Month” must be deleted. The following wording could be used; “1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual”. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.”

**Response:** The monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**7) Comment 7: Effluent Limitations Table, Sulfide**

Based on EQB’s Final WQC of June 24, 2016 and the reference to footnote (7), EPA must identify correctly this parameter as Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**Response:** Parameter name was revised to read Sulfide (undissociated H<sub>2</sub>S).

**8) Comment 8: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Ammonia Nitrogen**

This is a parameter recently modified by EQB in its WQSR amended in May 2016. Previously, this parameter was regulated as Total Ammonia which means the concentration of only ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>). However, EQB’s 2016 WQSR amendments defines the parameter of Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) as the sum of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) concentrations.” Therefore, in order to avoid confusion for the sampling of this parameter, PRASA requests that it be identified as “Total Ammonia Nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>)”.

**Response:** EPA has incorporated this parameter pursuant to the final WQC mandated by EQB. See response to A.1., above.

**9) Comment 9: Effluent Limitations Table, Total Phosphorus**

In order to avoid confusion with the monitoring frequency established by footnote (5), PRASA requests that the minimum sampling frequency of 1/Month be deleted in the alternative, PRASA suggests the use of the following wording; 1<sup>st</sup> year Monthly then Annual. Dashes cannot be used since according to the first footnote: “Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations for monitoring requirements for this parameter.”

**Response:** The monitoring frequency column will remain “1/Month” in the table since the clarification is already in Footnote 3. The suggested language is not part of EPA’s notes for the monitoring frequency column in a NPDES permit.

**10) Comment 10: Effluent Limitations Table, Whole Effluent Toxicity**

Dashes needs to be include in the “Average monthly” and “Average weekly” columns.

**Response:** As requested, dasher were included in the “Average monthly” and “Average weekly” columns.

**11) Comment 11: Effluent Limitations Table, Footnote (2)**

It must be modified. As written it make reference to comply with permit limits for bacterial indicators. However, the permit does not include limitations for bacterial parameters. EPA must clarify or in the alternative, delete it.

**Response:** After consideration, EPA has decided to eliminate this footnote and revised the footnotes numbering accordingly.