

**Reasonable** –identified based on case-specific information. Generally speaking, non-degrading or less-degrading pollution-control alternatives shall be considered reasonable where the costs of such alternatives are affordable.

**affordable** - being within the financial means of most discharges of the same industrial classification (e.g. SIC code), or size for a POTW (major or minor). If a wastewater treatment alternative is not affordable it is not a reasonable alternative for purposes of Tier 2 antidegradation analysis.

**Technologically feasible** – capable of accomplishment as evidenced by prior success under similar circumstances, e.g., technology based effluent limits have been established for a particular facility type, industry standards are in place for a facility, or treatment technologies exist at similar facilities within the state.

**cost-effectiveness** - the cost per unit mass of pollutant removal achieved in wastewater treatment, e.g. dollars per pound; a greater cost per pound means lower cost-effectiveness. In comparing alternative treatment methods, if there is a large jump in cost per unit mass for a relatively small gain in pollutant removal it may be said that the alternative offering greater pollutant removal but at significantly lower cost-effectiveness is not reasonable. Differences of less than 10% in cost per unit mass of pollutant removed may be considered to be the same.