Paula Wilson

From: Lawrence Bennett [l.j.bennett.engineering@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 5:06 PM

To: Paula Wilson

Cc: Lawrence Bennett

Subject: Anti-Degradation Negotiation Rule comment 2

Hi Paula,

After today's (June 2) meeting, I have three additional comments on the proposed rule:

1. on page 2, in Section 052 IMPLEMENTATION paragraphs 04.b.i and ii, I like the wording in paragraph ii and would like to see it expanded and used in both paragraphs. I suggest the following changes (changes shown in bold):

i. **For parameters that are currently limited**, current discharge quality shall be based on design flow and limits in the current permit or license. **For parameters not currently limited,** [words moved from end of sentence] the design flow and measured discharge quality during the most recent three years. No evaluation will be made of parameters for which there are not monitoring data.

ii. **For parameters that are currently limited**, future discharge quality shall be based on design flow and proposed limits. For parameters not limited in the proposed permit or license, future discharge quality will be projected from concentrations measured in the discharge since the last permit or license was issued accounting for any changes in production, treatment, or operation.

2. In paragraph ii, why is the statement: "For parameters not limited in the proposed permit or license, future discharge quality will be projected from concentrations measured in the discharge since the last permit or license was issued accounting for any changes in production, treatment, or operation."? If the parameters are not limited, why are they being analyzed?

3. On page 3, in paragraph 06 Tier II Analysis, subparagraph c.i(1). There is a blank to be filled in for ". . .conditions as of ?date?" It appears that future conditions will be compared to the conditions on a certain date. If some new parameter is considered in the future and there is no sampling data on of before the given date, then it will be impossible to determine insignificance. Would it be better to use the same 3 years of data that is stated in paragraph 052.04?

--
Lawrence J. Bennett, P.E.
Bennett Engineering
348 Provident Drive
Boise, ID 83706
208-343-2466
e-mail: L.J.Bennett.Engineering@gmail.com