RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

APPENDIX G

Questions and Answers on: Antidegradation

APPENDIX G

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS HANDBOOK

SECOND EDITION

SDMS DocID 508453

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of Water
Regulations and Standards
Washington, DC 20460

August 1985

Water

EPA

Questions & Answers on: Antidegradation

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON ANTIDEGRADATION

INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidance on the antidegradation policy component of water quality standards and its application. The document begins with the text of the policy as stated in the water quality standards regulation, 40 CFR 131.12 (40 FR 51400, November 8, 1983), the portion of the Preamble discussing the antidegradation policy, and the response to comments generated during the public comment period on the regulation.

The document then uses a question and answer format to present information about the origin of the policy, the meaning of various terms, and its application in both general terms and in specific examples. A number of the questions and answers are closely related; the reader is advised to consider the document in its entirety, for a maximum understanding of the policy, rather than to focus on particular answers in isolation. While this document obviously does not address every question which could arise concerning the policy, we hope that the principles it sets out will aid the reader in applying the policy in other situations. Additional guidance will be developed concerning the application of the antidegradation policy as it affects pollution from nonpoint sources. Since Congress is actively considering amending the Clean Water Act to provide additional programs for the control of nonpoint sources, EPA will await the outcome of congressional action before proceeding further.

EPA also has available, for public information, a summary of each State's antidegradation policy. For historical interest, limited copies are available of a Compendium of Department of the Interior Statements on Non-Degradation of Interstate Waters, August, 1968. Information on any aspect of the water quality standards program and copies of these documents may be obtained from:

David Sabock, Chief
Standards Branch (WH-585)
Office of Water Regulations and Standards
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M. Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

This document is designated as Appendix A to Chapter 2 - General Program Guidance (antidegradation) of the Water Quality Standards Handbook, December 1983.

James M. Conlon, Acting Director
Office of Water Regulations
and Standards

§ 131.12 Antidegradation policy.

(a) The State shall develop and adopt a statewide antidegradation policy and identify the methods for implementing such policy pursuant to this subpart. The antidegradation policy and implementation methods shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the following:

(1) Existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected.

(2) Where the quality of the waters exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water, that quality shall be maintained and protected unless the State finds, after full satisfaction of the intergovernmental coordination and public participation provisions of the State's continuing planning process, that allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located. In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully. Further, the State shall assure that there shall be achieved the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control.

(3) Where high quality waters constitute an outstanding National resource, such as waters of National and State parks and wildlife refuges and waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance, that water quality shall be maintained and protected.

(4) In those cases where potential water quality impairment associated with a thermal discharge is involved, the antidegradation policy and implementing method shall be consistent with section 316 of the Act.

51402 Federal Register / Vol. 48, No. 217 / Tuesday, November 8, 1983 / Rules and Regulations

Antidegradation Policy

The preamble to the proposed rule discussed three options for changing the existing antidegradation policy. Option 1, the proposed option, provided simply that uses attained would be maintained. Option 2 stated that not only would uses attained be maintained but that high quality waters, i.e. waters with quality better than that needed to protect fish and wildlife, would be maintained (that is, the existing antidegradation policy minus the "outstanding natural resource waters" provision). Option 3 would have allowed changes in an existing use if maintaining that use would effectively prevent any future growth in the community or if the benefits of maintaining the use do not bear a reasonable relationship to the costs.

Although there was support for Option 2, there was greater support for retaining the full existing policy, including the provision on outstanding National resource waters. Therefore, EPA has retained the existing antidegradation policy (Section 131.12) because it more accurately reflects the degree of water quality protection desired by the public, and is consistent with the goals and purposes of the Act.

In retaining the policy EPA made four changes. First, the provisions on maintaining and protecting existing instream uses and high quality waters were retained, but the sentences stating that no further water quality degradation which would interfere with or become injurious to existing instream uses is allowed were deleted. The deletions were made because the terms "interfere" and "injurious" were subject to misinterpretation as precluding any activity which might even momentarily add pollutants to the water. Moreover, we believe the deleted sentence was intended merely as a restatement of the basic policy. Since the rewritten provision, with the addition of a phrase on water quality described in the next sentence, stands alone as expressing the basic thrust and intent of the antidegradation policy, we deleted the confusing phrases. Second, in § 131.12(a)(1) a phrase was added requiring that the level of water quality necessary to protect an existing use be maintained and protected. The previous policy required only that an existing use be maintained. In § 131.12(a)(2) a phrase was added that "In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully". This means that the full use must continue to exist even if some change in water quality may be permitted. Third, in the first sentence of § 131.12(a)(2) the wording was changed from ". . . significant economic or social development . . ." to ". . . important economic or social development. . . ." In the context of the antidegradation policy the word "important" strengthens the intent of protecting higher quality waters. Although common usage of the words may imply otherwise, the correct definitions of the two terms indicate that the greater degree of environmental protection is afforded by the word "important."

Fourth, § 131.12(a)(3) dealing with the designation of outstanding National resource waters (ONRW) was changed to provide a limited exception to the absolute "no degradation" requirement. EPA was concerned that waters which properly could have been designated as ONRW were not being so designated because of the flat no degradation provision, and therefore were not being given special protection. The no degradation provision was sometimes interpreted as prohibiting *any* activity (including temporary or short-term) from being conducted. States may allow some limited activities which result in temporary and short-term changes in water quality. Such activities are considered to be consistent with the intent and purpose of an ONRW. Therefore, EPA has rewritten the provision to read ". . . that water quality shall be maintained and protected," and removed the phrase "No degradation shall be allowed. . . ."

In its entirety, the antidegradation policy represents a three-tiered approach to maintaining and protecting various levels of water quality and uses. At its base (Section 131.12(a)(1)), all existing uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect those uses must be maintained and protected. This provision establishes the absolute floor of water quality in all waters of the United States. The second level (Section 131.12(a)(2)) provides protection of actual water quality in areas where the quality of the waters exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water ("fishable/swimmable"). There are provisions contained in this subsection to allow some limited water quality degradation after extensive public involvement, as long as the water quality remains adequate to be "fishable/swimmable." Finally § 131.23(a)(3) provides special protection of waters for which the ordinary use classifications and water quality criteria do not suffice, denoted "outstanding National resource water." Ordinarily most people view this subsection as protecting and maintaining the highest quality waters of the United States: that is clearly the thrust of the provision. It does, however, also offer special protection for waters of "ecological significance." These are water bodies which are important, unique, or sensitive ecologically, but whose water quality as measured by the traditional parameters (dissolved oxygen, pH, etc.) may not be particularly high or whose character cannot be adequately described by these parameters.

Federal Register / Vol. 48, No. 217 / Tuesday, November 8, 1983 / Rules and Regulations 51409

Antidegradation Policy

EPA's proposal, which would have limited the antidegradation policy to the maintenance of existing uses, plus three alternative policy statements described in the preamble to the proposal notice, generated extensive public comment. EPA's response is described in the Preamble to this final rule and includes a response to both the substantive and philosophical comments offered. Public comments overwhelmingly supported retention of the existing policy and EPA did so in the final rule.

EPA's response to several comments dealing with the antidegradation policy, which were not discussed in the Preamble are discussed below.

Option three contained in the Agency's proposal would have allowed the possibility of exceptions to maintaining existing uses. This option was either criticized for being illegal or was supported because it provided additional flexibility for economic growth. The latter commenters believed that allowances should be made for carefully defined exceptions to the absolute requirement that uses attained must be maintained. EPA rejects this contention as being totally inconsistent with the spirit and intent of both the Clean Water Act and the underlying philosophy of the antidegradation policy. Moreover, although the Agency specifically asked for examples of where the existing antidegradation policy had precluded growth, no examples were provided. Therefore, wholly apart from technical legal concerns, there appears to be no justification for adopting Option 3.

Most critics of the proposed antidegradation policy objected to removing the public's ability to affect decisions on high quality waters and outstanding national resource waters. In attempting to explain how the proposed antidegradation policy would be implemented, the Preamble to the proposed rule stated that no public participation would be necessary in certain instances because no change was being made in a State's water quality standard. Although that statement was technically accurate, it left the mistaken impression that all public participation was removed from the discussions on high quality waters and that is not correct. A NPDES permit would have to be issued or a 208 plan amended for any deterioration in water quality to be "allowed". Both actions require notice and an opportunity for public comment. However, EPA retained the existing policy so this issue is moot. Other changes in the policy affecting ONRW are discussed in the Preamble.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON ANTIDEGRADATION

1. WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY?

The basic policy was established on February 8, 1968, by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior. It was included in EPA's first water quality standards regulation 40 CFR 130.17, 40 FR 55340-41, November 28, 1975. It was slightly refined and repromulgated as part of the current program regulation published on November 8, 1983 (48 FR 51400, 40 CFR §131.12). An antidegradation policy is one of the minimum elements required to be included in a State's water quality standards.

2. WHERE IN THE CLEAN WATER ACT (CWA) IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR AN ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY OR SUCH A POLICY EXPRESSED?

There is no explicit requirement for such a policy in the Act. However, the policy is consistent with the spirit, intent, and goals of the Act, especially the clause "... restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters" (§101(a)) and arguably is covered by the provision of 303(a) which made water quality standard requirements under prior law the "starting point" for CWA water quality requirements.

3. CAN A STATE JUSTIFY NOT HAVING AN ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY IN ITS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS?

EPA's water quality standards regulation requires each State to adopt an antidegradation policy and specifies the minimum requirements for a policy. If not included in the standards regulation of a State, the policy must be specifically referenced in the water quality standards so that the functional relationship between the policy and the standards is clear. Regardless of the location of the policy, it must meet all applicable requirements.

4. WHAT HAPPENS IF A STATE'S ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY DOES NOT MEET THE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS?

If this occurs either through State action to revise its policy or through revised Federal requirements, the State would be given an opportunity to make its policy consistent with the regulation. If this is not done, EPA has the authority to promulgate the policy for the State pursuant to Section 303(c)(4) of the Clean Water Act.

5. WHAT COULD HAPPEN IF A STATE FAILED TO IMPLEMENT ITS ANTI-DEGRADATION POLICY PROPERLY?

If a State issues an NPDES permit which violates the required antidegradation policy, it would be subject to a discretionary EPA veto under Section 402(d) or to a citizen challenge. In addition to actions on permits, any wasteload allocations and total maximum daily loads violating the antidegradation policy are subject to EPA disapproval and EPA promulgation of a new wasteload allocation/total maximum daily load under Section 303(d) of the Act. If a significant pattern of violation was evident, EPA could constrain the award of grants or possibly revoke any Federal permitting capability that had been delegated to the State. If the State issues a §401 certification (for an EPA-issued NPDES permit) which fails to reflect the requirements of the antidegradation policy, EPA will, on its own initiative, add any additional or more stringent effluent limitations required to ensure compliance with Section 301(b)(1)(C). If the faulty §401 certification related to permits issued by other Federal agencies (e.g. a Corp of Engineers Section 404 permit), EPA could comment unfavorably upon permit issuance. The public, of course, could bring pressure upon the permit issuing agency.

6. WILL THE APPLICATION OF THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY ADVERSELY IMPACT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

This concern has been raised since the inception of the antidegradation policy. The answer remains the same. The policy has been carefully structured to minimize adverse effects on economic development while protecting the water quality goals of the Act. As Secretary Udall put it in 1968, the policy serves "...the dual purpose of carrying out the letter and spirit of the Act without interfering unduly with further economic development" (Secretary Udall, February 8, 1968). Application of the policy could affect the levels and/or kinds of waste treatment necessary or result in the use of alternate sites where the environmental impact would be less damaging. These effects could have economic implications as do all other environmental controls.

7. WHAT IS THE PROPER INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM "AN EXISTING USE"?

An existing use can be established by demonstrating that fishing, swimming, or other uses have actually occurred since November 28, 1975, <u>or</u> that the water quality is suitable to allow such uses to occur (unless there are physical problems which prevent the use regardless of water quality). An example of the latter is an area where shellfish are propagating and surviving in a biologically suitable habitat and are available and suitable for harvesting. Such facts clearly establish that shellfish harvesting is an "existing" use, not one dependent oh improvements in water quality. To argue otherwise would be to say that

the only time an aquatic protection use "exists" is if someone succeeds in catching fish.

8. THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS REGULATION STATES THAT "EXISTING USES AND THE LEVEL OF WATER QUALITY NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE EXISTING USES SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED." HOW FULLY AND AT WHAT LEVEL OF PROTECTION IS AN EXISTING USE TO BE PROTECTED IN ORDER TO SATISFY THE ABOVE REQUIREMENT?

No activity is allowable under the antidegradation policy which would partially or completely eliminate any existing use whether or not that use is designated in a State's water quality standards. The aquatic protection use is a broad category requiring further explanation. Species that are in the water body and which are consistent with the designated use (i.e., not aberrational) must be protected, even if not prevalent in number or importance. Nor can activity be allowed which would render the species unfit for maintaining the use. Water quality should be such that it results in no mortality and no significant growth or reproductive impairment of resident species. (See Question 16 for situation where an aberrant sensitive species may exist.) Any lowering of water quality below this full level of protection is not allowed. A State may develop subcategories of aquatic protection uses but cannot choose different levels of protection for like uses. The fact that sport or commercial fish are not present does not mean that the water may not be supporting an aquatic life protection function. An existing aquatic community composed entirely of invertebrates and plants, such as may be found in a pristine alpine tributary stream, should still be protected whether or not such a stream supports a fishery. Even though the shorthand expression "fishable/swimmable" is often used, the actual objective of the act is to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of our Nation's waters (section 101(a)).[1] The term "aquatic life" would more accurately reflect the protection of the aquatic community that was intended in Section 101(a)(2) of the Act.

9. IS THERE ANY SITUATION WHERE AN EXISTING USE CAN BE REMOVED?

In general, no. Water quality may sometimes be affected, but an existing use, and the level of water quality to protect it must be maintained (§131.12(a)(1) and (2) of the regulation). However, the State may limit or not designate such a use if the reason for such action is non-water quality related. For example, a State may wish to impose a temporary shellfishing ban to prevent overharvesting and ensure an abundant population over the long run, or may wish to restrict swimming from heavily trafficked areas. If the State chooses,

---

1/ Note: "Fishable/swimmable" is a term of convenience used in the standards program in lieu of constantly repeating the entire text of Section 101(a)(2) goal of the Clean Water Act. As a short-hand expression it is potentially misleading.

for non-water quality reasons, to limit use designations, it must still adopt criteria to protect the use if there is a reasonable likelihood it will actually occur (e.g. swimming in a prohibited water). However, if the State's action is based on a recognition that water quality is likely to be lowered to the point that it no longer is sufficient to protect and maintain an existing use, then such action is inconsistent with the antidegradation policy.

10. HOW DOES THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE LEVEL OF WATER QUALITY NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE EXISTING USE(S) BE MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED, WHICH APPEARS IN §131.12(a)(1),(2), AND (3) OF THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS REGULATION, ACTUALLY WORK?

Section 131.12(a)(1), as described in the Preamble to the regulation, provides the absolute floor of water quality in all waters of the United States. This paragraph applies a minimum level of protection to all waters. However, it is most pertinent to waters having beneficial uses that are less than the Section 101(a)(2) goals of the Act. If it can be proven, in that situation, that water quality exceeds that necessary to fully protect the existing use(s) and exceeds water quality standards but is not of sufficient quality to cause a better use to be achieved, then that water quality may be lowered to the level required to fully protect the existing use as long as existing water quality standards and downstream water quality standards are not affected. If this does not involve a change in standards, no public hearing would be required under Section 303(c). However, public participation would still be provided in connection with the issuance of a NPDES permit or amendment of a 208 plan. If, however, analysis indicates that the higher water quality does result in a better use, even if not up to the Section 101(a)(2) goals, then the water quality standards must be upgraded to reflect the uses presently being attained (§131.10(i)).

Section 131.12(a)(2) applies to waters whose quality exceeds that necessary to protect the Section 101(a)(2) goals of the Act. In this case, water quality may not be lowered to less than the level necessary to fully protect the "fishable /swimmable" uses and other existing uses and may be lowered even to those levels only after following all the provisions described in §131.12(a)(2). This requirement applies to individual water quality parameters.

Section 131.12(a)(3) applies to so-called outstanding National Resource (ONRW) waters where the ordinary use classifications and supporting criteria are not appropriate. As described in the Preamble to the water quality standards regulation "States may allow some limited activities which result in temporary and short-term changes in water quality," but such changes in water quality should not alter the essential character or special use which makes the water an ONRW. (See also pages 2-14,-15 of the Water Quality Standards Handbook.)

Any one or a combination of several activities may trigger the antidegradation policy analysis as discussed above. Such activities include a scheduled water quality standards review,

the establishment of new or revised wasteload allocations NPDES permits, the demonstration of need for advanced treatment or request by private or public agencies or individuals for a special study of the water body.

11. WILL AN ACTIVITY WHICH WILL DEGRADE WATER QUALITY, AND PRECLUDE AN EXISTING USE IN ONLY A PORTION OF A WATER BODY (BUT ALLOW IT TO REMAIN IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WATER BODY) SATISFY THE ANTIDEGRADATION REQUIREMENT THAT EXISTING USES SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED?

No. Existing uses must be maintained in all parts of the water body segment in question other than in restricted mixing zones. For example, an activity which lowers water quality such that a buffer zone must be established within a previous shellfish harvesting area is inconsistent with the antidegradation policy. (However, a slightly different approach is taken for fills in wetlands, as explained in Question 13.)

12. DOES ANTIDEGRADATION APPLY TO POTENTIAL USES?

No. The focus of the antidegradation policy is on protecting existing uses. Of course, insofar as existing uses and water quality are protected and maintained by the policy the eventual improvement of water quality and attainment of new uses may be facilitated. The use attainability requirements of §131.10 also help ensure that attainable potential uses are actually attained. (See also questions 7 and 10.)

13. FILL OPERATIONS IN WETLANDS AUTOMATICALLY ELIMINATE ANY EXISTING USE IN THE FILLED AREA. HOW IS THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY APPLIED IN THAT SITUATION?

Since a literal interpretation of the antidegradation policy could result in preventing the issuance of any wetland fill permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and it is logical to assume that Congress intended some such permits to be granted within the framework of the Act, EPA interprets §131.12 (a)(1) of the antidegradation policy to be satisfied with regard to fills in wetlands if the discharge did not result in "significant degradation" to the aquatic ecosystem as defined under Section 230.10(c) of the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. If any wetlands were found to have better water quality than "fishable/ swimmable", the State would be allowed to lower water quality to the no significant degradation level as long as the requirements of Section 131.12(a)(2) were followed. As for the ONRW provision of antidegradation (131.(a)(2)(3)), there is no difference in the way it applies to wetlands and other water bodies.

14. IS POLLUTION RESULTING FROM NONPOINT SOURCE ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY?

Nonpoint source activities are not exempt from the provisions of the antidegradation policy. The language of Section 131.12 (a)(2) of the regulation: "Further, the State shall assure that there shall be achieved the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best mangement practices for nonpoint source control" reflects statutory provisions of the Clean Water Act. While it is true that the Act does not establish a regulatory program for nonpoint sources, it clearly intends that the BMPs developed and approved under sections 205(j), 208 and 303(e) be agressively implemented by the States. As indicated in the introduction, EPA will be developing additional guidance in this area.

15. IN HIGH QUALITY WATERS, ARE NEW DISCHARGERS OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ANTIDEGRADATION?

Yes. Since such activities would presumably lower water quality, they would not be permissible unless the State finds that it is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development (Section 131.12(a)(2). In addition the minimum technology based requirements must be met, including new source performance standards. This standard would be implemented through the waste-load and NPDES permit process for such new or expanded sources.

16. A STREAM, DESIGNATED AS A WARM WATER FISHERY, HAS BEEN FOUND TO CONTAIN A SMALL, APPARENTLY NATURALLY OCCURRING POPULATION OF A COLD-WATER GAME FISH. THESE FISH APPEAR TO HAVE ADAPTED TO THE NATURAL WARM WATER TEMPERATURES OF THE STREAM WHICH WOULD NOT NORMALLY ALLOW THEIR GROWTH AND REPRODUCTION. WHAT IS THE EXISTING USE WHICH MUST BE PROTECTED UNDER SECTION 131.12(a)(1)?

Section 131.12(a)(1) states that "Existing instream water uses and level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected." While sustaining a small cold-water fish population, the stream does not support an existing use of a "cold-water fishery." The existing stream temperatures are unsuitable for a thriving cold-water fishery. The small marginal population is an artifact and should not be employed to mandate a more stringent use (true cold-water fishery) where natural conditions are not suitable for that use.

A use attainability analysis or other scientific assessment should be used to determine whether the aquatic life population is in fact an artifact or is a stable population requiring

water quality protection. Where species appear in areas not normally expected, some adaptation may have occurred and site-specific criteria may be appropriately developed. Should the cold-water fish population consist of a threatened or endangered species, it may require protection under the Endangered Species Act. Otherwise the stream need only be protected as a warm water fishery.

17. HOW DOES EPA'S ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY APPLY TO A WATERBODY WHERE A CHANGE IN MAN'S ACTIVITIES IN OR AROUND THAT WATERBODY WILL PRECLUDE AN EXISTING USE FROM BEING FULLY MAINTAINED?

If a planned activity will forseeably lower water quality to the extent that it no longer is sufficient to protect and maintain the existing uses in that waterbody, such an activity is inconsistent with EPA's antidegradation policy which requires that existing uses are to be maintained. In such a circumstance the planned activity must be avoided or adequate mitigation or preventive measures must be taken to ensure that the existing uses and the water quality to protect them will be maintained.

In addition, in "high quality waters", under §131.12(a)(2), before any lowering of water quality occurs, there must be: 1) a finding that it is necessary in order to accommodate important economical or social development in the area in which the waters are located, (2) full satisfaction of all intergovernmental coordination and public participation provisions and (3) assurance that the highest statutory and regulatory requirements and best management practices for pollutant controls are achieved. This provision can normally be satisfied by the completion of Water Quality Management Plan updates or by a similar process that allows for public participation and intergovernmental coordination. This provision is intended to provide relief only in a few extra-ordinary circumstances where the economic and social <u>need</u> for the activity clearly outweighs the benefit of maintaining water quality above that required for "fishable/swimmable" water, and the two cannot both be achieved. The burden of demonstration on the individual proposing such activity will be very high. In any case, moreover, the existing use must be maintained and the activity shall not preclude the maintenance of a "fishable/swimmable" level of water quality protection.

18. WHAT DOES EPA MEAN BY "...THE STATE SHALL ENSURE THAT THERE SHALL BE ACHIEVED THE HIGHEST STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL NEW AND EXISTING POINT SOURCES AND ALL COST EFFECTIVE AND REASONABLE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR NON-POINT SOURCE CONTROL" (§131.12(a)(2)?

This requirement ensures that the limited provision for lowering water quality of high quality waters down to "fish-able /swimmable" levels will not be used to undercut the Clean Water Act requirements for point source and non-point source pollution control. Furthermore, by ensuring compliance

with such statutory and regulatory controls, there is less chance that a lowering of water quality will be sought in order to accommodate new economic and social development.

19. WHAT DOES EPA MEAN BY "...IMPORTANT ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA IN WHICH THE WATERS ARE LOCATED" IN 131.1 2(a)(2)?

This phrase is simply intended to convey a general concept regarding what level of social and economic development could be used to justify a change in high quality waters. Any more exact meaning will evolve through case-by-case application under the State's continuing planning process. Although EPA has issued suggestions on what might be considered in determining economic or social impacts, the Agency has no predetermined level of activity that is defined as "important".

20. IF A WATER BODY WITH A PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY DESIGNATED USE IS, FOR NON-WATER QUALITY REASONS, NO LONGER USED FOR DRINKING WATER MUST THE STATE RETAIN THE PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY USE AND CRITERIA IN ITS STANDARDS?

Under 40 CFR 131.10(h)(1), the State may delete the public water supply use designation and criteria if the State adds or retains other use designations for the waterbodies which have more stringent criteria. The State may also delete the use and criteria if the public water supply is not an "existing use" as defined in 131.3 (i.e., achieved on or after November 1975), as long as one of the §131.10(g) justifications for removal is met.

Otherwise, the State must maintain the criteria even if it restricts the actual use on non-water quality grounds, as long as there is any possibility the water could actually be used for drinking. (This is analogous to the swimming example in the preamble.)

21. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WASTELOAD ALLOCATIONS, TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS, AND THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY?

Wasteload allocations distribute the allowable pollutant loadings to a stream between dischargers. Such allocations also consider the contribution to pollutant loadings from non-point sources. Wasteload allocations must reflect applicable State water quality standards including the antidegradation policy. No wasteload allocation can be develped or NPDES permit issued that would result in standard being violated, or, in the case of waters whose quality exceeds that necessary for the Section 101(a)(2) goals of the Act, can result a lowering of water quality unless the applicable public participation, intergovernmental review and baseline control requirements of the antidegradation policy have been met.

22. DO THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS WHICH ESTABLISH THE PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING THAT WATER QUALITY WHICH EXCEEDS THAT NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE SECTION 101(a)(2) GOAL OF THE ACT MAY BE LOWERED APPLY TO CONSIDERING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE WASTELOAD ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPED FOR THE DISCHARGERS IN THE AREA?

Yes. Section 131.12(a)(2) of the water quality standards regulation is directed towards changes in water quality per se, not just towards changes in standards. The intent is to ensure that no activity which will cause water quality to decline in existing high quality waters is undertaken without adequate public review. Therefore, if a change in wasteload allocation could alter water quality in high quality waters, the public participation and coordination requirements apply.

23. IS THE ANSWER TO THE ABOVE QUESTION DIFFERENT IF THE WATER QUALITY IS LESS THAN THAT NEEDED TO SUPPORT "FISHABLE/SWIMMABLE" USES?

Yes. Nothing in either the water quality standards or the wasteload allocation regulations requires the same degree of public participation or intergovernmental coordination for such waters as is required for high quality waters. However, as discussed in question 10, public participation would still be provided in connection with the issuance of a NPDES permit or amendment of a 208 plan. Also, if the action which causes reconsideration of the existing wasteloads (such as dischargers withdrawing from the area) will result in an improvement in water quality which makes a better use attainable, even if not up to the "fishable/swimmable" goal, then the water quality standards must be upgraded and full public review is required for any action affecting changes in standards. Although not specifically required by the standards regulation between the triennial reviews, we recommend that the State conduct a use attainability analysis to determine if water quality improvement will result in attaining higher uses than currently designated in situations where significant changes in wasteloads are expected (see question 10).

24. SEVERAL FACILITIES ON A STREAM SEGMENT DISCHARGE PHOSPHORUS-CONTAINING WASTES. AMBIENT PHOSPHORUS CONCENTRATIONS MEET CLASS B STANDARDS, BUT BARELY. THREE DISCHARGERS ACHIEVE ELIMINATION OF DISCHARGE BY DEVELOPING A LAND TREATMENT SYSTEM. AS A RESULT, ACTUAL WATER QUALITY IMPROVES (I.E., PHOSPHORUS LEVELS DECLINE) BUT NOT QUITE TO THE LEVEL NEEDED TO MEET CLASS A (FISHABLE/SWIMMABLE) STANDARDS. CAN THE THREE REMAINING DISCHARGERS NOW INCREASE THEIR PHOSPHORUS DISCHARGE WITH THE RESULT THAT WATER QUALITY DECLINES (PHOSPHORUS LEVELS INCREASE) TO PREVIOUS LEVELS?

Nothing in the water quality standards regulation explicitly prohibits this (see answer to questions 10 and 23). Of course, changes in their NPDES permit limits may be subject to non-water quality constraints, such as BPT or BAT, which may restrict this.

25. SUPPOSE IN THE ABOVE SITUATION WATER QUALITY IMPROVES TO THE POINT THAT ACTUAL WATER QUALITY NOW MEETS CLASS A REQUIREMENTS. IS THE ANSWER DIFFERENT?

Yes. The standards must be upgraded (see answer to question 10).

26. AS AN ALTERNATIVE CASE, SUPPOSE PHOSPHORUS LOADINGS GO DOWN AND WATER QUALITY IMPROVES BECAUSE OF A CHANGE IN FARMING PRACTICES, E.G., INITIATION OF A SUCCESSFUL NON-POINT PROGRAM. ARE THE ABOVE ANSWERS THE SAME?

Yes. Whether the improvement results from a change in point or nonpoint source activity is immaterial to how any aspect of the standards regulation operates. Section 131.10(d) clearly indicates that uses are deemed attainable if they can be achieved by "... cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control". Section 131.12(a)(2) of the anti-degradation policy contains essentially the same wording.

27. WHEN A POLLUTANT DISCHARGE CEASES FOR ANY REASON, MAY THE WASTELOAD ALLOCATIONS FOR THE OTHER DISCHARGES IN THE AREA BE ADJUSTED TO REFLECT THE ADDITIONAL LOADING AVAILABLE?

This may be done consistent with the antidegradation policy only under two circumstances: (1) In "high quality waters" where after the full satisfaction of all public participation and intergovernmental review requirements, such adjustments are considered necessary to accomodate important economic or social development, and the "threshold" level requirements are met; or (2) in less than "high quality waters", when the expected improvement in water quality will not cause a better use to be achieved, the adjusted loads still meet water quality standards, and the new wasteload allocations are at least as stringent as technology-based limitations. Of course, all applicable requirements of the Section 402 permit regulations would have to be satisfied before a permittee could increase its discharge.

28. HOW MAY THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS BE SATISFIED?

This requirement may be satisfied in several ways. The State may obviously hold a public hearing or hearings. The State may also satisfy the requirement by providing the opportunity for the public to request a hearing. Activities which may affect several water bodies in a river basin or sub-basin may be considered in a single hearing. To ease the resource burden on both the State and public, standards issues may be combined with hearings on environmental impact statements, water management plans, or permits. However, if this is done, the public must be clearly informed that possible changes in water quality standards are being considered along with other activities. In other words, it is inconsistent with the water quality standards regulation to "back-door" changes in standards through actions on EIS's, wasteload allocations, plans, or permits.

29. WHAT IS MEANT BY THE REQUIREMENT THAT, WHERE A THERMAL DISCHARGE IS INCLUDED, THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH SECTION 316 OF THE ACT?

This requirement is contained in Section 131.12 (a)(4) of the regulation and is intended to coordinate the requirements and procedures of the antidegadation policy with those established in the Act for setting thermal discharge limitations. Regulations implementing Section 316 may be found at 40 CFR 124.66. The statutory scheme and legislative history indicate that limitations developed under Section 316 take precedence over other requirements of the Act.

30. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY, STATE WATER RIGHTS USE LAWS AND SECTION 101(g) OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT WHICH DEALS WITH STATE AUTHORITY TO ALLOCATE WATER QUANTITIES?

The exact limitations imposed by section 101(g) are unclear; however, the legislative history and the courts interpreting it do indicate that it does not nullify water quality measures authorized by CWA (such as water quality standards and their upgrading, and NPDES and 402 permits) even if such measures incidentally affect individual water rights; those authorities also indicate that if there is a way to reconcile water quality needs and water quantity allocations, such accomodation should be be pursued. In other words, where there are alternate ways to meet the water quality requirements of the Act, the one with least disruption to water quantity allocations should be chosen. Where a planned diversion would lead to a violation of water quality standards (either the antidegradation policy or a criterion), a 404 permit associated with the diversion should be suitably conditioned if possible and/or additional nonpoint and/or point source controls should be imposed to compensate.

31. AFTER READING THE REGULATION, THE PREAMBLE, AND ALL THESE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, I STILL DON'T UNDERSTAND ANTIDEGRADATION. WHOM CAN I TALK TO?

Call the Standards Branch at: (202) 245-3042. You can also call the water quality standards coordinators in each of our EPA Regional offices.