

ATTACHMENT C

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY IN THE FOLLOWING FINAL PERMITS

PRASA Caguas Sur WTP (PR0022888)
PRASA Cain Alto WTP (PR0026204)
PRASA El Duque WTP (PR0022853)
PRASA El Yunque WTP (PR0023931)
PRASA Esperanza WTP (PR0025950)
PRASA Guajataca WTP (PR0025721)
PRASA Guayanilla WWTP (PR0020494)
PRASA Gurabo WWTP (PR0026743)
PRASA Indiera Alta WTP (PR0025194)
PRASA Jagua Pasto WTP (PR0024678)
PRASA Jaguas y Pesas WTP (PR0025968)
PRASA La Boca (Barranquitas) WTP (PR0026595)
PRASA Lajas WTP (PR0020985)
PRASA Maricao WWTP (PR0020648)
PRASA Mayagüez, Ponce de Leon WTP (PR0022900)
PRASA Monte del Estado WTP (PR0022934)
PRASA Peñuelas WTP (PR0020761)
PRASA Ponce WTP (PR0022756)
PRASA Rio Grande Estates WWTP (PR0023264)
PRASA Rucio WTP (PR0025798)
PRASA San Sebastian Old WWTP (PR0020851)
PRASA San Sebastian WTP (PR0023981)
PRASA Unibón WTP (PR0024904)
PRASA Yabucoa, La Pica WTP (PR0022837)
PRASA Yahuecas WTP (PR0026948)
PRASA Yauco WWTP (PR0021661)

On **November 16, 2018**, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for Water Treatments Plants (WTP's) and Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) 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: 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 WQSs, 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. PRASA Caguas Sur WTP (PR0022888)

1) Comment 1; Facility Permit NPDES No.- The number of the NDES permit must be corrected to PR0022888.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (4) & (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(4) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions i of this permit”.

(5) “No Net Addition Limitation”. The title used for this footnote is missing. EPA must include the following title as it did in other permits.

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

C. PRASA Cain Alto WTP (PR0026204)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility’s permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 362, Km 9.6, Guamá Ward
San Germán, PR 00683.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) – The minimum sampling frequency must be modified from 1/Month to 1/Quarter, according to EQB's WQC.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete this footnote must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

D. PRASA El Duque WTP (PR0022853)

1) Comment 1; Facility Permit NPDES No.- The number of the NPDES permit must be corrected to PR0022853.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special

Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) –

the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

E. PRASA El Yunque WTP (PR0023931)

1) Comment 1, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Enterococci – The referenced to footnote (6) must be added. Obviously, the facility does not have control in the removal of this parameter. Any presence of this parameter in the discharge 001 comes from the raw water.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Mercury – Dashes needs to be included in the "Average Monthly" and "Average Weekly" columns according to the first footnote that the establishes that Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Solids and Other Matters & Taste and Odor Producing Substances – These parameters can be deleted form Table A. Usually in the NPDES permits it is not included in Table A since it is included in Part II.B.5.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Zinc – the reference to footnote (5) must be deleted. It applies only to the parameter of Total Phosphorus" which were not include in the existing permit. Zn is already in the permit. The intention of the requirements included in footnote (5) is to gather information through a monitoring program (monthly for the first year of the permit and then annually) for parameters without data, which is not the case of Zn.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: "Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" – The units must be corrected from "TUa" to "%".

Response: This limit and its Special Condition have been deleted from this permit. After evaluation of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) and (4) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit”.

(4) “See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit.”

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

9) Comment 9, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

F. PRASA Esperanza WTP (PR0025950)

1) Comment 1, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) & (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions g and h of this permit".

(5) "No Net Addition Limitation". The title used for this footnote is missing. EPA must include the following title as it did in other permits.

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

G. PRASA Guajataca WTP (PR0025721)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 119, Km 19.1, (Int.) Planas Ward
Isabela, PR 00662.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address). We did add the (Int) language to the facility location.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic

condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit”.

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

H. PRASA Guayanilla WWTP (PR0020494)

1) Comment 1, Background, A. Rationale for Permit Requirements; B. Water Quality Certificate; and D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

Typos were detected in these sections.

Response: The typographical errors have been corrected in the 3 sections of the final permit.

2) Comment 2. PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions. A. Pretreatment

Requirements: (2) Pretreatment Evaluation- The due date of 240 days after identifying a SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user’s final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12)

months (365 days) after identifying a SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA's experience is that 240 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The 365 days is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

(3) Pretreatment Report- In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 256 days to 380 days to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: After careful consideration, EPA has decided not to do an additional modification on the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance.

I. PRASA Gurabo WTP (PR0026743)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 181, Km 25.2 Jardines de Gurabo, Development, Street 1
Mameyes Ward
Gurabo, PR 00778.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Effluent Description: There is a typographical error in the word backwasher.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Outfall longitude: The outfall location must be corrected to read: 65°, 57', 53.94" W.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Enterococci – The referenced to footnote (5) must be added. Obviously, the facility does not have control in the removal of this parameter. Any presence of this parameter in the discharge 001 comes from the raw water.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) and (4) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

(5) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

9) Comment 9, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

J. PRASA Indiera Alta WTP (PR0025194)

1) Comment 1, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: “BOD5” – Dashes needs to be included in the “Average Monthly” and “Average Weekly” columns according to the first footnote that the establishes that Dashes indicate there are no effluent limitations or monitoring requirements for this parameter.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Oil and Grease – This parameter appears twice.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Solids and Other Matters & Taste and Odor Producing Substances – These parameters can be deleted form Table A. Usually in the NPDES permits it is not included in Table A since it is included in Part II.B.5.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) and (4) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit”.

(4) “See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit.”

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

7) CHANGES: Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table and Special Condition for “Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)”

This limit and its Special Condition have been deleted from this permit. After evaluation of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition

K. PRASA Jagua Pasto WTP (PR0024678)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility’s permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 378, Km 7.5, Jagua Pasto Ward
Guayanilla, PR 00656.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address). The zipcode was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) and (4) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

(4) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

L. PLASA Jaguas y Pesas WTP (PR0025968)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated June 2, 2017, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 615, Km 0.2, Pozas Ward
Ciales, PR 00638.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (\geq).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Sulfide – The minimum sampling frequency must be corrected from "1/Month" to "1/Quarter", based on EQB's WQC of November 28, 2018.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Total Dissolved Solids – The minimum sampling frequency must be corrected from "1/Month" to "1/Quarter", based on EQB's WQC of November 28, 2018.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) and (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit".

(5) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition i if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

9) Comment 9, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

10) CHANGES

The minimum sampling frequency for “**Turbidity**” and “**Total Ammonia Nitrogen**” was revised to read “1/Month” as established on EQB’s WQC.

M. PRASA La Boca (Barranquitas) WTP (PR0026595)

1) Comment 1; Effluent Description- There is a typographical error in the word backwasher.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Background, Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): The acronym WLA (Waste Load Allocation) must be defined.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: BOD – 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: These were typographical errors. Dashes were added as appropriate; the final permit was updated.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Color – 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: These were typographical errors. Dashes were added as appropriate; the final permit was updated.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)” and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The units must be corrected from “TUa” to “%”. Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent survival.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete, footnote (3) must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

N. **PRASA Lajas WTP (PR0020985)**

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated April 30, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 315, Int State Road 116, Lajas Ward
Lajas, PR 00667.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address). The zipcode was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: "Solids and Other Matter" and "Taste and Odor Producing Substances" – these parameters can be deleted form Table A. Usually in the NPDES permit it is not included here since it is included in Part II.B.3

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3), (4), and (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

- (3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit".
- (4) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit."
- (5) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition i if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal

Application dated June 2, 2017 shows that the plant's discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of complying with this condition.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

O. PRASA Maricao WWTP (PR0020648)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 357, Km 2.1,
Maricao, PR 00606.

Response: This was a typographical error. The address was updated in the final permit.

2) Comment 2; Outfall Latitude- The outfall location must be corrected to read:

18°, 11', 21" N

Response: This was a typographical error. Final permit was revised.

3) Comment 3; PART I. BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements: EPA must correct a typographical error in the term “Technology Bases Effluent Limitations”. The correct word is “Based”. A snapshot of the section is included below:

Response: This was a typographical error. The word “Bases” was corrected to read “Based” and the final permit updated.

4) Comment 4; Water Quality Certificate: The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements).

Response: This was a typographical error. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated.

5) Comment 5; D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements). EPA must also correct a typographical error in the word “than” in the second sentence. A snapshot of the section is included below:

Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements. The discharge is consistent with the federal anti-degradation provisions at 40 CFR 131.12, 72 *Federal Register* 238 (December 12, 2007, pages 70517-70526), and EQB’s *Anti-Degradation Policy Implementation Procedure* in Attachment A of PRWQS. **Some effluent limitations in this permit are less stringent than those in the previous permit and the rationale for these limitations are provided in the Fact Sheet for this permit. An anti-backsliding analysis has been conducted and EPA has determined that these limitations are consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements at 40 CFR 122.44(l).**

Response: These were typographical errors. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated. The typographical error in the word “than” was corrected.

6) Comment 6; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001

Effluent Limitations Table, “Sulfide” – the name of this parameter is incomplete. The work “undissociated H₂S” must be added in order to avoid confusion with “Sulfide, Total”.

Response: This was a typographical error; final permit was revised.

7) Comment 7; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, "Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)"

The units must be corrected from "TUa" to "%". Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent survival.

Response: The units have been corrected to read LC50% because it is an Acute Toxicity Test. The test should be performed quarterly for the first year as established in the Standard Special Condition B.2.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (5), and (6) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(5) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit".

(6) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition i if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

9) Comment 9; PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions: Pretreatment

a. Pretreatment Requirements

1) Pretreatment Implementation. The term "SIU" must be defined previous to its use (e.g., Significant Industrial User (SIU)).

Response: The term SIU was defined previous to its use. The final permit was updated to reflect this change.

2) Pretreatment Evaluation. The due date of 120 days after identifying an SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user's final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying an SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits' implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA's experience is that 120 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

Response: The language in the final permit was modified to read as follows:

Pretreatment Evaluation. No later than **240** days after identifying an SIU, the Permittee must have completed the evaluation and development process and have in place in the industrial users' final permits technically sound and defensible local limits.

3) Pretreatment Report. – In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 134 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: The term “SIU” was defined at the beginning of the special condition.

After careful consideration, EPA has decided to modify in the final the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance. Final permit has been modified to give 240 days for the Pretreatment Evaluation and 256 for the Pretreatment Report.

P. PRASA Mayagüez, Ponce de Leon WTP (PR0022900)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 108, Km 3.2, Mayaguez Arriba Ward
Mayaguez, PR 00680.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Copper– 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: These were typographical errors. Dashes were added as appropriate; the final permit was updated.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Sulfide – the name of this parameter is incomplete. The work “undissociated H₂S” must be added in order to avoid confusion with “Sulfide, Total”.

Response: This was a typographical error; final permit was revised.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)” and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates January 25, 2018 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) & (4)– the references to Part IV are incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions g and h of this permit”.

(4) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions k of this permit”.

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permits.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

Q. PRASA Monte del Estado WTP (PR0022934)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 366, Km 1.1, Indiera Ward
Maricao, PR 00606.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address). The zipcode was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: "Solids and Other Matter" and "Taste and Odor Producing Substances" – these parameters can be deleted form Table A. Usually in the NPDES permit it is not included here since it is included in Part II.B.3

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3), (4), and (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit".

(4) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit."

(5) "See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition i if this permit."

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

R. PRASA Peñuelas WTP (PR0020761)

1) Comment 1, Facility Name; Background; A. Rationale for Permit Requirements; B. Water Quality Certificate; and D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

Typos were detected in these sections.

Response: The typographical errors have been corrected in the 3 sections of the final permit.

2) Comment 2. PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions. A. Pretreatment Requirements: (2)

Pretreatment Evaluation- The due date of 240 days after identifying a SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user's final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying a SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits' implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA's experience is that 240 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

(3) Pretreatment Report- In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 256 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: After careful consideration, EPA has decided not to do an additional modification on the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance.

S. **PRASA Ponce WTP (PR0022756)**

1) **Comment 1; Facility (location address)**- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 501, Km 1.0, Magueyes Ward
Ponce, PR 00731.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) **Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO)** – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) **Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Flow** – The reference to footnote (4) must be added.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) **Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing** – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates January 25, 2018 shows that eh plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

5) **Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) & (4)**– the references to Part IV are incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

(4) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions j of this permit".

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permits.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnote (5)– the acronym DO must be defined before it’s use. Also, the statement indicating that “The limit must be greater than or equal to 5.0 mg/L” must be revised.

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permits.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

T. PRASA Rio Grande Estates WWTP (PR0023264)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)– According to the facility’s permit renewal application dated April 30, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 3, Km 28, Rio Grande Estates Development Street #19
Rio Grande, PR 00745.

Response: This was a typographical error. The address was updated in the final permit.

2) Comment 2; PART I. BACKGROUND, Rationale for Permit Requirements: EPA must correct a typographical error in the term “Technology Bases Effluent Limitations”. The correct word is “Based”. A snapshot of the section is included below:

Response: This was a typographical error. The word “Bases” was corrected to read “Based” and the final permit updated.

3) Comment 3; Water Quality Certificate: The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements).

Response: This was a typographical error. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated.

4) Comment 4; D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

The acronym PRWQS used for the “Water Quality Standards Regulation” is incomplete. EPA must correct it to “PRWQSR” in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements). EPA must also correct a typographical error in the word “than” in the second sentence. A snapshot of the section is included below:

Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements. The discharge is consistent with the federal anti-degradation provisions at 40 CFR 131.12, 72 *Federal Register* 238 (December 12, 2007, pages 70517-70526), and EQB’s *Anti-Degradation Policy Implementation Procedure* in Attachment A of PRWQS. **Some effluent limitations in this permit are less stringent than those in the previous permit and the rationale for these limitations are provided in the Fact Sheet for this permit. An anti-backsliding analysis has been conducted and EPA has determined that these limitations are consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements at 40 CFR 122.44(l).**

Response: These were typographical errors. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated. The typographical error in the word “than” was corrected.

5) Comment 5; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, “Chromium Hexavalent (Cr⁺⁶)”

The units (ug/L) are missing.

Response: This was a typographical error. The units ug/L were added.

6) Comment 6; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, “Enterococci”

Reference to footnote (7) in Page 3 of 15 must be deleted.

Response: This was a typographical error. The reference to footnote (7) in Page 3 of 15 was deleted. The final permit was updated.

7) Comment 7; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, “Effluent Flow”

Reference to footnote (7) must be added.

Response: Reference to footnote (7) was added. The final permit was updated.

8) Comment 8; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, "Total Phosphorus (P)"

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: These were typographical errors. Dashes were added as appropriate; the final permit was updated.

9) Comment 9; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, "Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)"

The units must be corrected from "TUa" to "%". Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent survival.

Response: The units have been corrected to read LC50% because it is an Acute Toxicity Test. The test should be performed quarterly for the first year as established in the Standard Special Condition B.2.

10) Comment 10; PART IV. STANDARD AN DSPEICAL CONDIONS. B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions: Pretreatment

a. Pretreatment Requirements

1) Pretreatment Implementation. The term "SIU" must be defined previous to its use (e.g., Significant Industrial User (SIU)).

Response: The term SIU was defined previous to its use. The final permit was updated to reflect this change.

2) Pretreatment Evaluation. The due date of 120 days after identifying an SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user's final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying an SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits' implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA's experience is that 120 days is not an adequate

time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

Response: The language in the final permit was modified to read as follows:

Pretreatment Evaluation. No later than **240** days after identifying an SIU, the Permittee must have completed the evaluation and development process and have in place in the industrial users' final permits technically sound and defensible local limits.

3) Pretreatment Report. – In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 134 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: The term “SIU” was defined at the beginning of the special condition.

After careful consideration, EPA has decided to modify in the final the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance. Final permit has been modified to give 240 days for the Pretreatment Evaluation and 256 for the Pretreatment Report.

U. **PRASA Rucio WTP (PR0025798)**

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated February 3, 2017, the complete physical address is as follows:
State Road 3391, Km 4.4, Rucio Ward
Guayanilla, PR 00656.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Copper (Cu) – The maximum daily limitation must be corrected from “4.1” to “**9.3**”, based on EQB's Final WQC of September 10, 2018.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Effluent Flow – There is a discrepancy with the flow included in Part IV Special Condition B.1.a (0.046 vs 0.035).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Turbidity – The minimum sampling frequency

must be corrected from “1/Month” to “1/Quarter”, according to EQB’s Final WQC of September 10, 2018.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “D” and not “C”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

V. PRASA San Sebastián Old WWTP (PR0020851)

1) Comment 1, GENERAL COMMENT - Facility Name: The name of the facility must be corrected to read; San Sebastián **Old** WWTP in the entire permit, in order to avoid confusion with the other WWTP located in the San Sebastián municipality.

Response: Facility name was updated; the final permit was revised.

2) Comment 2, Background; A. Rationale for Permit Requirements; B. Water Quality Certificate; and D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

Typos were detected in these sections.

Response: The typographical errors have been corrected in the 3 sections of the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Sulfates (SO4) – The word Monitor must be included in the “Maximum daily” column. Dashes (--) needs to be included in the Minimum sampling frequency column,

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

The “Minimum Sampling Frequency Column” was revised to read **1/Month** as required in the first year of monitoring.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) – The units must be corrected from “TUa” to “%”. Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent of survival.

Also, there is a discrepancy in the “Minimum sampling frequency” included in Table A and the one included in Part IV.B.2 Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (1/Year vs. **semi-annually**). EPA must clarify. Finally, reference to footnote (10) is made, which brings to confusion regarding the applicability of WET tests.

Response: Test results must be expressed in terms of the percentage of LC₅₀.

The “Minimum sampling frequency” was corrected and footnote (10) was deleted; the final.

5) Comment 5, PART IV STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, Special Conditions, Additional Special Conditions, Whole Effluent Toxicity, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing

This part of the permit indicates again that “this special condition shall not become in effect until EQB has determined the applicability...” As indicated above, EPA must clarify if it is necessary to conduct WET in this WWTP.

Also, there is a discrepancy in the frequency of the tests included in this part of the permit with the one included in Table A Testing (1/Year vs. **semi-annually**). EPA must clarify.

Response: These were typographical errors. Special condition was deleted, and the frequency was corrected; the final permit was revised

6) Comment 6. PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions. A. Pretreatment Requirements:

(2) Pretreatment Evaluation- The due date of 240 days after identifying a SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user’s final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying a SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits’ implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA’s experience is that 240 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and

public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

(3) Pretreatment Report- In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 256 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: After careful consideration, EPA has decided not to do an additional modification on the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance.

W. PRASA San Sebastián WTP (PR0023981)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated April 30, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 119, Km 40.6, Int Road 449
San Sebastian, PR 00685.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address). The zip code was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Arsenic (As) – Dashes need to be included in the "Average Monthly" and "Average Weekly" columns.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: "Solids and Other Matter" and "Taste and Odor Producing Substances" – these parameters can be deleted from Table A. Usually in the NPDES permit it is not included here since it is included in Part II.B.3

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A.

Final Effluent Limitations Table: Total Phosphorus (P) – The word Monitor must be included in the “Maximum daily” column. Dashes (--) needs to be included in the Minimum sampling frequency column,

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3), and (4) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) “See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions e and f of this permit”.

(4) “See Part IV.B.1 Special Condition j if this permit.”

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)” and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring the units must be corrected from “TUa” to “%”. Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent survival.

Response: The units have been corrected to read LC50% because it is an Acute Toxicity Test. The test should be performed quarterly for the first year as established in the Standard Special Condition B.2.

type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of comply with this condition.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter “C” and not “B”.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

9) Comment 9, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

X. PRASA Unibón WWTP (PR0024904)

1) Comment 1; Water Quality Certificate: The acronym PRWQS used for the "Water Quality Standards Regulation" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to "PRWQSR" in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements).

Response: This was a typographical error. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated.

2) Comment 2; Water Quality Certificate: The acronym PRWQS used for the "Water Quality Standards Regulation" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to "PRWQSR" in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements).

Response: This was a typographical error. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated.

3) Comment 3; D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

The acronym PRWQS used for the "Water Quality Standards Regulation" is incomplete. EPA must correct it to "PRWQSR" in this section as it was correctly defined in Section A (Rationale for Permit Requirements). EPA must also correct a typographical error in the word "than" in the second sentence. A snapshot of the section is included below:

Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements. The discharge is consistent with the federal anti-degradation provisions at 40 CFR 131.12, 72 *Federal Register* 238 (December 12, 2007, pages 70517-70526), and EQB's *Anti-Degradation Policy Implementation Procedure* in Attachment A of PRWQS. **Some effluent limitations in this permit are less stringent than those in the previous permit and the rationale for these limitations are provided in the Fact Sheet for this permit. An anti-backsliding analysis**

has been conducted and EPA has determined that these limitations are consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements at 40 CFR 122.44(l).

Response: These were typographical errors. The acronym was corrected, and the final permit updated. The typographical error in the word “than” was corrected.

4) Comment 4; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, “Total Phosphorus”

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: These were typographical errors. Dashes were added as appropriate; the final permit was updated.

5) Comment 5; PART II. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS: Final Effluent Limitations ---Outfall Number 001 Effluent Limitations Table, “Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)”

The units must be corrected from “TUa” to “%”. Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent survival.

Response: The units have been corrected to read LC50% because it is an Acute Toxicity Test. The test should be performed quarterly for the first year as established in the Standard Special Condition B.2.

6) Comment 6; PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITONS, b. Special conditions; 1. Special Conditions from the Water Quality Certificate, Special Conditon m.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA’s comment in the final permit.

7) Comment 7; PART IV. STANDARD AN DSPEICAL CONDIONS. B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions: Pretreatment

a. Pretreatment Requirements

1) Pretreatment Implementation. The term “SIU” must be defined previous to its use (e.g., Significant Industrial User (SIU)).

Response: The term SIU was defined previous to its use. The final permit was updated to reflect this change.

2) Pretreatment Evaluation. The due date of 120 days after identifying a SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user's final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying a SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits' implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA's experience is that 120 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

Response: The language in the final permit was modified to read as follows:

Pretreatment Evaluation. No later than **240** days after identifying a SIU, the Permittee must have completed the evaluation and development process and have in place in the industrial users' final permits technically sound and defensible local limits.

3) Pretreatment Report. – In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 134 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: The term "SIU" was defined at the beginning of the special condition.

After careful consideration, EPA has decided to modify in the final the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance. Final permit has been modified to give 240 days for the Pretreatment Evaluation and 256 for the Pretreatment Report.

Y. PRASA Yabucoa, La Pica WTP (PR0022837)

1) Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 3, Km 99, La Pica Sector, Calabazas Ward
Yabucoa, PR 00767.

Response: In English the ward is not needed as part Facility (location address).

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete, this footnote must be corrected to read as follows:

(3) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions g and h of this permit".

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

Z. PRASA Yahuecas WTP (PR0026948)

Comment 1; Facility (location address)- According to the facility's permit renewal application dated January 25, 2018, the complete physical address is as follows:

State Road 129 and 129 intersection
Adjuntas, PR 00601.

Response: In English the word is not needed as part Facility (location address). We did add the (Int) language to the facility location.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Cyanide, Free (CN) – In order to avoid confusion with Total Cyanide, PRASA requests EPA that the parameter's name be corrected to Cyanide, Free, according to EQB's final WQC.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) – The symbol of less than (<) in the effluent limitation must be changed by the symbol greater than or equal (≥).

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified

according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)" and B. Special Condition 2. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing – The toxicity results obtained during the previous permit cycle which were included in the plants NPDES Permit Renewal Application dates June 2, 2017 shows that the plants discharge is not toxic. PRASA does not understand why EPA is still requiring these tests for this type of facility. Based on this, PRASA requests that this parameter must be deleted for the permits.

Response: After careful consideration of the data provided by PRASA, EPA has decided that PRASA is correct and the effluent of this facility is not toxic. A toxic condition is still in the final permit contingent that EQB notifies us the necessity of complying with this condition.

5) Comment 5, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (3) & (6) – Both footnotes are the same. EPA must delete one of them.

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified.

6) Comment 6, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Notes, Footnotes, and Abbreviations: Footnotes (4) & (5) – the reference to Part IV is incomplete these footnotes must be corrected to read as follows:

(4) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Conditions f and g of this permit".

(5) "See Part IV.B.1. Special Condition j of this permit".

Response: These were typographical errors; the referenced items have been modified

7) Comment 7, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; C. Monitoring Requirements

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "C" and not "B".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

8) Comment 8, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements; D. Monitoring Locations

EPA must correct the letter assigned to this section. It corresponds to the letter "D" and not "C".

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

AA. **PRASA Yauco WWTP (PR0021661)**

1) Comment 1, Background; A. Rationale for Permit Requirements; B. Water Quality Certificate; and D. Antidegradation and Anti-backsliding Requirements.

Typos were detected in these sections.

Response: The typographical errors have been corrected in the 3 sections of the final permit.

2) Comment 2, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Sulfates (SO₄) – The word Monitor must be included in the “Maximum daily” column. Dashes (--) needs to be included in the Minimum sampling frequency column,

Response: The word “Monitor” was included in the Maximum Daily Column; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

The “Minimum Sampling Frequency Column” was revised to read **1/Month** as required in the first year of monitoring.

3) Comment 3, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Total Phosphorus (P) – The word Monitor must be included in the “Maximum daily” column. Dashes (--) needs to be included in the Minimum sampling frequency column,

Response: This was a typographical error; the referenced item has been modified according to PRASA's comment in the final permit.

The “Minimum Sampling Frequency Column” was revised to read **1/Month** as required in the first year of monitoring.

4) Comment 4, Part II. Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements. A. Final Effluent Limitations Table: Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)” – The units must be corrected from “TUa” to “%”. Although it is the maximum toxicity, it is expressed as the minimum percent of survival.

Also, there is a discrepancy in the “Minimum sampling frequency” included in Table A and the one included in Part IV.B.2 Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (1/Year vs. **semi-annually**). EPA must clarify. Finally, reference to footnote (10) is made, which brings to confusion regarding the applicability of WET tests.

Response: The units have been corrected to read LC50% because it is an Acute Toxicity Test. The test should be performed quarterly for the first year as established in the Standard Special Condition B.2.

The “Minimum sampling frequency” was corrected and footnote (10) was deleted.

5) Comment 5. PART IV STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, Special Conditions, Additional Special Conditions, Whole Effluent Toxicity, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing

This part of the permit indicates again that “this special condition shall not become in effect until EQB has determined the applicability...” As indicated above, EPA must clarify if it is necessary to conduct WET in this WWTP.

Also, there is a discrepancy in the frequency of the tests included in this part of the permit with the one included in Table A Testing (1/Year vs. **semi-annually**). EPA must clarify.

Response: These were typographical errors. Special condition was deleted, and the frequency was corrected; the final permit was revised

6) Comment 6. PART IV. STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS, B. Special Conditions, 5. Additional Special Conditions. A. Pretreatment Requirements:

(2) Pretreatment Evaluation- The due date of 240 days after identifying a SIU is not sufficient to complete the entire evaluation to develop specific local limits and have them in place in the industrial user’s final discharge permit. PRASA requests a modification of this condition to provide a schedule of twelve (12) months (365 days) after identifying a SIU to adequately complete the local limits process. PRASA has previously confronted many difficulties with the local limits’ implementation due to the lack of an adequate time to comply with the due process requirements of the Law No. 170 of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRASA’s experience is that 240 days is not an adequate time frame to complete the technical analysis and comply with all the legal and public participation requirements to establish enforceable local limits. The **365 days** is in compliance with the requirement established in the previous format of NPDES permits.

(3) Pretreatment Report- In the same terms as the previous comment, PRASA requests a modification of this condition to change the due date from 256 days to **380 days** to submit a progress report and a written notice of compliance or noncompliance with Part IV(B)(5)(a)(2).

Response: After careful consideration, EPA has decided not to do an additional

modification on the time needed to evaluate specific local limits as well as the timeframe to submit a progress report with the written notice of compliance or non-compliance.