

**Draft Technical Support Document:  
Implementing the 2018 Recommended Aquatic  
Life Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum**

**Notice:** This question and answer (Q&A) document is intended to support states and authorized tribes wishing to adopt and implement the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) recommended Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 304(a) *Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum*. Pursuant to 40 CFR 131.11(b), when establishing numeric criteria designed to protect designated uses, states and authorized tribes should base those criteria on (i) 304(a) guidance, (ii) 304(a) guidance modified to reflect site-specific conditions, or (iii) other scientifically defensible methods. States and authorized tribes may also consider other approaches that are not described in this document.

EPA may update this Q&A document as new information becomes available. Also, although this document cites statutes and regulations that contain requirements applicable to water quality standards, it does not impose legally binding requirements on EPA, states, authorized tribes, other regulatory authorities, or the regulated community. EPA, states, authorized tribes, and other decision makers retain the discretion to adopt approaches on a case-by-case basis that differ from those recommended in this document, as appropriate and consistent with statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition to this document, EPA has posted its Response to Comments on the 2017 Draft Aluminum Ambient Water Quality Criteria document and its responses to external peer review reports of the toxicity assessments used to model bioavailability; these documents can be found at the Agency's website for aluminum criteria: <https://www.epa.gov/wqc/aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum>.

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	6
Section 1: Adopting the 2018 Recommended Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum into State or Tribal Water Quality Standards .....	8
1.1. What are EPA’s recommended criteria for aluminum?.....	8
1.2. What flexibility does a state or authorized tribe have when adopting EPA’s recommended aluminum criteria into its state or tribal water quality standards, and what are the advantages and potential challenges of each approach? .....	9
1.3. If a state or authorized tribe adopts a methodology, what additional information should be included in their regulation or implementation documents to support such an approach? .....	13
1.4. If the recommended aluminum criteria are adopted in the form of the Criteria Calculator, how will the public and entities implementing the criteria know what numeric values represent the site-specific criteria for a given waterbody at a given time?.....	14
1.5. How does the adoption of the new aluminum criteria affect site-specific criteria developed using previous guidance? .....	15
1.6. Can a state retain an older version of the state’s aluminum criteria while also adopting the new CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria? .....	15
1.7. Can states/authorized tribes develop their own regionally informed calculators, or modify the Criteria Calculator to reflect regionally important species or situations, rather than using the CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria as is? .....	16
1.8. What methods can be used to derive criteria values that will result in protection of aquatic life at a site, given a range of Criteria Calculator outputs? .....	17
Section 2: Technical Questions on the Criteria Calculator, Sampling and Laboratory Analysis ...	19
2.1. Do the recommended criteria require data for all input parameters be collected concurrently?.....	19
2.2. How can data from continuous monitoring be used with the Criteria Calculator?.....	19
2.3. What are the preferred analytical methods to measure the water quality input parameters required by the Criteria Calculator (pH, total hardness, and DOC)? .....	20
2.4. What are the preferred analytical test methods to measure aluminum in water? .....	21
2.5. What should states and authorized tribes do to ensure data quality for use in the Criteria Calculator? .....	24
2.6. If data are available only for total organic carbon (TOC), can these be converted to dissolved organic carbon (DOC) for use as input to the Criteria Calculator? .....	24
2.7. What information does a single run of the Criteria Calculator provide, and what are the limitations on the output from one set of inputs (single sample)?.....	25
2.8. Can the Criteria Calculator still be used when the ambient data are outside the ranges included in the models used to develop the calculator?.....	25
2.9. How is the multiple linear regression (MLR) technique different from the Biotic Ligand Model (BLM)? .....	26
Section 3: Characterizing Spatial and Temporal Variability of Input Parameters to Develop Protective Criteria Values.....	28

3.1.	How should the <i>site</i> be defined for measuring input parameters to calculate protective numeric criteria values? .....	28
3.2.	How does the definition of a site impact sampling design and number of sampling locations needed to characterize the spatial variability of a site? .....	28
3.3.	How can a sampling plan be developed to capture the range of conditions that affect aluminum bioavailability (hence, toxicity) at a site? .....	29
3.4.	If monitoring shows seasonal differences in data, can seasonal data be separated out to generate seasonal criteria values? .....	31
<b>Section 4: Handling Missing or Insufficient Data When Using the Criteria Calculator .....</b>		<b>32</b>
4.1.	Where can I find additional data to use as inputs to the Criteria Calculator?.....	32
4.2.	Must states and authorized tribes have default input parameters or default criteria values for aluminum? .....	32
4.3.	Would default criteria be overly stringent?.....	33
4.4.	Must states and authorized tribes use EPA ecoregions to develop default criteria values or can they use the state’s own approach? .....	33
<b>Section 5: Implementing the Recommended Aluminum Criteria in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting .....</b>		<b>34</b>
5.1.	When using the Criteria Calculator for permitting (i.e., for reasonable potential analysis (RPA) or for developing WQBELs), how will an NPDES permit writer know what inputs to use?.....	34
5.2.	When using the Criteria Calculator to derive criteria values to use for developing NPDES permits, should the inputs be based on upstream ambient waters, the effluent, or a measured or modeled mix of ambient waters and effluent? .....	34
5.3.	If the state or authorized tribe has adopted the Criteria Calculator or lookup tables, how may a permit writer account for both the most appropriate conditions with respect to receiving water chemistry in deriving appropriate criteria values and “critical conditions” used in reasonable potential determinations and calculating a WQBEL? .....	35
5.4.	Would the recommended aluminum criteria be appropriate for deriving criteria values in effluent-dominated streams?.....	36
5.5.	Can the recommended aluminum criteria be implemented in an NPDES permit for a facility that has not yet started discharging? .....	37
5.6.	To the extent input parameters to the Criteria Calculator vary throughout the year (e.g., seasonally), and thus criteria values may vary, should permit limits also vary? .....	37
5.7.	Does EPA have any recommendations on criteria development at the watershed scale, or the potential for shared data collection and implementation at multiple NPDES facilities located in the same general vicinity? .....	38
<b>Section 6: Implementing the Recommended Aluminum Criteria in Assessments, Listings, and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) .....</b>		<b>39</b>
6.1.	How will assessment and listing staff know what numeric values represent “the criteria” when assessing waters with respect to the recommended aluminum criteria?.....	39
6.2.	How should states and authorized tribes prepare to transition to assess waters based on their new Criteria Calculator-based aluminum criteria, particularly for waters for which input parameter data are unavailable? .....	39
6.3.	If the state or authorized tribe only has data on aluminum in the dissolved form (when the	

criteria are expressed as total recoverable), how does that affect assessment and listing? ..... 39

6.4. How does EPA recommend applying the Criteria Calculator for a water that is impaired with respect to one or more of the input parameters? ..... 40

6.5. When both the water chemistry-dependent criteria and an associated derivation methodology are adopted into WQS which aluminum value should be used to develop TMDLs? 400

6.6. When should states and authorized tribes develop TMDLs based on EPA’s recommended aluminum criteria?..... 41

6.7. Can states and authorized tribes write a TMDL to achieve a presumptive aluminum criteria value that is based on a planned change to one of the input variables? ..... 41

## Introduction

On December 21, 2018, EPA updated its national Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 304(a) recommendations for freshwater aquatic life criteria for aluminum. The 2018 updated recommended criteria supersede EPA's previous 1988 CWA Section 304(a) aluminum criteria recommendations. The 2018 recommended criteria are water chemistry-dependent; this means that different numeric criteria values may be calculated for different waters that have different water chemistry or even at different times or locations within the same water. To calculate aluminum criteria concentration values, EPA developed the recommended Aluminum Criteria Calculator (Criteria Calculator).<sup>1</sup> The numeric outputs of the Criteria Calculator vary depending on the concurrent values for pH, total hardness, and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) at a given site that are entered as *inputs*. The Criteria Calculator *outputs* for a given set of inputs are the numeric values for the acute and chronic criteria that are protective of freshwater aquatic life uses for that unique set of input conditions.

States and authorized tribes have options for adopting aluminum criteria that may be used singly or in combination:

- (1) Adopting by reference to the applicable sections of the CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria document.
- (2) Adopting by reference to the Criteria Calculator [V2.0].
- (3) Adopting the criteria value lookup tables; or,
- (4) Adopting specific ecoregional, statewide, or localized criteria values for aluminum.

This document is intended to provide additional guidance to states and authorized tribes that are interested in implementing EPA's national CWA Section 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria through a state or tribal water quality standards program.

Section 1 describes some of the flexibilities available to states and authorized tribes if they choose to adopt the recommended criteria (or a modified version of the criteria) into state or tribal water quality standards. This section also recommends additional supporting documentation states or authorized tribes should include in their regulation or implementation documents.

Section 2 responds to technical questions about the Criteria Calculator and includes recommendations on water quality sampling and laboratory analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> EPA's CWA Section 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria are based upon multiple linear regression (MLR) models for fish and invertebrate species that use site-specific pH, total hardness, and DOC inputs to quantify the effects of these water chemistry parameters on the toxicity of aluminum to aquatic organisms. The MLR models normalize the available toxicity data to accurately reflect the effects of the site-specific water chemistry on the toxicity of aluminum to tested species. The normalized toxicity test data are then used in the recommended Criteria Calculator to generate protective acute and chronic values for specific ambient water chemistry conditions using EPA's *Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and their Uses*. The Criteria Calculator V2.0 is available in Microsoft Excel and in R on EPA's webpage for the Aquatic Life Criteria for Aluminum in Freshwater: <https://www.epa.gov/wqc/aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum#2018>.

Section 3 provides information to help develop protective criteria values for sites, considering the spatial and temporal variability of input parameters.

Section 4 provides recommendations for when there are insufficient data for pH, total hardness or DOC.

Section 5 provides information for implementing the recommended criteria through National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits.

Section 6 provides information for waterbody assessors who will be implementing the recommended criteria in assessing ambient waters, in determining whether to list waters as not attaining their water quality standards, and in developing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for those listed waters.











Approach to adopting the recommended criteria	Potential Advantages	Potential Challenges
statewide criteria values.	<p>throughout an ecoregion or state. This approach does not require a state to identify site-specific input parameters because the criteria values are the same for all sites within the ecoregion (or state), calculated based on representative water quality parameters for each ecoregion or state.</p> <p>Alternatively, a state or authorized tribe may choose to adopt such criteria as defaults for use in the absence of ambient data. Default criteria may also help to increase transparency of criteria for the public if they are adequately explained. This approach may be used in combination with the Criteria Calculator or lookup tables.</p>	of specific ecoregional or statewide criteria values does not allow for the use of water chemistry data at individual sites for input parameters.

After adopting the aluminum criteria and obtaining EPA’s approval, the state or authorized tribe may derive acute and chronic criteria values (i.e., criteria magnitude values) that correspond to a surface water or an entire geographic area with similar conditions for pH, total hardness, and DOC. EPA recommends that states and authorized tribes adopt criteria that will protect aquatic life over the full range of conditions, including when aluminum is most toxic, throughout the year (i.e., account for the variability of pH, total hardness, and DOC over time). Section 3 on [characterizing spatial and temporal variability of input parameters](#) provides more information about how to derive criteria values that will protect aquatic life throughout the temporal and spatial range of water chemistry conditions at a site, including those conditions when aluminum is most bioavailable (hence, most toxic to aquatic life). Bioavailable aluminum is the toxicologically relevant fraction(s) of aluminum, rather than dissolved aluminum generally. For more discussion on the relevant fractions of aluminum and appropriate analytical methods to measure them, see [Question 2.4](#).

To promote transparent and repeatable outcomes, EPA recommends that states and authorized tribes consider making publicly available the input parameters, along with the calculations and the resulting values for aluminum criteria. A map showing the extent of the site to which the criteria values apply would also be helpful to communicate those criteria values to the public and to the regulated community. States and authorized tribes may also choose to include detailed methods, for example, in an appendix to their water quality standards or in a Continuing Planning Process document, as described in 40 CFR 130.5(b)(6). This provision of the CFR implements CWA Section 303(e) and requires that states











develop aluminum criteria based on the revised deletion process should engage their EPA regional office early in the state's or authorized tribe's criteria development process.

Critical species should be taken into consideration when using the species deletion process. The 2013 revised deletion process document explains that, "A critical species is a resident species that (a) is commercially or recreationally important at the site, or (b) is listed as threatened or endangered under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, or (c) is a species for which there is firm evidence that its loss would yield an unacceptable impact on the site's commercially or recreationally important species, endangered species, abundances of a variety of other species, or structure or function. The species deletion process should not be undertaken unless toxicity data are available for at least one species in each class of aquatic plants or animals that contains a critical species."<sup>16</sup>

For the species deletion process, all species that occur at the site should be considered when deciding what species, if any, could be deleted from the dataset. Species not present at the site may be representative surrogates for other species for which there were no available toxicity data in the development of the Criteria Calculator database. Therefore, states and authorized tribes should consider how to demonstrate that a species (or any species for which that sensitive species might be a surrogate) is not present at the site before applying the species deletion process. States and authorized tribes that wish to develop site-specific aluminum criteria based on the revised deletion process should engage their EPA regional office early in the process. The Criteria Calculator or associated look-up table adopted into rule also would need to be revised to accurately reflect the revision.

States and authorized tribes using the species deletion process must also ensure that the resulting water quality standards "provide for the attainment and maintenance of the water quality standards of downstream waters" (40 CFR 131.10(b)). This requirement can be met in several ways, including using a combination of water quality standards and general policies. Additional information about this requirement can be found in *Protection of Downstream Waters in Water Quality Standards: Frequently Asked Questions*.<sup>17</sup>

## 1.8. What methods can be used to derive criteria values that will result in protection of aquatic life at a site, given a range of Criteria Calculator outputs?

EPA recommends that the criteria for each site be derived in a way that will protect aquatic life throughout the range of seasonal and flow conditions at a site, including those conditions of pH, total hardness, and DOC, when aluminum is most bioavailable (hence, toxic effects are greatest). EPA recommends the following three methods for deriving protective criteria values; states and authorized tribes may choose other scientifically defensible and protective methods, as well. Method 1 entails the greatest amount of input parameter data, and Method 3 involves the least (see below). EPA expects

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 14.

<sup>17</sup> USEPA. 2014. Protection of Downstream Waters in Water Quality Standards: Frequently Asked Questions. EPA 820-F-14-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2018-10/documents/protection-downstream-wqs-faqs.pdf>



conditions, including those under which aluminum is most bioavailable; hence, when toxicity is greatest).

## Section 2: Technical Questions on the Criteria Calculator, Sampling and Laboratory Analysis

### 2.1. Do the recommended criteria require data for all input parameters be collected concurrently?

EPA recommends that samples tested for all of the three input parameters (total hardness, pH, and DOC) to be used in the Criteria Calculator be collected concurrently, when possible. The criteria models incorporate the influence of input parameters, as well as interactions among those parameters and were based mainly on laboratory studies that had a 3x3x3 factorial design where the three parameters were changed for the laboratory tests.<sup>18</sup> However, if concurrent measurements of all three input parameters are not available, default values for DOC may be used.<sup>19</sup> For more information on the use of default input parameters, see [Section 4 for more information on handling missing and insufficient data](#).

### 2.2. How can data from continuous monitoring be used with the Criteria Calculator?

EPA understands that continuous monitoring for pH is more common than continuous monitoring for total hardness or DOC, and pH is more likely to exhibit greater variability over a short time period when compared to total hardness and DOC. The variable nature of pH, throughout a day, season, or year of data collection, raises questions about how continuously collected pH data should be paired with discrete measurements of total hardness and DOC. For example, how would one know whether the grab samples collected for measurement of total hardness or DOC were taken at a time when pH was in a range that would yield protective criteria?

High-quality continuous monitoring data for pH can provide information on when grab samples for total hardness and DOC should be collected to ensure the inputs to the Criteria Calculator generate protective acute and chronic criteria values. The solubility of aluminum varies with pH. Aluminum is most soluble at low and high pH values, and most bioavailable at low and high pH values; therefore, EPA recommends the full range of observed pH values be used when evaluating the Criteria Calculator outputs.<sup>20</sup> When sufficient data for total hardness and DOC are available to characterize the expected spatial and

---

<sup>18</sup> DeForest, D.K., K.V. Brix, L.M. Tear and W.J. Adams. 2018. Multiple linear regression models for predicting chronic aluminum toxicity to freshwater aquatic organisms and developing water quality guidelines. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 37(1): 80-90.

<sup>19</sup> EPA is developing a geospatial tool that will help determine appropriate input parameter estimates. This work is expected to be complete in 2021.

<sup>20</sup> For more information about the Criteria Calculator, please see the Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum 2018, EPA-822-R-18-001, December 2018, <https://www.epa.gov/wqc/2018-final-aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum-freshwater>.

temporal variability, simultaneously collected pH data should be paired with discrete samples to generate a distribution of criteria values (see [Question 1.8](#)).

Selecting a conservative value for pH from the range of observed pH values in a continuous dataset as an input (e.g., low or high pH value depending on the range of pH) and using that value with a conservative total hardness or DOC value may also be acceptable; however, the effects are not linear. In some cases, total hardness can influence the criteria value, such that a higher pH input might produce a lower criteria value with a different hardness concentration (Figure A). In general, a neutral pH produces higher values for the criteria, as do higher concentrations of DOC. However, the precise interaction of the three input parameters can be difficult to predict. For this reason, EPA recommends that a user run a series of input parameters then select the one with the lowest criteria value output by the Criteria Calculator (for  $n < 10$ ) or a low percentile (e.g., 10%) of the criteria values (for  $n > 10$ ). However, a user might decide to input a conservative DOC value in each calculation that included paired pH and total hardness values because the effect of DOC on criteria values is a monotonic reduction of toxicity (Figure B).

Figure A: Model output at constant DOC





Figure B: Model output at constant hardness



### 2.3. What are the preferred analytical methods to measure the water quality input parameters required by the Criteria Calculator (pH, total hardness, and DOC)?

For analysis of pH and total hardness, EPA provides “Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants” at 40 CFR Part 136.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Information on these analytical methods is available at <https://www.epa.gov/cwa-methods/approved-cwa-chemical-test-methods> and <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2017-08-28/pdf/2017-17271.pdf>



As an example of an approach to better measure the biologically available forms of aluminum, research on new analytical methods was published that addresses concerns with total recoverable aluminum concentrations (Rodriguez *et al.* 2019).<sup>25</sup> Under this approach, the analysis does not digest the sample at pH -0.05 to +0.7, but rather to pH 4 in order to measure only the bioavailable fraction of aluminum in the sample. The authors concluded that their proposed method is able to characterize and differentiate chronic toxicity effects attributable to bioavailable aluminum from nontoxic forms of aluminum (i.e., aluminum contained in the crystal lattice of aluminosilicate minerals) compared with existing methods for total or total recoverable aluminum. The methods for total or total recoverable aluminum may overestimate instream toxic effects by virtue of the digestion-induced dissolution of aluminum from clay minerals that would not dissolve in most ambient waters under ambient pH conditions.

EPA expects that an adjusted analytical method (referred to as a bioavailable analytical method) that uses a less aggressive initial acid digestion that liberates bioavailable forms of aluminum (including amorphous aluminum hydroxide) yet that minimizes dissolution of mineralized forms of aluminum (such as aluminosilicate minerals associated with suspended sediment particles) will better estimate the bioavailable fraction of aluminum under natural instream conditions.

The forms of aluminum introduced into the laboratory toxicity tests, upon which EPA relied for development of the CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria, were highly soluble salts of aluminum, rather than clays or other aluminum-containing particulates typically found in natural waters. Aluminum from suspended solids and clays would normally be extracted using total recoverable methods that have a strong acid (pH <2) digestion step but would not be biologically available to aquatic species in natural waters. Empirical laboratory testing indicates that measured concentrations of total recoverable (pH - 0.05 to +0.7 digestion) and bioavailable aluminum in laboratory waters are essentially equal up to approximately 1 mg/L of aluminum.<sup>26</sup> Studies are underway at Oregon State University with test solutions with greater than 1 mg/L of aluminum to better understand the relationship above 1 mg/L. Initial studies indicate there is little difference between “total recoverable” and “bioavailable” aluminum above 1 mg/L in laboratory waters.

EPA does not intend to develop or require a conversion or translation factor to compare field measurements using a bioavailable method against the promulgated aluminum total recoverable criteria. This is because both bioavailable and total recoverable analytical methods quantify the toxic fraction of aluminum equivalently in laboratory test waters given that standard toxicity test waters do not include suspended solids or clays per test protocols.

NPDES permit limits for metals must be expressed as “total recoverable” metals with the exception of specific circumstances that would not apply for aluminum. 40 CFR 122.45(c). This regulation exists because chemical differences between the effluent discharge and the receiving water body are expected to result in changes in the partitioning between dissolved and adsorbed or particulate forms of metals. However, for ambient water measurements, analytical methods that measure bioavailable aluminum

---

<sup>25</sup> Rodriguez PH, Arbildua JJ, Villavicencio G, Urrestarazu P, Opazo M, Cardwell AS, Stubblefield W, Nordheim E, Adams W. 2019. Determination of bioavailable aluminum in natural waters in the presence of suspended solids. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. 38(8):1668-1681.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid.*







- Oregon generated a translator to convert TOC data to DOC data for use with the Copper Biotic Ligand Model using a regression approach. A single statewide translator was developed using state and USGS NWIS data.

## 2.7. What information does a single run of the Criteria Calculator provide, and what are the limitations on the output from one set of inputs (single sample)?

The Criteria Calculator can be run for multiple samples of collected data for pH, total hardness, and DOC (inputs),<sup>30</sup> representing a range of conditions at a site. The samples may be taken from a single site throughout the year or from several different sites within a waterbody (or some combination of data collected over geographical space and time). Each sample would provide one set of input parameters and generate one set of outputs (i.e., the acute and chronic criteria). A single run of the Criteria Calculator could, therefore, provide a distribution of (in the case of the Excel version, up to 500) acute and chronic criteria values (outputs) which would be considered protective for each corresponding input sample. From the distribution of outputs, protective values for acute and chronic criteria may be selected. For more on identifying protective criteria values from a distribution of possible values, see [Question 1.8](#).

As the number of samples of pH, total hardness, and DOC increases, the ability to reliably translate Criteria Calculator outputs to a protective criteria value also increases. A single output of the Criteria Calculator represents one moment in time at a single point and may not adequately characterize the variation in water chemistry for a site throughout the year. The uncertainty associated with a criterion based on only one single set of inputs is not a problem unique to the Criteria Calculator, as other water quality parameters vary spatially and temporally. Running the Criteria Calculator with data from multiple sampling events will yield a distribution of multiple output criteria values, from which a sufficiently protective set of criteria may be selected.

## 2.8. Can the Criteria Calculator still be used when the ambient data are outside the ranges included in the models used to develop the calculator?

Yes, the Criteria Calculator can be used when the ambient data for the input parameters are outside the ranges included in the MLR models. The Criteria Calculator incorporates a data extrapolation to cover a broader range of inputs for pH, and a slightly broader range for hardness. However, the Criteria Calculator does not process input values far outside of the model range. For input values outside the Criteria Calculator range, it will default to the nearest allowable Criteria Calculator input parameter

---

<sup>30</sup> The number of samples the Criteria Calculator can run at a time depends on the format: the Excel version can handle up to 500 samples. The Criteria Calculator is also available in R; both versions are available on EPA webpage for the Recommended Aquatic Life Criteria for Aluminum in Freshwater: <https://www.epa.gov/wqc/aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum#2018>. The R version uses the same formulas and data that are found in the Excel version, but the R code can handle a larger number of parameter inputs and can calculate faster. The R code and data are in an easy-to-download Zip file. They can be found under the “2018 Final Aquatic Life Criteria for Aluminum in Freshwater” header.

value. For example, entering a DOC value of 9.5 mg/L is within the range of the Criteria Calculator input values for DOC, therefore the Criteria Calculator will accept an input of 9.5 mg/L without change. However, an input value of 15 mg/L for DOC will default to an input value of 12 mg/L, the maximum allowable DOC value for the Criteria Calculator. The CWA Section 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria document (see pages xiv-xv)<sup>31</sup> explains the decisions the Agency made regarding the bounds of the input parameter ranges in the Criteria Calculator and its corresponding look-up tables.<sup>32</sup> Table 2, below, summarizes the information from the criteria document and compares the range of values used in the MLR models with the corresponding ranges allowable as inputs to the Criteria Calculator for each input parameter. As discussed in Section 4 of the CWA Section 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria document, the ranges incorporated into the Criteria Calculator will be protective across a broad range of ambient waters found in the United States.

Table 2: Comparison of MLR models and Criteria Calculator input parameters

Input parameter	MLR models range	Criteria Calculator range
pH	6.0 – 8.2	5.0 – 10.5
Total hardness (mg/L)	9.8 – 428	0.01 – 430
Dissolved organic carbon (mg/L)	0.08 – 12.3	0.08 – 12.0

## 2.9. How is the multiple linear regression (MLR) technique different from the Biotic Ligand Model (BLM)?

EPA considered multiple options when developing the national CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria for aluminum, including the Biotic Ligand Model (BLM).<sup>33</sup> Both the BLM and the multiple linear regression (MLR) models are used to estimate the bioavailability – and resultant toxicity – of metals to aquatic species based on water chemistry at a site, including pH, total hardness, and DOC as inputs. The BLM, however, includes an additional seven inputs.

- The BLM, which is a mechanistic model, uses a series of submodels to estimate the capacity of metals to accumulate or bind to active sites on the gills of aquatic organisms. The submodels are

<sup>31</sup> Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum 2018, EPA-822-R-18-001, December 2018, <https://www.epa.gov/wqc/2018-final-aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum-freshwater>.

<sup>32</sup> Two models, one for invertebrates and one for vertebrates, were used to normalize freshwater aluminum toxicity values. These separate models correspond to effects on invertebrates and vertebrates due to differing effects of pH, total hardness, and DOC on aluminum bioavailability and toxicity, and therefore enable the criteria magnitudes to be calculated as a function of the unique chemistry conditions at a given site.

<sup>33</sup> The BLM was formerly referred to as the “gill model.” It is a metal bioavailability model that uses metal speciation across water chemistries and associated binding of a metal to fish gills with associated toxicity, receiving waterbody characteristics and monitoring data to develop site-specific water quality criteria. A BLM model was used to develop the 2007 [CWA 304\(a\) aquatic life criteria recommendation for copper](#).

based on an underlying theory of how overall water chemistry, as defined by the ten input parameters, affects the toxicity of metals.

- The MLR approach used to develop the Criteria Calculator empirically curve-fits log-log pH, total hardness, and DOC relationships (with interaction terms) to the empirical data.

EPA evaluated the use of empirical, non-mechanistic MLR models for aluminum as a bioavailability-based approach for deriving water quality criteria as well as a BLM for aluminum. The Criteria Calculator associated with EPA's 2018 CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria for aluminum uses the MLR approach. Given that the MLR and the BLM approaches performed comparably, EPA decided to use an empirical MLR approach in this aluminum criteria update rather than a BLM due to:

- the relative simplicity and transparency of the MLR model,
- the relative similarity to the available BLM outputs, and
- the decreased number of water chemistry input data parameters needed to derive criteria at different sites.

Under 40 CFR 131.11, states and authorized tribes may use EPA's CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria with modifications or may use other scientifically defensible methods to develop their own criteria. Regardless of the method used, a state or authorized tribe must submit the criteria to EPA for review and approval. EPA's current recommendation, based on the latest scientific knowledge, employs an MLR model. It is possible to use other modeling approaches, such as the BLM, to predict aluminum toxicity and account for the water chemistry parameters that influence toxicity the most.

If presented with proposed aluminum criteria based on a BLM or different approach, EPA would evaluate its scientific basis and protectiveness of the designated use. For additional information and references, see [Section 5.3](#) of the recommended criteria document available at:

<https://www.epa.gov/wqc/2018-final-aquatic-life-criteria-aluminum-freshwater>.

## Section 3: Characterizing Spatial and Temporal Variability of Input Parameters to Develop Protective Criteria Values

### 3.1. How should the *site* be defined for measuring input parameters to calculate protective numeric criteria values?

A *site* may be a state, region, watershed, segment of a waterbody, category of water (e.g., cold-water lakes), etc., but the criteria are to be derived to provide adequate protection for the entire site regardless of how the site is defined. A site could also be a facility mixing zone, an assessment unit, a watershed, or any spatial area that a state or authorized tribe has data to represent.

When defining a site, states and authorized tribes should consider the following:

- How the site definition will facilitate developing criteria values that are protective of the range of conditions expected to occur within the defined site.
- How the site definition will capture significant influences on water chemistry.
- How the size or spatial variability of the site can impact the number of water samples required to adequately characterize the spatial and temporal variability of a site.
- How to communicate a clear definition of the site's area or condition for which the criteria values apply.
- How, if at all, the site definition differs depending on the intended CWA program (e.g., is the receiving water site of a NPDES permit discharge location different from the assessment unit site?).

Regardless of how the "site" is defined, pursuant to 40 CFR 131.10(b), states and authorized tribes must consider downstream water quality standards when establishing protective criteria in upstream waters. For additional information on site-specific water quality criteria, see 40 CFR 131.10(b) and chapter 3 of EPA's *Water Quality Standards Handbook*.<sup>34</sup>

### 3.2. How does the definition of a site impact sampling design and number of sampling locations needed to characterize the spatial variability of a site?

The number of sampling locations needed to characterize spatial variability at a site will vary with physical and chemical characteristics of the site. Samples should be collected from enough locations so that the resulting dataset captures the expected spatial variability in pH, total hardness, and DOC of the site, based on the observed range of physical and chemical conditions.

When designing a sampling plan to develop inputs for the Criteria Calculator, unique characteristics of a waterbody segment should be considered such as size, flow, and presence of springs, tributaries, and outfalls. States and authorized tribes may also want to consider differences in hydrology, geology, eco-

---

<sup>34</sup> USEPA. 1994. Water Quality Criteria. Chapter 3 in *Water Quality Standards Handbook*. EPA 823-B-94-005a. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. <https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/water-quality-standards-handbook>.

region, watershed land use (e.g., urban, forested, cultivated, wetlands), trophic state (i.e., level of biological activity in the waterbody), and riparian condition within and among sites to inform decisions on the number of sampling locations needed. For example, land use within the watershed, the trophic state, and presence of discharges from a wastewater treatment plant can all influence the variability in concentrations of any of the input parameters.

Generally, relatively large or heterogeneous waterbodies will require more sampling locations to characterize the spatial variability, as compared to the number of sampling locations required to characterize small or homogenous systems. When a wide range of characteristics or water quality conditions is observed in a large waterbody, states and authorized tribes may consider dividing the waterbody into smaller segments or sites for purposes of establishing input values for the Criteria Calculator.

States or authorized tribes considering use of existing or new data for the development of default numeric values over larger geographic scales should evaluate existing data, monitoring strategies and other data sources to evaluate spatial and temporal representativeness of the data so that the variability in pH, total hardness, and DOC is understood. Sampling data from waterbodies with high levels of bioavailable aluminum should be included in the dataset to be representative of the observed site conditions.

See the [Section 5 on NPDES permitting](#) for additional considerations for monitoring to characterize waters impacted by point sources.


### 3.3. How can a sampling plan be developed to capture the range of conditions that affect aluminum bioavailability (hence, toxicity) at a site?

Understanding how aluminum bioavailability changes with increasing or decreasing values of pH, total hardness, and DOC will help when designing sampling plans intended to capture the range of ambient chemistry conditions. A sampling plan should be designed to capture the conditions under which aluminum would be most bioavailable; these conditions have the highest acute toxicity, and also the highest chronic toxicity, with respect to aluminum. However, because the input parameters interact in complex ways, it is not possible to generalize about a universal set of input parameter conditions that would represent conditions of the highest toxicity, with respect to aluminum. Nonetheless, there are some general observations regarding pH, total hardness, and DOC:

- Values of pH in the circumneutral range are associated with lower solubility of aluminum (see Figure C) and conditions of lower bioavailability and toxicity with respect to aluminum (see Figures A and B). Values of pH may vary over several units due to photosynthetic activity in the waterbody (lowest pH at dawn and highest pH in early afternoon coincident with peak photosynthetic activity). Significant diurnal variation in pH values due to photosynthesis and respiration patterns can affect the calculated aluminum criteria values by 1,000 µg/L or more. Therefore, it would be useful to sample during times when pH is expected to be highest or lowest at a particular site, in order to capture conditions under which aluminum would be

most bioavailable and toxic. Sampling early in the morning, before photosynthetic activity begins, and mid-afternoon, when photosynthetic activity peaks, may capture the extremes of pH at a site. Alternatively, data loggers could also be used to capture a range of pH values, including times (such as night) when sampling and monitoring is impractical (see [Question 2.2](#) for more information on the use of continuous monitoring data). Effluent discharges to the waterbody that vary over the course of the day or week may also affect pH.

Figure C: Solubility of aluminum hydroxide over a range of pH. Minimum solubility ( $\sim 0.000001$  M) achieved under near-neutral conditions of pH.



Source: Membrane filtration: Managing aluminum in membrane filtration. *Filtration + Separation*. Volume 51(4):26-28. July-August 2014. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-1882\(14\)70145-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-1882(14)70145-4) (p 27)

- Total hardness in flowing waters may be related to stream flow or other factors that alter the concentrations of calcium and magnesium (the components of total hardness). These ions are derived mainly from weathering of rocks and minerals in natural settings and exist in the dissolved phase in most fresh waters.
- DOC can bind aluminum, rendering it less bioavailable (hence, less toxic). In general, DOC and bioavailability of aluminum are inversely correlated. That is, low concentrations of DOC are associated with higher bioavailability of aluminum; hence, yield more stringent (lower) aluminum criteria values. High concentrations of DOC bind aluminum and reduce bioavailability; hence, yield less stringent (i.e., higher) aluminum criteria values. Sampling at times when DOC is low could help capture conditions under which aluminum is more bioavailable (i.e., conditions are more toxic). Seasonal patterns in DOC concentrations at a site may vary depending on soil type, vegetation, upstream inputs, and climate.

A sampling plan should also consider other factors, such as precipitation events and snow-melt cycles, particularly for waters that receive stormwater flows. Increased flows may affect the pH and other chemical parameters of the waterbody for up to several hours following a storm event. Wet season and dry season flows may lead to extremes in the conditions that affect aluminum bioavailability.

Considering the variety of factors that may affect toxicity over time at a site can help identify strategic times to sample. Strategically timed sampling is more likely to result in development of criteria values for a site that will be protective during more sensitive times (i.e., times when aluminum is most bioavailable). Conditions like time of day, date, and weather should be noted when sampling occurs.

The Criteria Calculator generates both acute and chronic criteria values from the same set of data inputs. The diurnal variability of input parameters may affect acute criteria values more than chronic criteria values, because chronic values are averaged over a four-day period. Capturing the variability of input parameter values on longer time scales (e.g., the average pH over a one- to four-day period) may be informative for chronic criteria values, because understanding that variability will help inform the design of routine sampling plans that include the collection of discrete measurements.

### 3.4. If monitoring shows seasonal differences in data, can seasonal data be separated out to generate seasonal criteria values?

If enough data are available and those data indicate significant seasonal differences in toxicity with respect to aluminum, it is possible to separate and create criteria values for application on a seasonal basis. For example, if spring snowmelt or heavy seasonal rainfall in the area significantly change the water chemistry parameters that affect aluminum bioavailability (hence, toxicity) during that season, then a state or authorized tribe may consider spring values that differ from values that apply during other seasons. The criteria values should protect the designated uses in all of the seasons. If states or authorized tribes choose to adopt seasonal criteria into their water quality standards, they should clearly define those seasons in their water quality standards.

## Section 4: Handling Missing or Insufficient Data When Using the Criteria Calculator

### 4.1. Where can I find additional data to use as inputs to the Criteria Calculator?

The sufficiency of data for pH, total hardness and DOC will depend on the range of variation in the values of those parameters throughout the year. In general, more data are important for waterbodies with characteristics that exhibit a greater range of variability, to achieve an acceptable level of confidence as defined by the user. If a state or authorized tribe has limited data, EPA recommends that the state or authorized tribe consider data from the Water Quality Portal. The Water Quality Portal is a service provided jointly by the EPA, USGS, and the National Water Quality Monitoring Council that uses the EPA's Water Quality Exchange format to share over 380 million water quality data records. It serves data collected by over 900 federal, state, tribal and other partners including the USGS's National Water Information System (NWIS) data (See: <https://www.waterqualitydata.us/>).<sup>35</sup> Note: Whatever dataset a state or authorized tribe uses, some level of quality assurance is vital, particularly with methods for handling total hardness or DOC, for which the analyst must comply with methodologies and holding times to ensure the resulting data meet state or tribal data quality requirements specified in the respective Quality Assurance Project Plans, or QAPPs.

### 4.2. Must states and authorized tribes have default input parameters or default criteria values for aluminum?

States and authorized tribes are not required to identify default input parameters or default criteria values for aluminum; however, states and authorized tribes are required to protect the designated uses of waterbodies within their jurisdictions.<sup>36</sup> The protectiveness of a state or authorized tribe's approach to adopting EPA's CWA Section 304(a) recommended criteria will be determined by both the *implementation methods* associated with the criteria and the *input parameter data* (for pH, total hardness, and DOC) used to calculate the criteria values for a given waterbody. See [Question 1.2](#) for more information on approaches to adopting aluminum criteria, including default criteria.

For states and authorized tribes that choose to adopt the criteria in the form of the Criteria Calculator or lookup tables, the adoption of default input values or default criteria values can help to ensure that aquatic life uses will be protected in all waters within their jurisdiction, regardless of data availability for pH, total hardness, or DOC. When considering the establishment of default input parameters, it is especially important to keep in mind the complex (e.g., non-monotonic) relationship between pH and aluminum toxicity as well as the high natural variability of pH. Both issues make it uniquely challenging to establish protective pH default values. See [Question 3.3](#) for more information. Having numeric default criteria values available may also help ensure that anyone implementing the criteria (e.g., a

---

<sup>35</sup> EPA is developing a geospatial tool that will help determine appropriate input parameter estimates. This work is expected to be complete in 2021.

<sup>36</sup> As provided at 40 CFR 131.11(a), state and tribal water quality criteria must be protective of the designated use based on a sound scientific rationale.



permit writer, or someone assessing the water) will have a clear numeric basis for implementation, providing transparency for the public and the regulated community.

#### 4.3. Would default criteria be overly stringent?

Because default criteria are generally applied to a broad geographical area (e.g., ecoregions), it is possible that defaults will result in criteria values that are more or less stringent than the criteria values would be if calculated based on the water chemistry parameters at a given location. The accuracy of an established default value will depend on the method used to group together similar waterbodies that share common physical and chemical characteristics. After grouping similar waterbodies, the state or authorized tribe can derive default values for those waters in each group.

States and authorized tribes have flexibility in the method used to derive default values and may choose whatever grouping method they believe will result in the most accurate defaults, provided that they have sufficient data to support such a method. If states or authorized tribes believe that the default criteria values are more stringent than necessary to protect aquatic life in a specific waterbody, site specific ambient data may be collected and used in the Criteria Calculator to establish site-specific criteria values.

#### 4.4. Must states and authorized tribes use EPA ecoregions to develop default criteria values or can they use the state's own approach?

As described in [Question 4.3](#), states and authorized tribes have discretion on how to establish default criteria values, including how to identify the geographic units to which defaults will be applied, which datasets are used to generate the defaults, and how to generate the default values from those data. A key consideration is grouping waterbodies with similar water chemistry. One option is to group waterbodies based on [ecoregions](#), geographic divisions for which EPA has already processed data and provided DOC estimates. However, states and authorized tribes may elect to use additional data or data divided into different regions. For example, Oregon has “geo-regional” divisions. States and authorized tribes may also choose to define default values by stream order if sufficient data exist to support such a division.

## Section 5: Implementing the Recommended Aluminum Criteria in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting

### 5.1. When using the Criteria Calculator for permitting (i.e., for reasonable potential analysis (RPA) or for developing WQBELs), how will an NPDES permit writer know what inputs to use?

NPDES permit writers should follow their state's criteria implementation guidance.<sup>37</sup> As stated in EPA's *NPDES Permit Writers' Manual*,<sup>38</sup> the goal of the permit writer is to derive effluent limitations that are enforceable, adequately account for effluent variability, consider available receiving water dilution, protect against acute and chronic impacts, account for compliance monitoring sampling frequency, and assure attainment of water quality standards and any applicable waste load allocation.

As described throughout this document, states and authorized tribes that adopt the recommended aluminum criteria should provide sufficient information and explanation in the criteria itself or in implementing documents so permit writers, the regulated community, and the public understand how the criteria operate to protect designated uses. In some cases, the state or authorized tribe may have adopted numeric criteria values for aluminum (e.g., Criteria Calculator outputs) as its water quality standards or adopted default input parameter values to be used in absence of ambient data. In other cases, the state may have adopted provisions specifying how ambient data, if available, must be used in the Criteria Calculator, and how criteria values must be generated. In the absence of state implementation guidance or other provisions, permit writers may also consider existing practices for similar model-based criteria. Permit writers may also wish to consult the water quality standards experts for the state or authorized tribe and the permitting authority may seek guidance from EPA.

### 5.2. When using the Criteria Calculator to derive criteria values to use for developing NPDES permits, should the inputs be based on upstream ambient waters, the effluent, or a measured or modeled mix of ambient waters and effluent?

The general principles regarding discharges affecting water chemistry in the context of NPDES permitting for aluminum are similar to permitting for discharges of other metals for which criteria are hardness-based. State water quality standards and permitting policies and procedures should include information on how to select locations for obtaining representative input water chemistry values in a manner that ensures calculated criteria are protective of applicable aquatic life designated uses. If

---

<sup>37</sup> Additional information on the calculation of design conditions can be found in EPA's *Technical Guidance on Supplementary Stream Design Conditions for Steady State Stream Modeling*. U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. EPA-440-48-80-91. December 1988. <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=00001JA6.txt>

<sup>38</sup> USEPA. 2010. NPDES Permit Writers' Manual. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. EPA-833-K-10-001. September 2010. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-09/documents/pwm\\_2010.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-09/documents/pwm_2010.pdf)

obtaining chemistry values is not practicable or possible, model inputs could be calculated as described below.

When a discharge from a point source to a receiving water or tributary is expected to influence the chemistry of the receiving water at the permitted discharge location or a downstream location, ambient sampling locations should include locations representing conditions in the waterbody after complete mixing. The number of sampling locations and the frequency of sampling should be adequate to characterize the spatial and temporal variability of the site (see [Question 3.2](#) and [Question 3.3](#) for more information).

If the boundaries of the mixing zone cannot be determined, or if downstream sampling reflecting conditions after mixing is not practicable, input parameter values representing those conditions may be estimated from concentration and flow values for the point source or tributary and the waterbody. In doing so, a range of observed or expected upstream and effluent/tributary conditions should be evaluated. Care should be taken to consider the buffering capacity (alkalinity) of the waters being mixed when estimating the mixed pH.

In general, effluent water chemistry alone should not be used to determine model input parameters. However, this might be appropriate in an effluent-dominated stream. For more information on effluent-dominated streams, see [Question 5.4](#).

### 5.3. If the state or authorized tribe has adopted the Criteria Calculator or lookup tables, how may a permit writer account for both the most appropriate conditions with respect to receiving water chemistry in deriving appropriate criteria values and “critical conditions” used in reasonable potential determinations and calculating a WQBEL?

In general, as discussed in EPA’s *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control and NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual*, NPDES permit writers seek to represent “critical conditions” in their calculations so that the resulting WQBELs will be set at a level necessary to meet water quality standards under those critical conditions and therefore under other foreseeable conditions.

Deriving applicable water quality criteria values (taking into account the most sensitive water chemistry conditions) is one calculation. Developing WQBELs based on those criteria values and using “critical conditions” is a subsequent calculation. The two steps are described below:

**Step 1:** If the state has adopted aluminum criteria values as static numeric values for a site, the permit writer would use those values. If not, the permit writer should use the Criteria Calculator as follows:

The permit writer should run the Criteria Calculator using data that represent the spatial and temporal variability at the site, including the most sensitive conditions. The criteria should protect aquatic life throughout the year, over the range of expected conditions, including conditions under which aluminum would be most bioavailable (hence, most toxic) to aquatic life (see [Question 1.2](#) for more information). The criteria values derived from the distribution of

criteria values should protect for the full range of conditions. (See [Section 3 on characterizing spatial and temporal variability](#) for more information).

#### Step 2: Determine the Need for and Derive WQBELs

After applicable criteria values are derived to protect for the range of conditions, the permit writer must determine whether a facility's discharge is causing, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of that criteria (also known as "reasonable potential analysis", or RPA). If a WQBEL is needed, then NPDES permit limits should be derived based on the criteria and assuming "critical conditions" to ensure the WQBEL is as stringent as necessary to meet the criteria.<sup>39</sup>

NPDES permit writers often complete RPAs and derive WQBELs based on a set of steady-state conditions, called "critical conditions" in order to ensure that the WQBELs will protect receiving water quality. Commonly, the 7Q10 or 4B3 stream flow is used to determine wasteload allocations based on chronic aquatic life criteria, and the 1Q10 or 1B3 stream flow is used to determine wasteload allocations based on acute aquatic life criteria. The NPDES authority may also use other critical flows as specified in the relevant water quality standards or permitting policies and procedures. Critical low flows represent relatively little available dilution in the receiving water. Permit limits are then based on the wasteload allocation, acute or chronic, whichever is more restrictive. EPA has provided guidance regarding critical low flows for permitting.<sup>40</sup>

The critical low flow used in RPA and WQBEL calculations may not correspond to the flows typically associated with water chemistry conditions under which aluminum would be most bioavailable (hence, most toxic). In order to ensure water quality is protective of the designated use, criteria values that will be protective of the range of conditions, including conditions under which aluminum would be most bioavailable, should be applied in conjunction with the critical conditions used in RPA and WQBEL calculations. This would ensure a protective limit.

EPA recommends that as RP and WQBELs are reevaluated at permit reissuance, permit writers consider potential changes to water chemistry since the last issuance. Conditions that render aluminum more or less bioavailable in receiving waters could change as the result of a newly permitted discharge or modification of an existing discharge, land-use changes, or changes to hydrologic conditions; all of which may affect pH, total hardness, and DOC.

#### 5.4. [Would the recommended aluminum criteria be appropriate for deriving criteria values in effluent-dominated streams?](#)

Yes, the Criteria Calculator and lookup tables can be used to derive criteria values in effluent-dominated streams. As in any case, the nature of the discharge in relation to stream conditions should be

---

<sup>39</sup> For more information on critical conditions, see Chapter 6 of the NPDES Permit Writers' Manual.

<sup>40</sup> For more on critical conditions, see EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* (March 15, 1991). <https://www3.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/owm0264.pdf>.

considered when determining a sampling approach. EPA is aware that in some cases, sampling for inputs to model-based criteria is conducted upstream of the discharge (or the “natural” receiving water, absent any effect of the effluent). However, in other cases sampling for inputs reflects the water chemistry that will exist in the receiving water *after* the receiving water and effluent completely mix (downstream of the discharge). The upstream approach would be more conservative/protective if the discharge itself has characteristics that mitigate aluminum toxicity, such as high concentrations of DOC.

#### 5.5. Can the recommended aluminum criteria be implemented in an NPDES permit for a facility that has not yet started discharging?

Permitting (both determining the need for and deriving a WQBEL) is always a predictive exercise based on critical effluent projections and critical stream conditions that are anticipated during the permit term. The predictive models for both the criteria calculation and for effluent and receiving water mixing are always improved with more refined input values; however, the analyses can be performed using expected ranges of input values even before a discharge occurs.

#### 5.6. To the extent input parameters to the Criteria Calculator vary throughout the year (e.g., seasonally), and thus criteria values may vary, should permit limits also vary?

Seasonal WQBELs can be developed based on calculated seasonal criteria values. As discussed in the response to [Question 3.4](#), the Criteria Calculator may be used to generate seasonal water quality criteria values. The NPDES authority could use the different criteria as the basis for determining reasonable potential and deriving the WQBELs.

Additionally, even in cases where there are not seasonal criteria, NPDES authorities have discretion to provide seasonal or tiered flow limitations in NPDES permits based on seasonal critical conditions, where appropriate, unless the state’s water quality standards prohibit this. Where not prohibited, seasonal WQBELs could be based on year-round criteria values but different flow scenarios and background concentrations. To develop seasonal WQBELs, the permit writer would have to model the critical stream flow, background concentrations, and effluent and stream flows during any season in which the criteria were applicable.

EPA recommends that as reasonable potential and WQBELs are reevaluated at permit reissuance, permit writers consider potential changes to water chemistry since the last issuance. Conditions that render aluminum more or less bioavailable in receiving waters could change as the result of a newly permitted discharge or modification of an existing discharge, land-use changes, or changes to hydrologic conditions; all of which may affect pH, total hardness, and DOC. In some cases, additional data and/or monitoring would be required to determine when the various seasonal or tiered flow limits apply.

5.7. Does EPA have any recommendations on criteria development at the watershed scale, or the potential for shared data collection and implementation at multiple NPDES facilities located in the same general vicinity?

EPA has not developed specific guidance on watershed scale permitting for toxic metals, though specific TMDLs may provide some examples of how to gather and share data to support use of the Criteria Calculator. A key question for the state to consider is whether the water quality data used as inputs to the Criteria Calculator would be representative of the entire area to which the criteria would apply. For more information regarding site characterization, see [Section 3 on characterizing spatial and temporal variability](#). If a TMDL exists for a particular waterbody or watershed, more information may be available that could be used in considering the appropriate watershed scale. More information on watershed-scale permitting is available at <https://www.epa.gov/npdes/watershed-based-permitting>.

## Section 6: Implementing the Recommended Aluminum Criteria in Assessments, Listings, and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

### 6.1. How will assessment and listing staff know what numeric values represent “the criteria” when assessing waters with respect to the recommended aluminum criteria?

As described throughout this document, states and authorized tribes that adopt some or all of the recommended aluminum criteria should provide sufficient information and explanation in the criteria itself or in implementing documents so permit writers, the regulated community, and the public understand how the criteria operate to protect designated uses. As discussed in [Question 1.2](#) above, states have options for how to adopt EPA’s aluminum criteria recommendation. Specifically, states may develop criteria values at different scales (e.g., statewide, ecoregional, site-specific) using EPA’s recommended tools (e.g., the Criteria Calculator, look up tables) and submit those values as criteria to EPA for approval under CWA Section 303(c). States may also adopt both the water chemistry-dependent criteria and an associated derivation methodology whereby the same tools are described along with criteria derivation and implementation methods. EPA recommends that criteria derivation and implementation be included in the state’s or authorized tribe’s water quality standards. As such, states and authorized tribes should be able to determine the applicable water quality criteria for aluminum for completing water quality assessments by consulting EPA-approved aluminum criteria and associated criteria derivation and implementation methods.

### 6.2. How should states and authorized tribes prepare to transition to assess waters based on their new Criteria Calculator-based aluminum criteria, particularly for waters for which input parameter data are unavailable?

State and authorized tribes should monitor for input parameters and aluminum if they plan to transition to uses of the 2018 recommended criteria. The Criteria Calculator relies on ambient data, so collecting as much data as feasible before running the Criteria Calculator will facilitate assessment of these criteria. During the time of transition to the new criteria, states may maintain aluminum listings on the CWA Section 303(d) list that were based on the state’s or authorized tribe’s previously applicable aluminum criteria until water quality can be evaluated using the new criteria for aluminum.

### 6.3. If the state or authorized tribe only has data on aluminum in the dissolved form (when the criteria are expressed as total recoverable), how does that affect assessment and listing?

As described in EPA’s CWA Section 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria document, measurements of dissolved aluminum do not sufficiently characterize the full spectrum of forms of aluminum that contribute to toxicity. EPA recommends that if a state or authorized tribe adopts the recommended criteria, it collects data in a form that appropriately characterizes the bioavailability of aluminum.

EPA's regulations require that states and authorized tribes assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information in developing their CWA Section 303(d) lists (40 CFR 130.7(b)(5)), which would include data and information on the dissolved form of aluminum.

However, a state or authorized tribe is not required to use all available data and information to make listing decisions where it can provide a technical, science-based rationale for the exclusion of such data and information. 40 CFR 130.7(b)(6)(iii). For example, a state or authorized tribe may demonstrate that the use of dissolved aluminum measurements in impairment decisions may underestimate the bioavailable aluminum in the waterway and not be representative of the water's impairment status, especially when the levels of aluminum measured as dissolved are below the Criteria Calculator values. However, dissolved aluminum measurements that show concentrations above the criterion would likely indicate that the criterion is exceeded. If a state or authorized tribe decides not to use dissolved aluminum data and information for making listing decisions, particularly measurements that show concentrations above the criterion, it must provide a technical, science-based rationale.

#### 6.4. How does EPA recommend applying the Criteria Calculator for a water that is impaired with respect to one or more of the input parameters?

In some situations, the values for the input parameters would themselves cause impairment of the water (e.g., pH that is outside the range of an approved water quality standard for a state's pH criteria which specify a pH range between 6.5 and 9). If a state or authorized tribe finds that values for input parameters indicate nonattainment of state standards, then the waterbody should be placed on the list of impaired waters for these and any other parameters that are not meeting water quality standards (per 40 CFR 130.7(b)(1)).

The water may or may not be impaired with respect to aluminum, even if one or more of the input parameters causes impairments of other water quality criteria. The Criteria Calculator can be used with a wide range of inputs, regardless of whether those inputs themselves would be considered causes of impairment. For more information about using the Criteria Calculator for values inside and outside the ranges covered by the Criteria Calculator, see [Question 2.8](#).

The Criteria Calculator-derived aluminum criteria are not a substitute for other integrating measures of water quality, such as biological assessments and ambient toxicity tests. When available, the result of these integrative tests should be considered data and information that states and authorized tribes are required to assemble and evaluate for assessment determinations (40 CFR 130.7(b)(5)).

#### 6.5. When both the water chemistry-dependent criteria and an associated derivation methodology are adopted into WQS which aluminum value should be used to develop TMDLs?

States and authorized tribes should develop TMDLs to address the applicable aluminum criteria adopted by the states and authorized tribes and approved by EPA. States and authorized tribes have the option of choosing one, or a combination, of the approaches described in [Question 1.2](#) above.



States and authorized tribes that adopt a methodology as part of their criteria should include implementation methods in their water quality standards or other legally binding documents, as described in [Question 1.3](#). Such implementation methods should clearly describe which aluminum criteria value is applicable for TMDL development purposes, particularly for states that adopt a combination of the approaches listed above (e.g., ecoregional default values and criteria values derived from the Criteria Calculator).

#### 6.6. When should states and authorized tribes develop TMDLs based on EPA's recommended aluminum criteria?

CWA Section 303(d) requires states and authorized tribes to develop a TMDL when they identify a waterbody as not meeting applicable water quality standards and place the impairment on their biennial CWA Section 303(d) list. As part of the biennial list, states and authorized tribes are required to prioritize impairments on their CWA Section 303(d) lists for TMDL development, taking into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such waters, and include a schedule of TMDLs that will be developed over the next two years. See 40 CFR 130.7(b)(4). The opportunity to prioritize impairments for TMDL development provides states and authorized tribes flexibility on scheduling TMDL development for waters not meeting the aluminum water quality standard. Such flexibility may be important to states and authorized tribes that identify impaired waters for inclusion on the 303(d) list using small datasets (such as in method 3 in [Question 1.8](#)) because the criteria value may not represent conditions under which aluminum is most bioavailable. In these circumstances, states and authorized tribes can consider scheduling these TMDLs for development once the criteria value for the site is derived in a way that will protect aquatic life throughout the range of seasonal and flow conditions at a site, including those conditions of pH, total hardness, and DOC, when aluminum is most bioavailable.

#### 6.7. Can states and authorized tribes write a TMDL to achieve a presumptive aluminum criteria value that is based on a planned change to one of the input variables?

States and authorized tribes should develop TMDLs for the aluminum criteria value that exists at the time of developing the TMDL rather than a presumptive aluminum criteria value based on a planned increase or decrease to one or more of the input parameters (i.e., pH, total hardness, and DOC). As discussed in [Question 1.8](#), the methods for deriving the recommended criteria value are based on input variable values observed in the field. The methods do not provide for a consideration of presumptive, or potential, input variable values that may be realized in the future after practices are put in place to change the input variables. However, as discussed in the previous question, states and authorized tribes have flexibility on prioritizing and scheduling TMDLs for development. As such, instead of developing a TMDL based on the current aluminum criteria value, a state or authorized tribe may first choose to calculate a new criteria value after measures are taken to change the input variables and those changes are realized in the field.