



# CVCWA

## CENTRAL VALLEY CLEAN WATER ASSOCIATION

Formerly the Central Valley Wastewater Manager's Association

*Representing Over Forty Wastewater Agencies*

---

STAN DEAN – CHAIR, SRCSD      STEVE WILSON – VICE CHAIR, CERES  
JACQUE McCALL – SECRETARY, VACAVILLE      MICHAEL BERKLICH – TREASURER, TURLOCK

---

January 24, 2006

Tam Doduc, Chair, and Members of the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
P.O. Box 100  
1001 I Street, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

[commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: Comment Letter – 2/8/06 Public Hearing for SSORP  
Affordability Analysis**

Dear Chair Doduc and Members of the Board:

The Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) for Wastewater Collection System Agencies. CVCWA consists of 47 local public agencies located within the Central Valley Region that provide wastewater treatment, sewage collection and conveyance, and water recycling services to millions of Central Valley residents and businesses. The majority of our members are what you would consider small communities and a number of them are in the smallest population category proposed in the new requirements. All of our members operate wastewater collections systems and are very interested in the proposed WDR.

In general, CVCWA supports the concept of a state wide WDR for collection systems. We realize that it is in the best interests of the public to implement a program that will protect the public health and the environment and to protect one of the largest infrastructure systems in the State. However, our primary concern is the **cost** of the program, especially to small and very small communities that will have the most difficulty funding these requirements.

**CVCWA Comment Letter – 2/8/06 Public Hearing for SSORP  
Affordability Analysis  
Page 2 of 3**

CVCWA would like to thank your State Board Staff for their effort to perform a cost analysis for the proposed Collection System WDR. So many times in the past such analysis have been non-existent. However their effort was hampered by the fact that the only cost data they had was from twenty wastewater agencies in Orange County and that data only covered the last three years. The analysis developed an average statewide cost per equivalent dwelling unit to implement the proposed WDR of \$5.99 per household. That average, however, was developed using data from large collection systems and does not reflect the cost to the small and very small collection systems that are prevalent in the Central Valley. Those costs can be up to ten times that household average. These small communities also tend to not be populated by middle to high income tax payers, but with the lower income population of this State, who cannot afford to live in the expensive larger communities. Some of our members report that the average income level of their residences is well below the State average.

The smaller the population of a community, the more the WDR and resulting Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP) requirements will cost each resident. The smallest population category listed in the WDR Time Schedule equates to about 1,000 EDUs or smaller and less than 300,000 gallons per day of flow. Even though there are many communities in the Central Valley with less than 1,000 EDUs, using that as an example, a sample of the impact on small communities would be as follows:

A one-dollar per month increase in sewer user fees for 1,000 EDUs would generate only **\$12,000 per year** to be used for infrastructure maintenance and repair. A one-dollar increase in sewer user fees to an agency with 360,000 connections would generate **\$4,300,000 per year**. They both will have to develop a SSMP (which may require consultant costs) and they both may have to replace a portion of sewer pipe that would cost \$100,000 or more. The one-dollar increase for the small agency won't even cover the cost of administering the program.

**Accordingly, CVCWA is requesting that consideration be given to small and low-income communities to help develop and implement this proposed WDR as follows:**

**Cost Analysis**

The proposed WDR and its accompanying Information Sheet need to be revised to reflect that the analysis was completed using a small set of cost figures that do not reflect the real cost of the proposed Statewide WDR to small communities. The Information Sheet also needs to be revised to state that many small agencies may have to raise their rates to as much as ten times the average \$5.99 per household derived in the State's original analysis and that such rates may be beyond the capability of such agencies to collect.

**CVCWA Comment Letter – 2/8/06 Public Hearing for SSORP  
Affordability Analysis  
Page 3 of 3**

**Grants**

Small and low-income communities in the State of California will need financial assistance to develop a SSMP and implement the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation programs it specifies. The State should pursue developing a grant program for small communities, possibly through a statewide bond issue. The State Revolving Fund (loan) program will not work for small and very small communities that are unable to generate the necessary funds to implement all of the WDR requirements because loans have to be paid back plus federal regulations may preclude its use for maintenance purposes without action by the Regional Boards due to health and environmental impacts. Your State Water Resources Control Board controls how Small Community Grants are allocated and as such should consider revising their regulations to give more priority to maintenance and rehabilitation projects. Your Board can also ask the State Legislature to allocate some of the proposed infrastructure bond issues towards sewer rehabilitation projects for small and low-income communities.

**Affordability Analysis**

Consideration should be given to adding to the proposed SSMP an affordability analysis for small and low-income communities. For every community, there is a breaking point where a monthly sewer user fees can not be afforded and some people will be forced from their homes or have to cut back on other essentials like food and medicine. When establishing how much a community can afford to spend rehabilitating it's sewer infrastructure it should also apply risk analysis principals to determine the extent of public health and environmental impacts of sewer system overflows within their community. Then, a time frame can be developed for implementing the SSMPs. For small and low-income communities, that would give them more time to generate the necessary revenue to implement new rehabilitation programs.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,



---

Warren Tellefson  
Executive Officer

T:\fac\cvcwa\315.61\WDR Comment – Affordability