

## Environmental Protection Agency

## § 141.83

program revision submitted pursuant to §142.12 of this chapter, the State's formula shall be used to aggregate multiple measurements taken at a sampling point for the water quality parameter in lieu of the formula in this paragraph.

(2) On days when only one measurement for the water quality parameter is collected at the sampling location, the daily value shall be the result of that measurement.

(3) On days when no measurement is collected for the water quality parameter at the sampling location, the daily value shall be the daily value calculated on the most recent day on which the water quality parameter was measured at the sample site.

(h) *Modification of State treatment decisions.* Upon its own initiative or in response to a request by a water system or other interested party, a State may modify its determination of the optimal corrosion control treatment under paragraph (d) of this section or optimal water quality control parameters under paragraph (f) of this section. A request for modification by a system or other interested party shall be in writing, explain why the modification is appropriate, and provide supporting documentation. The State may modify its determination where it concludes that such change is necessary to ensure that the system continues to optimize corrosion control treatment. A revised determination shall be made in writing, set forth the new treatment requirements, explain the basis for the State's decision, and provide an implementation schedule for completing the treatment modifications.

(i) *Treatment decisions by EPA in lieu of the State.* Pursuant to the procedures in §142.19, the EPA Regional Administrator may review treatment determinations made by a State under paragraphs (d), (f), or (h) of this section and issue federal treatment determinations consistent with the requirements of those paragraphs where the Regional Administrator finds that:

(1) A State has failed to issue a treatment determination by the applicable deadlines contained in §141.81,

(2) A State has abused its discretion in a substantial number of cases or in

cases affecting a substantial population, or

(3) The technical aspects of a State's determination would be indefensible in an expected Federal enforcement action taken against a system.

[56 FR 26548, June 7, 1991, as amended at 65 FR 2004, Jan. 12, 2000]

### § 141.83 Source water treatment requirements.

Systems shall complete the applicable source water monitoring and treatment requirements (described in the referenced portions of paragraph (b) of this section, and in §§141.86, and 141.88) by the following deadlines.

(a) *Deadlines for completing source water treatment steps*—(1) *Step 1:* A system exceeding the lead or copper action level shall complete lead and copper source water monitoring (§141.88(b)) and make a treatment recommendation to the State (§141.83(b)(1)) within 6 months after exceeding the lead or copper action level.

(2) *Step 2:* The State shall make a determination regarding source water treatment (§141.83(b)(2)) within 6 months after submission of monitoring results under step 1.

(3) *Step 3:* If the State requires installation of source water treatment, the system shall install the treatment (§141.83(b)(3)) within 24 months after completion of step 2.

(4) *Step 4:* The system shall complete follow-up tap water monitoring (§141.86(d)(2)) and source water monitoring (§141.88(c)) within 36 months after completion of step 2.

(5) *Step 5:* The State shall review the system's installation and operation of source water treatment and specify maximum permissible source water levels (§141.83(b)(4)) within 6 months after completion of step 4.

(6) *Step 6:* The system shall operate in compliance with the State-specified maximum permissible lead and copper source water levels (§141.83(b)(4)) and continue source water monitoring (§141.88(d)).

(b) *Description of source water treatment requirements*—(1) *System treatment recommendation.* Any system which exceeds the lead or copper action level shall recommend in writing to the State the installation and operation of

one of the source water treatments listed in paragraph (b)(2) of this section. A system may recommend that no treatment be installed based upon a demonstration that source water treatment is not necessary to minimize lead and copper levels at users' taps.

(2) *State determination regarding source water treatment.* The State shall complete an evaluation of the results of all source water samples submitted by the water system to determine whether source water treatment is necessary to minimize lead and copper levels in water delivered to users' taps. If the State determines that treatment is needed, the State shall either require installation and operation of the source water treatment recommended by the system (if any) or require the installation and operation of another source water treatment from among the following: Ion exchange, reverse osmosis, lime softening or coagulation/filtration. If the State requests additional information to aid in its review, the water system shall provide the information by the date specified by the State in its request. The State shall notify the system in writing of its determination and set forth the basis for its decision.

(3) *Installation of source water treatment.* Each system shall properly install and operate the source water treatment designated by the State under paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(4) *State review of source water treatment and specification of maximum permissible source water levels.* The State shall review the source water samples taken by the water system both before and after the system installs source water treatment, and determine whether the system has properly installed and operated the source water treatment designated by the State. Based upon its review, the State shall designate the maximum permissible lead and copper concentrations for finished water entering the distribution system. Such levels shall reflect the contaminant removal capability of the treatment properly operated and maintained. The State shall notify the system in writing and explain the basis for its decision.

(5) *Continued operation and maintenance.* Each water system shall maintain lead and copper levels below the

maximum permissible concentrations designated by the State at each sampling point monitored in accordance with § 141.88. The system is out of compliance with this paragraph if the level of lead or copper at any sampling point is greater than the maximum permissible concentration designated by the State.

(6) *Modification of State treatment decisions.* Upon its own initiative or in response to a request by a water system or other interested party, a State may modify its determination of the source water treatment under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, or maximum permissible lead and copper concentrations for finished water entering the distribution system under paragraph (b)(4) of this section. A request for modification by a system or other interested party shall be in writing, explain why the modification is appropriate, and provide supporting documentation. The State may modify its determination where it concludes that such change is necessary to ensure that the system continues to minimize lead and copper concentrations in source water. A revised determination shall be made in writing, set forth the new treatment requirements, explain the basis for the State's decision, and provide an implementation schedule for completing the treatment modifications.

(7) *Treatment decisions by EPA in lieu of the State.* Pursuant to the procedures in § 142.19, the EPA Regional Administrator may review treatment determinations made by a State under paragraphs (b) (2), (4), or (6) of this section and issue Federal treatment determinations consistent with the requirements of those paragraphs where the Administrator finds that:

(i) A State has failed to issue a treatment determination by the applicable deadlines contained in § 141.83(a),

(ii) A state has abused its discretion in a substantial number of cases or in cases affecting a substantial population, or

(iii) The technical aspects of a State's determination would be indefensible in an expected Federal enforcement action taken against a system.