

**Part IV – Receiving Stream Information**

**RECEIVING STREAM(S) TABLE: OUTFALL #001**

WATER-BODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	DESIGNATED USES*	12-DIGIT HUC	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
Meramec River 303(d) List	P	2185	AQL, CLF, DWS, HHP, IND, IRR, LWW, SCR, WBC-A	07140102-1001	Direct Discharge

\*As per 10 CSR 20-7.031 Missouri Water Quality Standards, the Department defines the Clean Water Commission’s water quality objectives in terms of "water uses to be maintained and the criteria to protect those uses." The receiving stream and 1<sup>st</sup> classified receiving stream’s beneficial water uses to be maintained are in the receiving stream table in accordance with [10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(C)].

Uses which may be found in the receiving streams table, above:

10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(C)1.:

AQL = Protection of aquatic life (Current narrative use(s) are defined to ensure the protection and propagation of fish shellfish and wildlife, which is further subcategorized as: WWH = Warm Water Habitat; CDF = Cold-water fishery (Current narrative use is cold-water habitat.); CLF = Cool-water fishery (Current narrative use is cool-water habitat); EAH = Ephemeral Aquatic Habitat; MAH = Modified Aquatic Habitat; LAH = Limited Aquatic Habitat. This permit uses AQL effluent limitations in 10 CSR 20-7.031 Table A for all habitat designations unless otherwise specified.)

10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(C)2.: Recreation in and on the water

WBC = Whole Body Contact recreation where the entire body is capable of being submerged;  
WBC-A = Whole body contact recreation that supports swimming uses and has public access;  
WBC-B = Whole body contact recreation that supports swimming;  
SCR = Secondary Contact Recreation (like fishing, wading, and boating).

10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(C)3. to 7.:

HHP (formerly HHF) = Human Health Protection as it relates to the consumption of fish;  
IRR = Irrigation for use on crops utilized for human or livestock consumption;  
LWW = Livestock and wildlife watering (Current narrative use is defined as LWP = Livestock and Wildlife Protection);  
DWS = Drinking Water Supply;  
IND = Industrial water supply

10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(C)8-11.: Wetlands (10 CSR 20-7.031 Table A currently does not have corresponding habitat use criteria for these defined uses)

WSA = Storm- and flood-water storage and attenuation; WHP = Habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species;  
WRC = Recreational, cultural, educational, scientific, and natural aesthetic values and uses; WHC = Hydrologic cycle maintenance.

10 CSR 20-7.031(6): GRW = Groundwater

**RECEIVING STREAM(S) LOW-FLOW VALUES:**

RECEIVING STREAM ( P )	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)*		
	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
Meramec River	351.9	368.3	425.3

\* - Data from USGS Gauge Station #07019000 located on the Meramec River near Eureka, MO.

**MIXING CONSIDERATIONS TABLE:**

MIXING ZONE (CFS) [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(A)4.B.(II)(a)]			ZONE OF INITIAL DILUTION (CFS) [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(A)4.B.(II)(b)]		
1Q10	7Q10	30Q10	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
87.98	92.08	106.33	8.798	9.208	N/A

**RECEIVING STREAM MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:**

**Permitted Feature SM1 – Upstream**

Facilities with a design flow greater than 100,000 gallons per day are required to sample their effluent quarterly for Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)7. Upstream monitoring for these parameters is necessary to determine background concentrations in order to complete calculations related to future effluent limit derivation where necessary or appropriate.

**Permitted Feature SM2 – Downstream**

This permit includes downstream hardness monitoring in order to develop a site-specific hardness for determining reasonable potential and calculating hardness-dependent metals limits.

### Receiving Water Body's Water Quality

Currently, no stream survey has been conducted by the Department. When a stream survey is conducted, more information may be available about the receiving stream.

## **Part V – Rationale and Derivation of Effluent Limitations & Permit Conditions**

### **ALTERNATIVE EVALUATIONS FOR NEW FACILITIES:**

As per [10 CSR 20-7.015(4)(A)], discharges to losing streams shall be permitted only after other alternatives including land application, discharges to a gaining stream and connection to a regional wastewater treatment facility have been evaluated and determined to be unacceptable for environmental and/or economic reasons.

- The facility does not discharge to a Losing Stream as defined by [10 CSR 20-2.010(36)] & [10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(N)], or is an existing facility.

### **ANTI-BACKSLIDING:**

A provision in the Federal Regulations [CWA §303(d)(4); CWA §402(o); 40 CFR Part 122.44(l)] that requires a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit with some exceptions.

- Limitations in this operating permit for the reissuance of this permit conform to the anti-backsliding provisions of Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR Part 122.44.

- Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

- **pH.** – 6.0-9.0 SU. pH limitations [10 CSR 20-7.015] are protective of the water quality standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(E)], due to the buffering capacity of the mixing zone.

- The Department determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b).

- **General Criteria.** The previous permit contained a special condition which described a specific set of prohibitions related to general criteria found in 10 CSR 20-7.031(4). In order to comply with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1), the permit writer has conducted reasonable potential determinations for each general criterion and established numeric effluent limitations where reasonable potential exists. While the removal of the previous permit special condition creates the appearance of backsliding, since this permit establishes numeric limitations where reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of the general criteria exists the permit maintains sufficient effluent limitations and monitoring requirements in order to protect water quality, this permit is equally protective as compared to the previous permit. Therefore, given this new information, and the fact that the previous permit special condition was not consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1), an error occurred in the establishment of the general criteria as a special condition of the previous permit. Please see Part VI – Effluent Limits Determination for more information regarding the reasonable potential determinations for each general criterion related to this facility.

### **ANTIDEGRADATION:**

In accordance with Missouri's Water Quality Standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)], for domestic wastewater discharge with new, altered, or expanding discharges, the Department is to document by means of Antidegradation Review that the use of a water body's available assimilative capacity is justified. In accordance with Missouri's water quality regulations for antidegradation [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)], degradation may be justified by documenting the socio-economic importance of a discharge after determining the necessity of the discharge. Facilities must submit the antidegradation review request to the Department prior to establishing, altering, or expanding discharges. See <http://dnr.mo.gov/cnv/wpp/permits/antideg-implementation.htm>

- No degradation proposed and no further review necessary. Facility did not apply for authorization to increase pollutant loading or to add additional pollutants to their discharge.

- The facility does not have stormwater discharges or the stormwater outfalls onsite have no industrial exposure.

### **AREA-WIDE WASTE TREATMENT MANAGEMENT & CONTINUING AUTHORITY:**

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(3)(B)], ...An applicant may utilize a lower preference continuing authority by submitting, as part of the application, a statement waiving preferential status from each existing higher preference authority, providing the waiver does not conflict with any area-wide management plan approved under section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act or any other regional sewage service and treatment plan approved for higher preference authority by the Department.

**BIOSOLIDS & SEWAGE SLUDGE:**

Biosolids are solid materials resulting from domestic wastewater treatment that meet federal and state criteria for beneficial uses (i.e. fertilizer). Sewage sludge is solids, semi-solids, or liquid residue generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works; including but not limited to, domestic septage; scum or solids removed in primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment process; and a material derived from sewage sludge. Sewage sludge does not include ash generated during the firing of sewage sludge in a sewage sludge incinerator or grit and screening generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works. Additional information regarding biosolids and sludge is located at the following web address: <http://extension.missouri.edu/main/DisplayCategory.aspx?C=74>, items WQ422 through WQ449.

- Permittee is not authorized to land apply biosolids. Sludge/biosolids are stored in the lagoon. The permittee must submit a sludge management plan for approval that details removal and disposal plans when sludge is to be removed from lagoons.

**COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT:**

Enforcement is the action taken by the Water Protection Program (WPP) to bring an entity into compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law, its implementing regulations, and/or any terms and conditions of an operating permit. The primary purpose of the enforcement activity in the WPP is to resolve violations and return the entity to compliance.

- The facility is not currently under Water Protection Program enforcement action.

**ELECTRONIC DISCHARGE MONITORING REPORT (EDMR) SUBMISSION SYSTEM:**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated a final rule on October 22, 2015, to modernize Clean Water Act reporting for municipalities, industries, and other facilities by converting to an electronic data reporting system. This final rule requires regulated entities and state and federal regulators to use information technology to electronically report data required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program instead of filing paper reports. To comply with the federal rule, the Department is requiring all permittees to begin submitting discharge monitoring data and reports online. In an effort to aid facilities in the reporting of applicable information electronically, the Department has created several new forms including operational control monitoring forms and an I&I location and reduction form. These forms are for optional use and can be found on the Department's website at the following locations:

Operational Monitoring Lagoon: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2801-f.pdf>

Operational Monitoring Mechanical: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2800-f.pdf>

I&I Report: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2690-f.pdf>

Per 40 CFR 127.15 and 127.24, permitted facilities may request a temporary waiver for up to 5 years or a permanent waiver from electronic reporting from the Department. To obtain an electronic reporting waiver, a permittee must first submit an eDMR Waiver Request Form: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2692-f.pdf>. A request must be made for each facility. If more than one facility is owned or operated by a single entity, then the entity must submit a separate request for each facility based on its specific circumstances. An approved waiver is non-transferable.

The Department must review and notify the facility within 120 calendar days of receipt if the waiver request has been approved or rejected [40 CFR 124.27(a)]. During the Department review period as well as after a waiver is granted, the facility must continue submitting a hard-copy of any reports required by their permit. The Department will enter data submitted in hard-copy from those facilities allowed to do so and electronically submit the data to the EPA on behalf of the facility.

- The permittee/facility is currently using the eDMR data reporting system.

**PRETREATMENT PROGRAM:**

The reduction of the amount of pollutants, the elimination of pollutants, or the alteration of the nature of pollutant properties in wastewater prior to or in lieu of discharging or otherwise introducing such pollutants into a Publicly Owned Treatment Works [40 CFR Part 403.3(q)].

Pretreatment programs are required at any POTW (or combination of POTW operated by the same authority) and/or municipality with a total design flow greater than 5.0 MGD and receiving industrial wastes that interfere with or pass through the treatment works or are otherwise subject to the pretreatment standards. Pretreatment programs can also be required at POTWs/municipals with a design flow less than 5.0 MGD if needed to prevent interference with operations or pass through.

Several special conditions pertaining to the permittee's pretreatment program may be included in the permit, and are as follows:

- Implementation and enforcement of the program,
- Annual pretreatment report submittal,
- Submittal of list of industrial users,
- Technical evaluation of need to establish local limitations, and
- Submittal of the results of the evaluation

- The permittee, at this time, is not required to have a Pretreatment Program or does not have an approved pretreatment program.

**REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS (RPA):**

Federal regulation [40 CFR Part 122.44(d)(1)(i)] requires effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above narrative or numeric water quality standard.

In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(d)(1)(iii)] if the permit writer determines that any given pollutant has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the WQS, the permit must contain effluent limits for that pollutant.

- An RPA analysis was completed for the last permit cycle. Due to permit synchronization, the previous permit cycle was reduced to a time period of less than 5 years. Therefore, all RPA results from short term permit have been carried over to this permit. Please see APPENDIX – RPA RESULTS.

**REMOVAL EFFICIENCY:**

Removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals.

- Secondary Treatment is 85% removal [40 CFR Part 133.102(a)(3) & (b)(3)].

**SANITARY SEWER OVERFLOWS (SSO) AND INFLOW AND INFILTRATION (I&I):**

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are defined as untreated sewage releases and are considered bypassing under state regulation [10 CSR 20-2.010(11)] and should not be confused with the federal definition of bypass. SSOs result from a variety of causes including blockages, line breaks, and sewer defects that can either allow wastewater to backup within the collection system during dry weather conditions or allow excess stormwater and groundwater to enter and overload the collection system during wet weather conditions. SSOs can also result from lapses in sewer system operation and maintenance, inadequate sewer design and construction, power failures, and vandalism. SSOs include overflows out of manholes, cleanouts, broken pipes, and other into waters of the state and onto city streets, sidewalks, and other terrestrial locations.

Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) is defined as unwanted intrusion of stormwater or groundwater into a collection system. This can occur from points of direct connection such as sump pumps, roof drain downspouts, foundation drains, and storm drain cross-connections or through cracks, holes, joint failures, faulty line connections, damaged manholes, and other openings in the collection system itself. I&I results from a variety of causes including line breaks, improperly sealed connections, cracks caused by soil erosion/settling, penetration of vegetative roots, and other sewer defects. In addition, excess stormwater and groundwater entering the collection system from line breaks and sewer defects have the potential to negatively impact the treatment facility.

Missouri RSMo §644.026.1.(13) mandates that the Department issue permits for discharges of water contaminants into the waters of this state, and also for the operation of sewer systems. Such permit conditions shall ensure compliance with all requirements as established by sections 644.006 to 644.141. Standard Conditions Part I, referenced in the permit, contains provisions requiring proper operation and maintenance of all facilities and systems of treatment and control. Missouri RSMo §644.026.1.(15) instructs the Department to require proper maintenance and operation of treatment facilities and sewer systems and proper disposal of residual waste from all such facilities. To ensure that public health and the environment are protected, any noncompliance which may endanger public health or the environment must be reported to the Department within 24 hours of the time the permittee becomes aware of the noncompliance. Standard Conditions Part I, referenced in the permit, contains the reporting requirements for the permittee when bypasses and upsets occur. The permit also contains requirements for permittees to develop and implement a program for maintenance and repair of the collection system. The permit requires that the permittee submit an annual report to the Department for the previous calendar year that contains a summary of efforts taken by the permittee to locate and eliminate sources of excess I & I, a summary of general maintenance and repairs to the collection system, and a summary of any planned maintenance and repairs to the collection system for the upcoming calendar year.

- At this time, the Department recommends the US EPA's Guide for Evaluating Capacity, Management, Operation and Maintenance (CMOM) Programs at Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems (Document # EPA 305-B-05-002) or the Departments' CMOM Model located at <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/cmom-template.doc>. For additional information regarding the Departments' CMOM Model, see the CMOM Plan Model Guidance document at <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2574.htm>. The CMOM identifies some of the criteria used to evaluate a collection system's management, operation, and maintenance and was intended for use by the EPA, state, regulated community, and/or third party entities. The CMOM is applicable to small, medium, and large systems; both public and privately owned; and both regional and satellite collection systems. The CMOM does not substitute for the Clean Water Act, the Missouri Clean Water Law, and both federal and state regulations, as it is not a regulation.

**SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE (SOC):**

Per 644.051.4 RSMo, a permit may be issued with a Schedule of Compliance (SOC) to provide time for a facility to come into compliance with new state or federal effluent regulations, water quality standards, or other requirements. Such a schedule is not allowed if the facility is already in compliance with the new requirement, or if prohibited by other statute or regulation. A SOC includes an enforceable sequence of interim requirements (actions, operations, or milestone events) leading to compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law, its implementing regulations, and/or the terms and conditions of an operating permit. See also Section 502(17) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR §122.2. For new effluent limitations, the permit includes interim monitoring for the specific parameter to demonstrate the facility is not already in compliance with the new requirement. Per 40 CFR § 122.47(a)(1) and 10 CSR 20-7.031(11), compliance must occur as soon as possible. If the permit provides a schedule for meeting new water quality based effluent limits, a SOC must include an enforceable, final effluent limitation in the permit even if the SOC extends beyond the life of the permit.

A SOC is not allowed:

- For effluent limitations based on technology-based standards established in accordance with federal requirements, if the deadline for compliance established in federal regulations has passed. 40 CFR § 125.3.
- For a newly constructed facility in most cases. Newly constructed facilities must meet applicable effluent limitations when discharge begins, because the facility has installed the appropriate control technology as specified in a permit or antidegradation review. A SOC is allowed for a new water quality based effluent limit that was not included in a previously public noticed permit or antidegradation review, which may occur if a regulation changes during construction.
- To develop a TMDL, UAA, or other study associated with development of a site specific criterion. A facility is not prohibited from conducting these activities, but a SOC may not be granted for conducting these activities.

In order to provide guidance to Permit Writers in developing SOCs, and attain a greater level of consistency, on April 9, 2015 the Department issued an updated policy on development of SOCs. This policy provides guidance to Permit Writers on the standard time frames for schedules for common activities, and guidance on factors that may modify the length of the schedule such as a Cost Analysis for Compliance.

- The time given for effluent limitations of this permit listed under Interim Effluent Limitation and Final Effluent Limitations were established in accordance with [10 CSR 20-7.031(11)]. The facility has been given a schedule of compliance to meet final effluent limits for Ammonia. The permit for this facility issued on October 1, 2016 included new effluent limitations for ammonia, and a 5 year schedule to attain compliance with those final effluent limitations. The City plans to construct a new treatment facility and requested a time extension to the existing schedule; therefore, the schedule of compliance has been established at 6 years. Compliance must be achieved by October 1, 2022. Information provided by the City suggested the cost for the new treatment facility will be approximately \$4,000,000. This is significantly less than the estimated cost for upgrades in the previous cost analysis; therefore, the previous cost analysis remains adequate. Please see the Cost Analysis for Compliance attached as an appendix to the permit for further detail on how the socio-economic status of the community has impacted this SOC.

**SEWER EXTENSION AUTHORITY SUPERVISED PROGRAM:**

In accordance with [10 CSR 20-6.010(6)(A)], the Department may grant approval of a permittee's Sewer Extension Authority Supervised Program. These approved permittees regulate and approve construction of sanitary sewers and pump stations, which are tributary to this wastewater treatment facility. The permittee shall act as the continuing authority for the operation, maintenance, and modernization of the constructed collection system. See <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/sewer-extension.htm>.

- The permittee does not have a Department approved Sewer Extension Authority Supervised Program.

**STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP):**

In accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(k) *Best Management Practices (BMPs)* to control or abate the discharge of pollutants when: (1) Authorized under section 304(e) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) for the control of toxic pollutants and hazardous substances from ancillary industrial activities; (2) Authorized under section 402(p) of the CWA for the control of stormwater discharges; (3) Numeric effluent limitations are infeasible; or (4) the practices are reasonably necessary to achieve effluent limitations and standards or to carry out the purposes and intent of the CWA.

In accordance with the EPA's *Developing Your Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, A Guide for Industrial Operators*, (Document number EPA 833-B-09-002) [published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in February 2009], BMPs are measures or practices used to reduce the amount of pollution entering (regarding this operating permit) waters of the state. BMPs may take the form of a process, activity, or physical structure.

Additionally in accordance with the Stormwater Management, a SWPPP is a series of steps and activities to (1) identify sources of pollution or contamination, and (2) select and carry out actions which prevent or control the pollution of stormwater discharges. The purpose of a SWPPP is to comply with all applicable stormwater regulations by creating an adaptive management plan to control and mitigate stream pollution from stormwater runoff. Developing a SWPPP provides opportunities to employ appropriate BMPs to minimize the risk of pollutants being discharged during storm events. The following paragraph outlines the general steps the permittee

should take to determine which BMPs will work to achieve the benchmark values or limits in the permit. This section is not intended to be all encompassing or restrict the use of any physical BMP or operational and maintenance procedure assisting in pollution control. Additional steps or revisions to the SWPPP may be required to meet the requirements of the permit.

Areas which should be included in the SWPPP are identified in 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14). Once the potential sources of stormwater pollution have been identified, a plan should be formulated to best control the amount of pollutant being released and discharged by each activity or source. This should include, but is not limited to, minimizing exposure to stormwater, good housekeeping measures, proper facility and equipment maintenance, spill prevention and response, vehicle traffic control, and proper materials handling. Once a plan has been developed the facility will employ the control measures determined to be adequate to achieve the benchmark values discussed above. The facility will conduct monitoring and inspections of the BMPs to ensure they are working properly and re-evaluate any BMP not achieving compliance with permitting requirements. For example, if sample results from an outfall show values of TSS above the benchmark value, the BMP being employed is deficient in controlling stormwater pollution. Corrective action should be taken to repair, improve, or replace the failing BMP. This internal evaluation is required at least once per month but should be continued more frequently if BMPs continue to fail. If failures do occur, continue this trial and error process until appropriate BMPs have been established.

For new, altered, or expanded stormwater discharges, the SWPPP shall identify reasonable and effective BMPs while accounting for environmental impacts of varying control methods. The antidegradation analysis must document why no discharge or no exposure options are not feasible. The selection and documentation of appropriate control measures shall serve as an alternative analysis of technology and fulfill the requirements of antidegradation [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)]. For further guidance, consult the antidegradation implementation procedure (<http://dnr.mo.gov/cnv/wpp/docs/AIP050212.pdf>).

Alternative Analysis (AA) evaluation of the BMPs is a structured evaluation of BMPs that are reasonable and cost effective. The AA evaluation should include practices that are designed to be: 1) non-degrading; 2) less degrading; or 3) degrading water quality. The glossary of AIP defines these three terms. The chosen BMP will be the most reasonable and effective management strategy while ensuring the highest statutory and regulatory requirements are achieved and the highest quality water attainable for the facility is discharged. The AA evaluation must demonstrate why "no discharge" or "no exposure" is not a feasible alternative at the facility. This structured analysis of BMPs serves as the antidegradation review, fulfilling the requirements of 10 CSR 20-7.031(3) Water Quality Standards and *Antidegradation Implementation Procedure* (AIP), Section II.B.

If parameter-specific numeric exceedances continue to occur and the permittee feels there are no practicable or cost-effective BMPs which will sufficiently reduce a pollutant concentration in the discharge to the benchmark values established in the permit, the permittee can submit a request to re-evaluate the benchmark values. This request needs to include 1) a detailed explanation of why the facility is unable to comply with the permit conditions and unable to establish BMPs to achieve the benchmark values; 2) financial data of the company and documentation of cost associated with BMPs for review and 3) the SWPPP, which should contain adequate documentation of BMPs employed, failed BMPs, corrective actions, and all other required information. This will allow the Department to conduct a cost analysis on control measures and actions taken by the facility to determine cost-effectiveness of BMPs. The request shall be submitted in the form of an operating permit modification; the application is found at: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/index.html>.

- At this time, the permittee is not required to develop and implement a SWPPP as the facility submitted a No Exposure Certification form.

**VARIANCE:**

As per the Missouri Clean Water Law § 644.061.4, variances shall be granted for such period of time and under such terms and conditions as shall be specified by the commission in its order. The variance may be extended by affirmative action of the commission. In no event shall the variance be granted for a period of time greater than is reasonably necessary for complying with the Missouri Clean Water Law §§644.006 to 644.141 or any standard, rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to Missouri Clean Water Law §§644.006 to 644.141.

- This operating permit is not drafted under premises of a petition for variance.

**WASTELOAD ALLOCATIONS (WLA) FOR LIMITS:**

As per [10 CSR 20-2.010(78)], the amount of pollutant each discharger is allowed by the Department to release into a given stream after the Department has determined total amount of pollutant that may be discharged into that stream without endangering its water quality.

- Wasteload allocations were calculated where applicable using water quality criteria or water quality model results and the dilution equation below:

$$C_e = \frac{(Q_e + Q_s)C - (Q_s \times C_s)}{(Q_e)} \quad (\text{EPA/505/2-90-001, Section 4.5.5})$$

Where C = downstream concentration      Ce = effluent concentration  
Cs = upstream concentration              Qe = effluent flow  
Qs = upstream flow

Chronic wasteload allocations were determined using applicable chronic water quality criteria (CCC: criteria continuous concentration) and stream volume of flow at the edge of the mixing zone (MZ). Acute wasteload allocations were determined using applicable water quality criteria (CMC: criteria maximum concentration) and stream volume of flow at the edge of the zone of initial dilution (ZID).

Water quality based maximum daily and average monthly effluent limitations were calculated using methods and procedures outlined in USEPA's "Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control" (EPA/505/2-90-001).

Number of Samples "n":

Additionally, in accordance with the TSD for water quality-based permitting, effluent quality is determined by the underlying distribution of daily values, which is determined by the Long Term Average (LTA) associated with a particular Wasteload Allocation (WLA) and by the Coefficient of Variation (CV) of the effluent concentrations. Increasing or decreasing the monitoring frequency does not affect this underlying distribution or treatment performance, which should be, at a minimum, be targeted to comply with the values dictated by the WLA. Therefore, it is recommended that the actual planned frequency of monitoring normally be used to determine the value of "n" for calculating the AML. However, in situations where monitoring frequency is once per month or less, a higher value for "n" must be assumed for AML derivation purposes. Thus, the statistical procedure being employed using an assumed number of samples is "n = 4" at a minimum. For Total Ammonia as Nitrogen, "n = 30" is used.

WLA MODELING:

There are two general types of effluent limitations, technology-based effluent limits (TBELs) and water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs). If TBELs do not provide adequate protection for the receiving waters, then WQBEL must be used.

- A WLA study was either not submitted or determined not applicable by Department staff.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS:

Per [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)], General Criteria shall be applicable to all waters of the state at all times including mixing zones. Additionally, [40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)] directs the Department to establish in each NPDES permit to include conditions to achieve water quality established under Section 303 of the Clean Water Act, including State narrative criteria for water quality.

WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET) TEST:

- The permittee is required to conduct WET test for this facility.

A WET test is a quantifiable method of determining if a discharge from a facility may be causing toxicity to aquatic life by itself, in combination with or through synergistic responses when mixed with receiving stream water.

Under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) §101(a)(3), requiring WET testing is reasonably appropriate for site-specific Missouri State Operating Permits for discharges to waters of the state issued under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). WET testing is also required by 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1). WET testing ensures that the provisions in the 10 CSR 20-6.010(8)(A)7. and the Water Quality Standards 10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(D),(F),(G),(I)2.A & B are being met. Under [10 CSR 20-6.010(8)(A)4], the Department may require other terms and conditions that it deems necessary to assure compliance with the Clean Water Act and related regulations of the Missouri Clean Water Commission. In addition the following MCWL apply: §§644.051.3 requires the Department to set permit conditions that comply with the MCWL and CWA; 644.051.4 specifically references toxicity as an item we must consider in writing permits (along with water quality-based effluent limits, pretreatment, etc...); and 644.051.5 is the basic authority to require testing conditions. WET test will be required by facilities meeting the following criteria:

- Facility is a designated Major.
- Facility continuously or routinely exceeds its design flow.
- Facility that exceeds its design population equivalent (PE) for BOD<sub>5</sub> whether or not its design flow is being exceeded.
- Facility (whether primarily domestic or industrial) that alters its production process throughout the year.
- Facility handles large quantities of toxic substances, or substances that are toxic in large amounts.
- Facility has Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations for toxic substances (other than NH<sub>3</sub>)
- Facility is a municipality with a Design Flow ≥ 22,500 gpd.
- Other – please justify.

**40 CFR 122.41(M) - BYPASSES:**

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 402 prohibits wastewater dischargers from “bypassing” untreated or partially treated sewage (wastewater) beyond the headworks. A bypass is defined as an intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility, [40 CFR 122.41(m)(1)(i)]. Additionally, Missouri regulation 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(G) states a bypass means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility, except in the case of blending, to waters of the state. Only under exceptional and specified limitations do the federal regulations allow for a facility to bypass some or all of the flow from its treatment process. Bypasses are prohibited by the CWA unless a permittee can meet all of the criteria listed in 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A), (B), & (C). Any bypasses from this facility are subject to the reporting required in 40 CFR 122.41(l)(6) and per Missouri’s Standard Conditions I, Section B, part 2.b. Additionally, Anticipated Bypasses include bypasses from peak flow basins or similar devices designed for peak wet weather flows.

- This facility does not anticipate bypassing.

**303(d) LIST & TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL):**

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires that each state identify waters that are not meeting water quality standards and for which adequate water pollution controls have not been required. Water quality standards protect such beneficial uses of water as whole body contact (such as swimming), maintaining fish and other aquatic life, and providing drinking water for people, livestock and wildlife. The 303(d) list helps state and federal agencies keep track of waters that are impaired but not addressed by normal water pollution control programs.

A TMDL is a calculation of the maximum amount of a given pollutant that a body of water can absorb before its water quality is affected. If a water body is determined to be impaired as listed on the 303(d) list, then a watershed management plan will be developed that shall include the TMDL calculation

- This facility discharges to a 303(d) listed stream. The Meramec River (P) (2183) is listed on the 2016 Missouri 303(d) List for *E. coli* and Lead. Old Lead belt tailings are listed as the source of the lead; however, the source for the *E. coli* impairment is unknown. This facility has the potential to contribute to the *E. coli* impairment. Once a TMDL is developed, the permit may be modified to include WLAs from the TMDL.

**Part VI – Effluent Limits Determination**

**APPLICABLE DESIGNATIONS OF WATERS OF THE STATE:**

As per Missouri’s Effluent Regulations [10 CSR 20-7.015], the waters of the state are divided into the below listed seven (7) categories. Each category lists effluent limitations for specific parameters, which are presented in each outfall’s Effluent Limitation Table and further discussed in the Derivation & Discussion of Limits section.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Missouri or Mississippi River [10 CSR 20-7.015(2)]     | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Streams [10 CSR 20-7.015(6)]             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lakes or Reservoirs [10 CSR 20-7.015(3)]               | <input type="checkbox"/> Subsurface Waters [10 CSR 20-7.015(7)]           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Losing Streams [10 CSR 20-7.015(4)]                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Other Waters [10 CSR 20-7.015(8)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Metropolitan No-Discharge Streams [10 CSR 20-7.015(5)] |   |

**OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL**

Effluent limitations derived and established in the below Effluent Limitations Table are based on current operations of the facility. Future permit action due to facility modification may contain new operating permit terms and conditions that supersede the terms and conditions, including effluent limitations, of this operating permit.



**EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS TABLE:**

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ****
Flow	MGD	1	*		*	*/*	1/week	monthly	T
BOD <sub>5</sub>	mg/L	1		45	30	45/30	1/week	monthly	C
TSS	mg/L	1		45	30	45/30	1/week	monthly	C
<i>Escherichia coli</i> **	#/100mL	1, 3		630	126	630/126	1/week	monthly	G
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Sep 30)	mg/L	2, 3	*		*	*/*	1/week	monthly	G
Ammonia as N (Oct 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	2, 3	36.6		9.3	36.6/9.3	1/week	monthly	G
Oil & Grease	mg/L	1, 3	15		10	15/10	1/month	monthly	G
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Total Phosphorus	mg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Cadmium, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Chromium III, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Chromium VI, Total Dissolved	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Lead, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Nickel, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1	*		*	*/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity	TUa	1, 9	*			*	1/year	annually	C
Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity	TUc	1, 9	*			*	1/permit cycle	1/permit cycle	C
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Minimum		Maximum	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
pH	SU	1	6.0		9.0	6.5-9.0	1/month	monthly	G
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Monthly Avg Min			Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
BOD <sub>5</sub> Percent Removal	%	1	85			85	1/month	monthly	M
TSS Percent Removal	%	1	85			85	1/month	monthly	M

\* - Monitoring requirement only.

\*\* - #/100mL; the Monthly Average for *E. coli* is a geometric mean.

\*\*\* - Parameter not previously established in previous state operating permit.

\*\*\*\* - C = 24-hour composite

G = Grab

T = 24-hr. total

E = 24-hr. estimate

M = Measured/calculated

**Basis for Limitations Codes:**

- |  |                                   |                                  |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. State or Federal Regulation/Law       | 5. Antidegradation Policy         | 9. WET Test Policy               |
| 2. Water Quality Standard (includes RPA) | 6. Water Quality Model            | 10. Multiple Discharger Variance |
| 3. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits   | 7. Best Professional Judgment     |                                  |
| 4. Antidegradation Review                | 8. TMDL or Permit in lieu of TMDL |                                  |

**OUTFALL #001 – DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS:**

- **Flow.** In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(1)(ii)] the volume of effluent discharged from each outfall is needed to assure compliance with permitted effluent limitations. If the permittee is unable to obtain effluent flow, then it is the responsibility of the permittee to inform the Department, which may require the submittal of an operating permit modification.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>).** 45 mg/L as a Weekly Average and 30 mg/L as a Monthly Average. Please see the APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF WATERS OF THE STATE sub-section of the **Effluent Limits Determination**. The Water Quality Review Sheet from 2004 established a secondary treatment level for the aerated lagoon. Please see APPENDIX – WATER QUALITY REVIEW SHEET.
- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** 45 mg/L as a Weekly Average and 30 mg/L as a Monthly Average. Please see the APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF WATERS OF THE STATE sub-section of the **Effluent Limits Determination**. The Water Quality Review Sheet from 2004 established a secondary treatment level for the aerated lagoon. Please see APPENDIX – WATER QUALITY REVIEW SHEET.

- **Escherichia coli (E. coli)**. Monthly average of 126 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Weekly Average of 630 per 100 mL as a geometric mean during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), to protect Whole Body Contact Recreation (A) designated use of the receiving stream, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C). An effluent limit for both monthly average and weekly average is required by 40 CFR 122.45(d). The Geometric Mean is calculated by multiplying all of the data points and then taking the nth root of this product, where n = # of samples collected. For example: Five *E. coli* samples were collected with results of 1, 4, 6, 10, and 5 (#/100mL). Geometric Mean = 5<sup>th</sup> root of (1)(4)(6)(10)(5) = 5<sup>th</sup> root of 1,200 = 4.1 #/100mL.
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen**. Early Life Stages Present Total Ammonia Nitrogen criteria apply [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(B)7.C. & Table B3]. Background total ammonia nitrogen = 0.01 mg/L. No mixing considerations allowed; therefore, WLA = appropriate criterion.

Season	Temp (°C)	pH (SU)	Total Ammonia Nitrogen CCC (mg/L)	Total Ammonia Nitrogen CMC (mg/L)
Summer	26	7.8	1.5	12.1
Winter	6	7.8	3.1	12.1

**Summer: April 1 – September 30**

Due to permit synchronization, the previous permit cycle was reduced to a time period of less than 5 years. Therefore, all Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) results from the short term permit have been carried over to this permit. The previous permit writer conducted a RPA using past monitoring data submitted by the permittee. It was determined that there is no reasonable potential to cause an excursion of water quality standards for Ammonia in the receiving stream. Therefore monitoring only is required for the summer designated months to collect data over the permit cycle so this determination can be reassessed during the next renewal. Please see **Appendix – RPA Results** for more information.

**Winter: October 1 – March 31**

Chronic WLA:  $C_e = ((4.34 + 106.3)1.5 - (106.3 * 0.01))/4.34$   
 $C_e = 78.8 \text{ mg/L}$

Acute WLA:  $C_e = ((4.34 + 8.798)12.1 - (8.798 * 0.01))/4.34$   
 $C_e = 36.6 \text{ mg/L}$

$LTA_c = 78.8 \text{ mg/L} (0.639) = 50.3 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 1.12, 99<sup>th</sup> Percentile, 30 day avg.]

$LTA_a = 36.6 \text{ mg/L} (0.185) = 6.78 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 1.12, 99<sup>th</sup> Percentile]

Use most protective number of  $LTA_c$  or  $LTA_a$ .

MDL = 6.78 mg/L (5.40) = 36.6 mg/L

[CV = 1.12, 99<sup>th</sup> Percentile]

AML = 6.78 mg/L (1.37) = 9.3 mg/L

[CV = 1.12, 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile, n = 30]

- **Oil & Grease**. Conventional pollutant, effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.
- **Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen**. Monitoring required for facilities greater than 100,000 gpd design flow per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)7. Total Nitrogen shall be determined by testing for Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) and Nitrate + Nitrite and reporting the sum of the results (reported as N). Nitrate + Nitrite can be analyzed together or separately.
- **Cadmium, Total Recoverable**. Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for cadmium. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Chromium III, Total Recoverable**. Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for chromium. Further, an established categorical industry has identified themselves which discharges process water from a chromium plating process. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Chromium VI, Total Dissolved**. Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for chromium. Further, an established categorical industry has identified themselves which discharges process water from a chromium plating process. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.

- **Copper, Total Recoverable.** Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for copper. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Lead, Total Recoverable.** Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for lead. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Nickel, Total Recoverable.** Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for nickel. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Zinc, Total Recoverable.** Monitoring only; sample results from expanded effluent testing submitted with the renewal application exceeded the water quality standard for zinc. Quarterly monitoring will allow sufficient data to conduct a reasonable potential analysis and to calculate appropriate effluent limits if applicable.
- **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Monitoring is required to determine if reasonable potential exists for this facility's discharge to exceed water quality standards. Where no mixing is allowed, the acute criterion must be met at the end of the pipe. However, when using an LC50 as the test endpoint, the acute toxicity test has an upper sensitivity level of 100% effluent, or 1.0 TUa. If less than 50% of the test organisms die at 100% effluent, the true LC50 value for the effluent cannot be measured, effectively acting as a detection limit. Therefore, when the allowable effluent concentration is 100% a limit of 1.0 TUa will apply. If more than 50% of the organisms survive at 100% effluent, the permittee should report TUa <1.

Classified P with other than default Mixing Considerations, the AEC% is determined as follows:

$$\text{Acute AEC\%} = (((4.34 + 9.208)/4.34)^{-1}) * 100 = 32\%$$

The Allowable Effluent Concentration (AEC) is 32% with the dilution series being: 100%, 66%, 32%, 16%, and 8%.

- **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Monitoring is required to determine if reasonable potential exists for this facility's discharge to exceed water quality standards.

(Classified P with other than default Mixing Considerations, the AEC% is determined as follows:

$$\text{Chronic AEC\%} = (((4.34 + 92.08)/4.34)^{-1}) * 100 = 4.5\%$$

The Allowable Effluent Concentration (AEC) is 4.5% with the dilution series being: 36%, 18%, 9%, 4.5%, and 2.25%.

- **pH.** -6.0-9.0 SU. pH limitations [10 CSR 20-7.015] are protective of the water quality standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(E)], due to the buffering capacity of the mixing zone.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) Percent Removal.** In accordance with 40 CFR Part 133, removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals. This facility is required to meet 85% removal efficiency for BOD<sub>5</sub>.
- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS) Percent Removal.** In accordance with 40 CFR Part 133, removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals. This facility is required to meet 85% removal efficiency for TSS.

#### Sampling Frequency Justification:

Sampling and Reporting Frequency was retained from previous permit except for Ammonia. Per the request of the permittee, Ammonia sampling frequency was changed to weekly. Weekly sampling is required for *E. coli*, per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)6.A. Sampling for *E. coli* is set at weekly per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)6.C.

**WET Test Sampling Frequency Justification.** WET Testing schedules and intervals are established in accordance with the Department's Permit Manual; Section 5.2 *Effluent Limits / WET Testing for Compliance Bio-monitoring*. It is recommended that WET testing be conducted during the period of lowest stream flow.

#### Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity

- No less than ONCE/YEAR:

- Facility is designated as a Major facility or has a design flow  $\geq$  1.0 MGD.

**Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity**

- No less than ONCE/PERMIT CYCLE:
- POTW facilities with a design flow of greater than 1.0 million gallons per day, but less than 10 million gallons per day, shall conduct and submit to the Department a chronic WET test no less than once per five years.

**Sampling Type Justification:**

As per 10 CSR 20-7.015, BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and WET test samples collected for mechanical plants shall be a 24 hour composite sample. Grab samples, however, must be collected for pH, Ammonia as N, *E. coli*, Oil & Grease, metals, and Total Phosphorus. This is due to the holding time restriction for *E. coli*, the volatility of Ammonia and TRC, and the fact that pH cannot be preserved and must be sampled in the field. As Ammonia, Oil & Grease, metals, Total Nitrogen, and Total Phosphorus samples must be immediately preserved, these samples are to be collected as a grab.

**PERMITTED FEATURE SM1 – INSTREAM MONITORING (UPSTREAM)**

The monitoring requirements established in the below Monitoring Requirements Table are based on current operations of the facility. Future permit action due to facility modification may contain new operating permit terms and conditions that supersede the terms and conditions, including the monitoring requirements listed in this table..

**MONITORING REQUIREMENTS TABLE:**

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ****
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	7	*		*	*/*	quarterly	quarterly	G
Total Phosphorus	mg/L	7	*		*	*/*	quarterly	quarterly	G

\* - Monitoring requirement only.  
 \*\*\* - Parameter not previously established in previous state operating permit.  
 \*\*\*\* - C = 24-hour composite  
 G = Grab  
 M = Measured /calculated

**Basis for Limitations Codes:**

- |  |                           |                                   |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. State or Federal Regulation/Law       | 4. Antidegradation Review | 7. Best Professional Judgment     |
| 2. Water Quality Standard (includes RPA) | 5. Antidegradation Policy | 8. TMDL or Permit in lieu of TMDL |
| 3. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits   | 6. Water Quality Model    | 9. WET Test Policy                |

**PERMITTED FEATURE SM1 – DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:**

- **Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen.** Facilities with a design flow greater than 100,000 gallons per day are required to sample their effluent quarterly for Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)7. Upstream monitoring for these parameters is necessary to determine background stream concentrations in order to complete calculations that determine instream nutrient loading.

**Sampling Frequency Justification:**

The sampling and reporting frequency for Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen has been established to match the required sampling frequency of these parameters in the effluent.

**Sampling Type Justification**

As Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen samples must be immediately preserved; these samples are to be collected as a grab.

**PERMITTED FEATURE SM2 – INSTREAM MONITORING (DOWNSTREAM)**

The monitoring requirements established in the below Monitoring Requirements Table are based on current operations of the facility. Future permit action due to facility modification may contain new operating permit terms and conditions that supersede the terms and conditions, including the monitoring requirements listed in this table.

**MONITORING REQUIREMENTS TABLE:**

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ****
Total Hardness	mg/L	1, 3	*		*	*/*	monthly	monthly	G

\* - Monitoring requirement only.

\*\*\* - Parameter not previously established in previous state operating permit.

\*\*\*\* - C = 24-hour composite

G = Grab

M = Measured /calculated

**Basis for Limitations Codes:**

- |  |                           |                                   |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. State or Federal Regulation/Law       | 4. Antidegradation Review | 7. Best Professional Judgment     |
| 2. Water Quality Standard (includes RPA) | 5. Antidegradation Policy | 8. TMDL or Permit in lieu of TMDL |
| 3. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits   | 6. Water Quality Model    | 9. WET Test Policy                |

**PERMITTED FEATURE SM2 – DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:**

- **Total Hardness.** Monitoring only requirement as the metals parameters contained in the permit are hardness based. This data will be used in the next permit renewal.

**Sampling Frequency Justification:**

The sampling and reporting frequency for Total Hardness has been established to match the required sampling frequency of the metals parameters in the effluent.

**Sampling Type Justification:**

As Total Hardness samples must be immediately preserved; these samples are to be collected as a grab.

**OUTFALL #004 – GENERAL CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS:**

In accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1), effluent limitations shall be placed into the permit for those pollutants which have been determined to cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality. The rule further states that pollutants which have been determined to cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permit shall contain a numeric effluent limitation to protect that narrative criterion. In order to comply with this regulation, the permit writer will complete reasonable potential determinations on whether the discharge will violate any of the general criteria listed in 10 CSR 20-7.031(4). These specific requirements are listed below followed by derivation and discussion (the lettering matches that of the rule itself, under 10 CSR 20-7.031(4)). It should also be noted that Section 644.076.1, RSMo as well as Section D – Administrative Requirements of Standard Conditions Part I of this permit states that it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or permit any discharge of water contaminants from any water contaminant or point source located in Missouri that is in violation of sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law or any standard, rule or regulation promulgated by the commission.

- (A) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause the formation of putrescent, unsightly or harmful bottom deposits or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. The discharge from this facility is made up of treated domestic wastewater. Based upon review of the recent Report of Compliance Inspection dated September 20, 2017, no evidence of an excursion of this criterion has been observed by the Department in the past and the facility has not disclosed any other information related to the characteristics of the discharge on their permit application which has the potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this narrative criterion. Additionally, this facility utilizes secondary treatment technology and is currently in compliance with the secondary treatment technology based effluent limits established in this permit and there has been no indication to the Department that the stream has had issues maintaining beneficial uses as a result of this discharge. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, these final effluent limitations appear to have protected against the excursion of this criterion in the past. Therefore, the discharge does not have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.
- (B) Waters shall be free from oil, scum and floating debris in sufficient amounts to be unsightly or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (C) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause unsightly color or turbidity, offensive odor or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (D) Waters shall be free from substances or conditions in sufficient amounts to result in toxicity to human, animal or aquatic life. This permit contains final effluent limitations which are protective of both acute and chronic toxicity for various pollutants that are either expected to be discharged by domestic wastewater facilities or that were disclosed by this facility on the application for

permit coverage. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, it has been determined if the facility meets final effluent limitations established in this permit, there is no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause an excursion of this criterion.

- (E) There shall be no significant human health hazard from incidental contact with the water. Please see (D) above as justification is the same.
- (F) There shall be no acute toxicity to livestock or wildlife watering. Please see (D) above as justification is the same.
- (G) Waters shall be free from physical, chemical or hydrologic changes that would impair the natural biological community. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (H) Waters shall be free from used tires, car bodies, appliances, demolition debris, used vehicles or equipment and solid waste as defined in Missouri's Solid Waste Law, section 260.200, RSMo, except as the use of such materials is specifically permitted pursuant to section 260.200-260.247. The discharge from this facility is made up of treated domestic wastewater. No evidence of an excursion of this criterion has been observed by the Department in the past and the facility has not disclosed any other information related to the characteristics of the discharge on their permit application which has the potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this narrative criterion. Additionally, any solid wastes received or produced at this facility are wholly contained in appropriate storage facilities, are not discharged, and are disposed of offsite. This discharge is subject to Standard Conditions Part III, which contains requirements for the management and disposal of sludge to prevent its discharge. Therefore, this discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.

### **Part VII – Cost Analysis for Compliance**

Pursuant to Section 644.145, RSMo, when issuing permits under this chapter that incorporate a new requirement for discharges from publicly owned combined or separate sanitary or storm sewer systems or publicly owned treatment works, or when enforcing provisions of this chapter or the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq., pertaining to any portion of a publicly owned combined or separate sanitary or storm sewer system or [publicly owned] treatment works, the Department of Natural Resources shall make a “finding of affordability” on the costs to be incurred and the impact of any rate changes on ratepayers upon which to base such permits and decisions, to the extent allowable under this chapter and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This process is completed through a cost analysis for compliance. Permits that do not include new requirements may be deemed affordable.

- The Department is required to determine “findings of affordability” because the permit applies to a combined or separate sanitary sewer system for a publically-owned treatment works.

**Cost Analysis for Compliance** - The Department has made a reasonable search for empirical data indicating the permit is affordable. The search consisted of a review of Department records that might contain economic data on the community, a review of information provided by the applicant as part of the application, and public comments received in response to public notices of this draft permit. If the empirical cost data was used by the permit writer, this data may consist of median household income, any other ongoing projects that the Department has knowledge, and other demographic financial information that the community provided as contemplated by Section 644. 145.3. See **Appendix – Cost Analysis for Compliance**

## **Part VIII – Administrative Requirements**

On the basis of preliminary staff review and the application of applicable standards and regulations, the Department, as administrative agent for the Missouri Clean Water Commission, proposes to issue a permit(s) subject to certain effluent limitations, schedules, and special conditions contained herein and within the operating permit. The proposed determinations are tentative pending public comment.

### **PERMIT SYNCHRONIZATION:**

The Department of Natural Resources is currently undergoing a synchronization process for operating permits. Permits are normally issued on a five-year term, but to achieve synchronization many permits will need to be issued for less than the full five years allowed by regulation. The intent is that all permits within a watershed will move through the Watershed Based Management (WBM) cycle together will all expire in the same fiscal year. This will allow further streamlining by placing multiple permits within a smaller geographic area on public notice simultaneously, thereby reducing repeated administrative efforts. This will also allow the Department to explore a watershed based permitting effort at some point in the future. Renewal applications must continue to be submitted within 180 days of expiration, however, in instances where effluent data from the previous renewal is less than 4 years old, that data may be re-submitted to meet the requirements of the renewal application. If the permit provides a schedule of compliance for meeting new water quality based effluent limits beyond the expiration date of the permit, the time remaining in the schedule of compliance will be allotted in the renewed permit. With permit synchronization, this permit will expire in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter of calendar year 2022.

### **PUBLIC NOTICE:**

The Department shall give public notice that a draft permit has been prepared and its issuance is pending. Additionally, public notice will be issued if a public hearing is to be held because of a significant degree of interest in and water quality concerns related to a draft permit. No public notice is required when a request for a permit modification or termination is denied; however, the requester and permittee must be notified of the denial in writing. The Department must issue public notice of a pending operating permit or of a new or reissued statewide general permit. The public comment period is the length of time not less than 30 days following the date of the public notice which interested persons may submit written comments about the proposed permit. For persons wanting to submit comments regarding this proposed operating permit, then please refer to the Public Notice page located at the front of this draft operating permit. The Public Notice page gives direction on how and where to submit appropriate comments.

- The Public Notice period for this operating permit was from March 16, 2018 to April 16, 2018. Due to comments received by the City on April 4, 2018, special condition #7 has been updated to require "reporting limits" instead of "detection limits". Also, the City plans to construct a new treatment facility and requested a time extension to the existing schedule; therefore, the schedule of compliance has been established at 6 years. No other changes were made at this time.

**DATE OF FACT SHEET:** FEBRUARY 2, 2018

### **COMPLETED BY:**

**SAMANTHA OSTMANN, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST  
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM  
OPERATING PERMITS SECTION - DOMESTIC WASTEWATER UNIT  
(573) 526-2445  
samantha.ostmann@dnr.mo.gov**