

**AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE
NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM**

In compliance with the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act, as amended, (33 U.S.C. §§1251 et seq.; the "CWA"),

Town of Milford, New Hampshire

is authorized to discharge from the facility located at

**Milford Wastewater Treatment Plant
564 Nashua St
Milford, NH 03055**

to receiving water named

Souhegan River (Hydrologic Basin Code: 01070002)

in accordance with effluent limitations, monitoring requirements and other conditions set forth herein.

The Town of Wilton is a co-permittee for Part B, Unauthorized Discharges; Part C, Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System, which include conditions regarding the operation and maintenance of the collection systems owned and operated by the Town; and Part D, Alternate Power Source.

Operation and Maintenance of the sewer system shall be in compliance with the General Requirements of Part II of the terms and conditions of Part B, Part C, and Part D of this permit. The Permittee and co-permittee are severally liable under Part B, Part C, and Part D for their own activities and required reporting with respect to the portions of the collection system that they own or operate. They are not liable for violations of Part B, Part C, and Part D committed by others relative to the portions of the collection system owned and operated by others. Nor are they responsible for any reporting this is required of other Permittees under Part B, Part C, and Part D. The responsible Town department is:

Town of Wilton
Sewer Commission
42 Main St
P.O. Box 83
Wilton, NH 03086

This permit shall become effective on the first day of the calendar month immediately following 60 days after signature.¹

This permit expires at midnight, five years from the last day of the month preceding the effective date.

¹ Pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 124.15(b)(3), if no comments requesting a change to the Draft Permit are received, the permit will become effective upon the date of signature. Procedures for appealing EPA's Final Permit decision may be found at 40 C.F.R. § 124.19.

This permit supersedes the permit issued on February 8, 2000.

This permit consists of the cover page(s), **Part I; Attachment A** (Freshwater Acute Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, February 2011); **Attachment B** (Freshwater Chronic Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, March 2013); **Attachment C** (Reassessment of Technically Based Industrial Discharge Limits); **Attachment D** (NPDES Permit Requirement for Industrial Pretreatment Annual Report) and **Part II** (NPDES Part II Standard Conditions, April 2018).

Signed this day of

Ken Moraff, Director
Water Division
Environmental Protection Agency
Region 1
Boston, MA

PART I

A. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

1. During the period beginning on the effective date and lasting through the expiration date, the Permittee is authorized to discharge treated effluent through Outfall Serial Number 001 to Souhegan River. The discharge shall be limited and monitored as specified below; the receiving water and the influent shall be monitored as specified below.

Effluent Characteristic	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Requirements ^{1,2,3}	
	Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Measurement Frequency	Sample Type ⁴
Rolling Average Effluent Flow ⁵	2.15 MGD	---	---	Continuous	Recorder
Effluent Flow ⁵	Report MGD	---	Report MGD	Continuous	Recorder
CBOD ₅ (June 1 - October 31)	7 mg/L 126 lb/day	14 mg/L 251 lb/day	16 mg/L 287 lb/day	2/week	Composite
CBOD ₅ (November 1 - March 31)	10 mg/L 179 lb/day	23 mg/L 412 lb/day	25 mg/L 448 lb/day	2/week	Composite
CBOD ₅ Removal	≥ 85 %	---	---	---	Calculation
TSS (June 1 - October 31)	15 mg/L 269 lb/day	25 mg/L 448 lb/day	30 mg/L 538 lb/day	2/week	Composite
TSS (November 1 - May 31)	15 mg/L 269 lb/day	30 mg/L 538 lb/day	35 mg/L 628 lb/day	2/week	Composite
TSS Removal	≥ 85 %	---	---	---	Calculation
pH Range ⁶	6.5 - 8.0 S.U.			1/day	Grab
<i>Escherichia coli</i> ⁷	126 <i>E. coli</i> /100 mL	---	406 <i>E. coli</i> /100 mL	3/week	Grab
Dissolved Oxygen	≥ 6.0 mg/L			3/week	Grab
Ammonia Nitrogen (June 1 – October 31)	4.1 mg/L Report lb/day	---	10 mg/L 179 lb/day	2/week	Composite

Effluent Characteristic	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Requirements ^{1,2,3}	
	Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Measurement Frequency	Sample Type ⁴
Ammonia Nitrogen (November 1 - May 31)	12.9 mg/L	---	Report mg/L	2/week	Composite
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen ⁸	Report mg/L	---	Report mg/L	1/week	Composite
Total Nitrate + Nitrite ⁸	Report mg/L	---	Report mg/L	1/week	Composite
Total Nitrogen ⁸	Report mg/L Report lb/day	---	Report mg/L	1/week	Composite
Total Phosphorus ⁹ (April 1 – October 31)	3.6 lb/day	---	Report mg/L	1/week	Composite
Total Aluminum ¹⁰	87.0 µg/L	---	Report µg/L	2/month	Composite
Total Cadmium	1.4 µg/L	---	3.1 µg/L	2/month	Composite
Total Copper	14.4 µg/L	---	16.2 µg/L	2/month	Composite
Total Lead	2.0 µg/L	---	51.0 µg/L	2/month	Composite
Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing^{11,12}					
LC ₅₀	---	---	≥ 100 %	1/quarter	Composite
C-NOEC	---	---	≥ 38 %	1/quarter	Composite
Hardness	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Ammonia Nitrogen	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Aluminum	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Cadmium	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Copper	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Lead	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Nickel	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Zinc	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite
Total Organic Carbon	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Composite

Ambient Characteristic ¹⁴	Reporting Requirements			Monitoring Requirements ^{1,2,3}	
	Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Measurement Frequency	Sample Type
Hardness	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Ammonia Nitrogen	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Aluminum	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Cadmium	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Copper	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Nickel	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Lead	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Zinc	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Total Organic Carbon	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
Dissolved Organic Carbon ¹³	---	---	Report mg/L	1/quarter	Grab
pH ¹⁵	---	---	Report S.U.	1/quarter	Grab
Temperature ¹⁵	---	---	Report °C	1/quarter	Grab
Total Phosphorus ⁹ (April 1 – October 31)	Report mg/L	---	Report mg/L	1/month	Grab

Influent Characteristic ¹⁶	Reporting Requirements			Monitoring Requirements ^{1,2,3}	
	Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Measurement Frequency	Sample Type
CBOD ₅	Report mg/L	---	---	2/month	Composite
TSS	Report mg/L	---	---	2/month	Composite

Footnotes:

1. Effluent samples shall yield data representative of the discharge. A routine sampling program shall be developed in which samples are taken at the same location, same time and same days of the week each month. The Permittee shall report the results to the Environmental Protection Agency Region 1 (EPA) and the State of any additional testing above that required herein, if testing is in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 136.
2. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(i)(1)(iv), the Permittee shall monitor according to sufficiently sensitive test procedures (i.e., methods) approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. Chapter I, Subchapter N or O, for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters (except WET). A method is “sufficiently sensitive” when: 1) The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the level of the effluent limitation established in the permit for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter; or 2) The method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. Chapter I, Subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter. The term “minimum level” refers to either the sample concentration equivalent to the lowest calibration point in a method or a multiple of the method detection limit (MDL), whichever is higher. Minimum levels may be obtained in several ways: They may be published in a method; they may be based on the lowest acceptable calibration point used by a laboratory; or they may be calculated by multiplying the MDL in a method, or the MDL determined by a laboratory, by a factor.
3. When a parameter is not detected above the ML, the Permittee must report the data qualifier signifying less than the ML for that parameter (e.g., < 50 µg/L, if the ML for a parameter is 50 µg/L). For reporting an average based on a mix of values detected and not detected, assign a value of “0” to all non-detects for that reporting period and report the average of all the results.
4. A “grab” sample is an individual sample collected in a period of less than 15 minutes.

A “composite” sample is a composite of at least twenty-four (24) grab samples taken during one consecutive 24-hour period, either collected at equal intervals and combined proportional to flow or continuously collected proportional to flow.
5. The limit is a rolling annual average, reported in million gallons per day (MGD), which will be calculated as the arithmetic mean of the monthly average flow for the reporting month and the monthly average flows of the previous eleven months. Also report monthly average and maximum daily flow in MGD.

6. The pH shall always be within the specified range. The minimum and maximum pH sample measurement values for the month shall be reported in standard units (S.U.). See Part I.G.1. below for a provision to modify the pH range.
7. The monthly average limit for *E. coli* is expressed as a geometric mean. *E. coli* monitoring shall be conducted concurrently with TRC monitoring if TRC monitoring is required.
8. Total Kjeldahl nitrogen and nitrate + nitrite samples shall be collected concurrently. The results of these analyses shall be used to calculate both the concentration and mass loadings of total nitrogen, as follows.

Total Nitrogen (mg/L) = Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L) + Nitrate + Nitrite (mg/L)

Total Nitrogen (lb/day) = [(average monthly Total Nitrogen (mg/L) * total monthly effluent flow (Millions of Gallons (MG)) / # of days in the month] * 8.345

9. See Part I.G.2 for the phosphorus compliance schedule and ambient monitoring requirements.
10. See Part I.G.3 for special conditions related to the aluminum compliance schedule.
11. The Permittee shall conduct acute toxicity tests (LC₅₀) and chronic toxicity tests (C-NOEC) in accordance with test procedures and protocols specified in **Attachment A and B** of this permit. LC₅₀ and C-NOEC are defined in Part II.E. of this permit. The Permittee shall test the daphnid, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*, and the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*. Toxicity test samples shall be collected and tests completed during the same weeks each time of calendar quarters ending March 31st, June 30th, September 30th, and December 31st. The complete report for each toxicity test shall be submitted as an attachment to the DMR submittal which includes the results for that toxicity test.
12. For Part I.A.1., Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing, the Permittee shall conduct the analyses specified in **Attachment A and B**, Part VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS for the effluent sample. If toxicity test(s) using the receiving water as diluent show the receiving water to be toxic or unreliable, the Permittee shall follow procedures outlined in **Attachment A and B**, Section IV., DILUTION WATER. Minimum levels and test methods are specified in **Attachment A and B**, Part VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.
13. Monitoring and reporting for dissolved organic carbon (DOC) is not a requirement of the Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) tests but is an additional

- requirement. The Permittee may analyze the WET samples for DOC or may collect separate samples for DOC concurrently with WET sampling.
14. For Part I.A.1., Ambient Characteristic, the Permittee shall conduct the analyses specified in **Attachment A and B**, Part VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS for the receiving water sample collected as part of the WET testing requirements. Such samples shall be taken from the receiving water at a point immediately upstream of the permitted discharge's zone of influence at a reasonably accessible location, as specified in **Attachment A and B**. Minimum levels and test methods are specified in **Attachment A and B**, Part VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.
 15. A pH and temperature measurement shall be taken of each receiving water sample at the time of collection and the results reported on the appropriate DMR. These pH and temperature measurements are independent from any pH and temperature measurements required by the WET testing protocols.
 16. Influent CBOD₅ and TSS monitoring is to be used for calculating TSS and CBOD₅ percent removal (i.e., % removal = $[1 - \text{monthly average effluent concentration} / \text{monthly average influent concentration}] \times 100\%$).

Part I.A. continued.

2. The discharge shall not cause a violation of the water quality standards of the receiving water.
3. The discharge shall be free from substances in kind or quantity that settle to form harmful benthic deposits; float as foam, debris, scum or other visible substances; produce odor, color, taste or turbidity that is not naturally occurring and would render the surface water unsuitable for its designated uses; result in the dominance of nuisance species; or interfere with recreational activities.
4. Tainting substances shall not be present in the discharge in concentrations that individually or in combination are detectable by taste and odor tests performed on the edible portions of aquatic organisms.
5. The discharge shall not result in toxic substances or chemical constituents in concentrations or combinations in the receiving water that injure or are inimical to plants, animals, humans or aquatic life; or persist in the environment or accumulate in aquatic organisms to levels that result in harmful concentrations in edible portions of fish, shellfish, other aquatic life, or wildlife that might consume aquatic life.
6. The discharge shall not result in benthic deposits that have a detrimental impact on the benthic community. The discharge shall not result in oil and grease, color, slicks, odors, or surface floating solids that would impair any existing or designated uses in the receiving water.

7. The discharge shall not result in an exceedance of the naturally occurring turbidity in the receiving water by more than 10 NTUs.
8. The Permittee must provide adequate notice to EPA-Region 1 and the State of the following:
 - a. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger which would be subject to § 301 or § 306 of the Clean Water Act if it were directly discharging those pollutants or in a primary industry category (see 40 C.F.R. §122 Appendix A as amended) discharging process water; and
 - b. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of issuance of the permit.
 - c. For purposes of this paragraph, adequate notice shall include information on:
 - (1) The quantity and quality of effluent introduced into the POTW; and
 - (2) Any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW.
9. Pollutants introduced into the POTW by a non-domestic source (user) shall not pass through the POTW or interfere with the operation or performance of the works.

B. UNAUTHORIZED DISCHARGES

This permit authorizes discharges only from the outfall listed in Part I.A.1, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this permit. Discharges of wastewater from any other point sources, including sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), are not authorized by this permit and shall be reported in accordance with Part D.1.e.(1) of the Standard Conditions of this permit (24-hour reporting). See Part I.H below for reporting requirements.

C. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SEWER SYSTEM

Operation and maintenance (O&M) of the sewer system shall be in compliance with the Standard Conditions of Part II and the following terms and conditions. The Permittee and co-permittee are required to complete the following activities for the collection system which it owns:

1. Maintenance Staff

The Permittee and co-permittee shall provide an adequate staff to carry out the operation, maintenance, repair, and testing functions required to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit. Provisions to meet this requirement shall be described in the Collection System O&M Plan required pursuant to Section C.5. below.

2. Preventive Maintenance Program

The Permittee and co-permittee shall maintain an ongoing preventive maintenance program to prevent overflows and bypasses caused by malfunctions or failures of the sewer system infrastructure. The program shall include an inspection program designed to identify all potential and actual unauthorized discharges. Plans and programs to meet this requirement shall be described in the Collection System O&M Plan required pursuant to Section C.5. below.

3. Infiltration/Inflow

The Permittee and co-permittee shall control infiltration and inflow (I/I) into the sewer system as necessary to prevent high flow related unauthorized discharges from their collection systems and high flow related violations of the wastewater treatment plant's effluent limitations. Plans and programs to control I/I shall be described in the Collection System O&M Plan required pursuant to Section C.5. below.

4. Collection System Mapping

Within 30 months of the effective date of this permit, the Permittee and co-permittee shall prepare a map of the sewer collection system it owns (see page 1 of this permit for the effective date). The map shall be on a street map of the community, with sufficient detail and at a scale to allow easy interpretation. The collection system information shown on the map shall be based on current conditions and shall be kept up-to-date and available for review by federal, state, or local agencies. Such map(s) shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. All sanitary sewer lines and related manholes;
- b. All combined sewer lines, related manholes, and catch basins;
- c. All combined sewer regulators and any known or suspected connections between the sanitary sewer and storm drain systems (e.g. combination manholes);
- d. All outfalls, including the treatment plant outfall(s), CSOs, and any known or suspected SSOs, including stormwater outfalls that are connected to combination manholes;
- e. All pump stations and force mains;
- f. The wastewater treatment facility;
- g. All surface waters (labeled);
- h. Other major appurtenances such as inverted siphons and air release valves;

- i. A numbering system which uniquely identifies manholes, catch basins, overflow points, regulators and outfalls;
- j. The scale and a north arrow; and
- k. The pipe diameter, date of installation, type of material, distance between manholes, and the direction of flow.

5. Collection System O&M Plan

The Permittee and co-permittee shall develop and implement a Collection System O&M Plan.

- a. Within six (6) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall submit to EPA and the State
 - (1) A description of the collection system management goals, staffing, information management, and legal authorities;
 - (2) A description of the collection system and the overall condition of the collection system including a list of all pump stations and a description of recent studies and construction activities; and
 - (3) A schedule for the development and implementation of the full Collection System O&M Plan including the elements in paragraphs b.1. through b.8. below.
- b. The full Collection System O&M Plan shall be completed, implemented and submitted to EPA and the State within twenty-four (24) months from the effective date of this permit. The Plan shall include:
 - (1) The required submittal from paragraph 5.a. above, updated to reflect current information;
 - (2) A preventive maintenance and monitoring program for the collection system;
 - (3) Description of sufficient staffing necessary to properly operate and maintain the sanitary sewer collection system and how the operation and maintenance program is staffed;
 - (4) Description of funding, the source(s) of funding and provisions for funding sufficient for implementing the plan;
 - (5) Identification of known and suspected overflows and back-ups, including manholes. A description of the cause of the identified overflows and back-ups, corrective actions taken, and a plan for addressing the overflows and back-ups consistent with the requirements of this permit;
 - (6) A description of the programs for preventing I/I related effluent violations and all unauthorized discharges of wastewater, including overflows and by-passes and the ongoing program to identify and remove sources of I/I. The program shall include an inflow identification and control program that focuses on the disconnection and redirection of illegal sump pumps and roof down spouts;

- (7) An educational public outreach program for all aspects of I/I control, particularly private inflow; and
- (8) An Overflow Emergency Response Plan to protect public health from overflows and unanticipated bypasses or upsets that exceed any effluent limitation in the permit.

6. Annual Reporting Requirement

The Permittee and co-permittee shall submit a summary report of activities related to the implementation of its Collection System O&M Plan during the previous calendar year. The report shall be submitted to EPA and the State annually by March 31. The first annual report is due the first March 31st following submittal of the collection system O&M Plan required by Part I.C.5.b. of this permit. The summary report shall, at a minimum, include:

- a. A description of the staffing levels maintained during the year;
- b. A map and a description of inspection and maintenance activities conducted and corrective actions taken during the previous year;
- c. Expenditures for any collection system maintenance activities and corrective actions taken during the previous year;
- d. A map with areas identified for investigation/action in the coming year;
- e. A summary of unauthorized discharges during the past year and their causes and a report of any corrective actions taken as a result of the unauthorized discharges reported pursuant to the Unauthorized Discharges section of this permit; and
- f. If the monthly average flow exceeded 80 percent of the facility's 2.15 MGD design flow (1.72 MGD) for three consecutive months in the previous calendar year, or there have been capacity related overflows, the report shall include:
 - (1) Plans for further potential flow increases describing how the Permittee will maintain compliance with the flow limit and all other effluent limitations and conditions; and
 - (2) A calculation of the maximum daily, weekly, and monthly infiltration and the maximum daily, weekly, and monthly inflow for the reporting year.

D. ALTERNATE POWER SOURCE

In order to maintain compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit, the Permittee and co-permittee shall provide an alternative power source(s) sufficient to operate the portion of the publicly owned treatment works it owns and operates, as defined in Part II.E.1 of this permit.

E. INDUSTRIAL USERS AND PRETREATMENT PROGRAM

1. The Permittee shall develop and enforce specific effluent limits (local limits) for Industrial User(s), and all other users, as appropriate, which together with appropriate changes in the POTW Treatment Plant's Facilities or operation, are necessary to ensure continued compliance with the POTW's NPDES permit or sludge use or disposal practices. Specific local limits shall not be developed and enforced without individual notice to persons or groups who have requested such notice and an opportunity to respond. Within 90 days of the effective date of this permit, the Permittee shall prepare and submit a written technical evaluation to the EPA analyzing the need to revise local limits. As part of this evaluation, the Permittee shall assess how the POTW performs with respect to influent and effluent of pollutants, water quality concerns, sludge quality, sludge processing concerns/inhibition, biomonitoring results, activated sludge inhibition, worker health and safety and collection system concerns. In preparing this evaluation, the Permittee shall complete and submit the attached form (see **Attachment C – Reassessment of Technically Based Industrial Discharge Limits**) with the technical evaluation to assist in determining whether existing local limits need to be revised. Justifications and conclusions should be based on actual plant data if available and should be included in the report. Should the evaluation reveal the need to revise local limits, the Permittee shall complete the revisions within 120 days of notification by EPA and submit the revisions to EPA for approval. The Permittee shall carry out the local limits revisions in accordance with EPA's Local Limit Development Guidance (July 2004).
2. The Permittee shall implement the Industrial Pretreatment Program in accordance with the legal authorities, policies, procedures, and financial provisions described in the Permittee's approved Pretreatment Program, and the General Pretreatment Regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 403. At a minimum, the Permittee must perform the following duties to properly implement the Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP):
 - a. Carry out inspection, surveillance, and monitoring procedures which will determine independent of information supplied by the industrial user, whether the industrial user is in compliance with the Pretreatment Standards. At a minimum, all significant industrial users shall be sampled and inspected at the frequency established in the approved IPP but in no case less than once per year and maintain adequate records.
 - b. Issue or renew all necessary industrial user control mechanisms within 90 days of their expiration date or within 180 days after the industry has been determined to be a significant industrial user.
 - c. Obtain appropriate remedies for noncompliance by any industrial user with any pretreatment standard and/or requirement.
 - d. Maintain an adequate revenue structure for continued implementation of the Pretreatment Program.

3. The Permittee shall provide the EPA and the State with an annual report describing the Permittee's pretreatment program activities for the twelve (12) month period ending 60 days prior to the due date in accordance with 403.12(i). The annual report shall be consistent with the format described in **Attachment D** (NPDES Permit Requirement for Industrial Pretreatment Annual Report) of this permit and shall be submitted no later than **March 1** of each year.
4. The Permittee must obtain approval from EPA prior to making any significant changes to the industrial pretreatment program in accordance with 40 C.F.R. 403.18(c).
5. The Permittee must assure that applicable National Categorical Pretreatment Standards are met by all categorical industrial users of the POTW. These standards are published in the Federal Regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 403 et seq.
6. The Permittee must modify its pretreatment program, if necessary, to conform to all changes in the Federal Regulations that pertain to the implementation and enforcement of the industrial pretreatment program. The Permittee must provide EPA, in writing, within 180 days of this permit's effective date proposed changes, if applicable, to the Permittee's pretreatment program deemed necessary to assure conformity with current Federal Regulations. At a minimum, the Permittee must address in its written submission the following areas: (1) Enforcement response plan; (2) revised sewer use ordinances; and (3) slug control evaluations. The Permittee will implement these proposed changes pending EPA Region I's approval under 40 C.F.R. § 403.18. This submission is separate and distinct from any local limits analysis submission described in Part I.E.1.

F. SLUDGE CONDITIONS

1. The Permittee shall comply with all existing federal and state laws and regulations that apply to sewage sludge use and disposal practices, including EPA regulations promulgated at 40 C.F.R. § 503, which prescribe “Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge” pursuant to § 405(d) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1345(d).
2. If both state and federal requirements apply to the Permittee’s sludge use and/or disposal practices, the Permittee shall comply with the more stringent of the applicable requirements.
3. The requirements and technical standards of 40 C.F.R. § 503 apply to the following sludge use or disposal practices:
 - a. Land application - the use of sewage sludge to condition or fertilize the soil
 - b. Surface disposal - the placement of sewage sludge in a sludge only landfill
 - c. Sewage sludge incineration in a sludge only incinerator
4. The requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 503 do not apply to facilities which dispose of sludge in a municipal solid waste landfill. 40 C.F.R. § 503.4. These requirements also do not apply to facilities which do not use or dispose of sewage sludge during the life of the permit but rather treat the sludge (e.g., lagoons, reed beds), or are otherwise excluded under 40 C.F.R. § 503.6.

5. The 40 C.F.R. § 503 requirements include the following elements:

- General requirements
- Pollutant limitations
- Operational Standards (pathogen reduction requirements and vector attraction reduction requirements)
- Management practices
- Record keeping
- Monitoring
- Reporting

Which of the 40 C.F.R. § 503 requirements apply to the Permittee will depend upon the use or disposal practice followed and upon the quality of material produced by a facility. The EPA Region 1 Guidance document, “EPA Region 1 - NPDES Permit Sludge Compliance Guidance” (November 4, 1999), may be used by the Permittee to assist it in determining the applicable requirements.²

6. The sludge shall be monitored for pollutant concentrations (all Part 503 methods) and pathogen reduction and vector attraction reduction (land application and surface disposal) at the following frequency. This frequency is based upon the volume of sewage sludge generated at the facility in dry metric tons per year, as follows:

less than 290	1/ year
290 to less than 1,500	1 /quarter
1,500 to less than 15,000	6 /year
15,000 +	1 /month

Sampling of the sewage sludge shall use the procedures detailed in 40 C.F.R. § 503.8.

7. Under 40 C.F.R. § 503.9(r), the Permittee is a “person who prepares sewage sludge” because it “is ... the person who generates sewage sludge during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works ...” If the Permittee contracts with *another* “person who prepares sewage sludge” under 40 C.F.R. § 503.9(r) – i.e., with “a person who derives a material from sewage sludge” – for use or disposal of the sludge, then compliance with § 503 requirements is the responsibility of the contractor engaged for that purpose. If the Permittee does not engage a “person who prepares sewage sludge,” as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 503.9(r), for use or disposal, then the Permittee remains responsible to ensure that the applicable requirements in § 503 are met. 40 C.F.R. § 503.7. If the ultimate use or disposal method is land application, the Permittee is responsible for providing the person receiving the sludge with notice and necessary information to comply with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 503 Subpart B.

² This guidance document is available upon request from EPA Region 1 and may also be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/permits/generic/sludgeguidance.pdf>

8. The Permittee shall submit an annual report containing the information specified in the 40 C.F.R. § 503 requirements (§ 503.18 (land application), § 503.28 (surface disposal), or § 503.48 (incineration)) by **February 19** (*see also* “EPA Region 1 - NPDES Permit Sludge Compliance Guidance”). Reports shall be submitted electronically using EPA’s Electronic Reporting tool (“NeT”) (*see* “Reporting Requirements” section below).
9. Compliance with the requirements of this permit or 40 C.F.R. § 503 shall not eliminate or modify the need to comply with applicable requirements under RSA 485-A and Env-Wq 800, New Hampshire Sludge Management Rules.

G. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Provision to Modify pH Range

The pH range may be modified if the Permittee satisfies conditions set forth in Part I.I.5 below. Upon notification of an approval by NHDES, EPA will review and, if acceptable, will submit written notice to the Permittee of the permit change. The modified pH range will not be in effect until the Permittee receives written notice from EPA.

2. Phosphorus Compliance Schedule and Ambient Monitoring Requirements

- a. The effluent limit for total phosphorus shall be subject to a schedule of compliance, as follows:
 - i. Within twelve (12) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall submit to EPA and NHDES a status report relative to the planning and design of the facilities necessary to achieve the permit limit.
 - ii. Within twenty-four (24) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall complete design of the Facility improvements required to achieve the total phosphorus limit.
 - iii. Within thirty (30) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall initiate construction of the Facility improvements required to achieve the total phosphorus limit.
 - iv. Within forty-two (42) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall submit to EPA and NHDES a status report relative to construction of the Facility improvements required to achieve the total phosphorus limit.
 - v. Within fifty-four (54) months of the effective date of the permit, the Permittee shall complete construction of the Facility improvements required to achieve the total phosphorus limit and shall comply with the permit limit.
- b. The Permittee shall develop and implement a sampling and analysis plan for biannually collecting monthly samples in the receiving water for total phosphorus at a location upstream of the facility’s discharge. Samples shall be collected once per month, from April through October, every other calendar year starting on the calendar year following the date of permit issuance. Sampling shall be conducted on any calendar day that is preceded by at least 72 hours with less than or equal to 0.1 inches of cumulative rainfall.

A sampling plan shall be submitted to EPA and the State at least three months prior to the first planned sampling date as part of a Quality Assurance Project Plan for review and State approval. For the years that monitoring is not required, the Permittee shall report NODI code "9" (conditional monitoring not required).

3. Aluminum Compliance Schedule

The effluent limit for total aluminum shall be subject to a schedule of compliance whereby the limit takes effect three years after the effective date of the permit. For the period starting on the effective date of this permit and ending three (3) years after the effective date, the Permittee shall report the monthly average and daily maximum aluminum concentration on the monthly DMR. After this initial three (3) year period, the permittee shall comply with the monthly average total aluminum limits of 87 µg/L ("final aluminum effluent limit"). The Permittee shall submit an annual report due January 15th of the first three years of the permit that will detail its progress towards meeting the final aluminum effluent limit.

At a minimum, the Permittee shall include the following:

- a. An evaluation of all potentially significant sources of aluminum in the sewer system and alternatives for minimizing these sources.
- b. An evaluation of alternative modes of operation at the wastewater treatment facility in order to reduce the effluent levels of aluminum.

If during the three-year period after the effective date of the permit, New Hampshire adopts revised aluminum criteria but EPA has not yet approved them, then the Permittee may request a permit modification, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.62(a)(3), for a further delay in the effective date of the final aluminum effluent limit. If new criteria are approved by EPA before the effective date of the final aluminum effluent limit, the Permittee may apply for a permit modification, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.62(a)(3), to revise the time to meet the final aluminum effluent limit and/or for revisions to the permit based on whether there is reasonable potential for the facility's aluminum discharge to cause or contribute to a violation of the newly approve aluminum criteria.³

H. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Unless otherwise specified in this permit, the Permittee shall submit reports, requests, and information and provide notices in the manner described in this section.

1. Submittal of DMRs Using NetDMR

³ The final effluent limit of 87 µg/L for aluminum may be modified prior to the end of the three-year compliance schedule if warranted by the new criteria and a reasonable potential analysis ad consistent with antidegradation requirements. Such a modification would not trigger anti-backsliding prohibitions, as reflected in CWA 402 § (o) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l).

The Permittee shall continue to submit its monthly monitoring data in discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) to EPA and the State no later than the 15th day of the month electronically using NetDMR. When the Permittee submits DMRs using NetDMR, it is not required to submit hard copies of DMRs to EPA or the State. NetDMR is accessible through EPA's Central Data Exchange at <https://cdx.epa.gov/>.

2. Submittal of Reports as NetDMR Attachments

Unless otherwise specified in this permit, the Permittee shall electronically submit all reports to EPA as NetDMR attachments rather than as hard copies. This includes the NHDES Monthly Operating Reports (MORs). *See* Parts I.H.7. for more information on State reporting. Because the due dates for reports described in this permit may not coincide with the due date for submitting DMRs (which is no later than the 15th day of the month), a report submitted electronically as a NetDMR attachment shall be considered timely if it is electronically submitted to EPA using NetDMR with the next DMR due following the report due date specified in this permit.

3. Submittal of Industrial User and Pretreatment Related Reports

a. Prior to December 21, 2020, all reports and information required of the Permittee in the Industrial Users and Pretreatment Program section of this permit shall be submitted to the Pretreatment Coordinator in Region 1 EPA's Water Division. Starting on 21 December 2020, these submittals must be done electronically as NetDMR attachments and/or using EPA's NPDES Electronic Reporting Tool ("NeT"), or another approved EPA system, which will be accessible through EPA's Central Data Exchange at <https://cdx.epa.gov/>. These requests, reports and notices include:

- (1) Annual Pretreatment Reports,
- (2) Pretreatment Reports Reassessment of Technically Based Industrial Discharge Limits Form,
- (3) Revisions to Industrial Discharge Limits,
- (4) Report describing Pretreatment Program activities, and
- (5) Proposed changes to a Pretreatment Program

b. This information shall be submitted to EPA/Water Division as a hard copy at the following address:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Water Division
Regional Pretreatment Coordinator
5 Post Office Square - Suite 100 (06-03)
Boston, MA 02109-3912

4. Submittal of Biosolids/Sewage Sludge Reports

By February 19 of each year, the Permittee must electronically report their annual Biosolids/Sewage Sludge Report for the previous calendar year using EPA's NPDES Electronic Reporting Tool ("NeT"), or another approved EPA system, which is accessible through EPA's Central Data Exchange at <https://cdx.epa.gov/>.

5. Submittal of Requests and Reports to EPA Water Division (WD)

- a. The following requests, reports, and information described in this permit shall be submitted to the NPDES Applications Coordinator in the EPA WD:
 - (1) Transfer of permit notice;
 - (2) Request for changes in sampling location;
 - (3) Request for reduction in testing frequency;
 - (4) Report on unacceptable dilution water / request for alternative dilution water for WET testing.
- b. These reports, information, and requests shall be submitted to EPA WD electronically at R1NPDESReporting@epa.gov.

6. Submittal of Reports to EPA Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division (ECAD) in Hard Copy Form

- a. The following notifications and reports shall be signed and dated originals, submitted as hard copy, with a cover letter describing the submission:
 - (1) Prior to 21 December 2020, written notifications required under Part II.B.4.c, for bypasses, and Part II.D.1.e, for sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs). Starting on 21 December 2020, such notifications must be done electronically using EPA's NPDES Electronic Reporting Tool ("NeT"), or another approved EPA system, which will be accessible through EPA's Central Data Exchange at <https://cdx.epa.gov/>.
 - (2) Collection System Operation and Maintenance Plan (from co-Permittees)
 - (3) Report on annual activities related to O&M Plan (from co-Permittees)
- b. This information shall be submitted to EPA ECAD at the following address:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division
Water Compliance Section
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100 (04-SMR)
Boston, MA 02109-3912

7. State Reporting

Unless otherwise specified in this permit or by the State, duplicate signed copies of all reports, information, requests or notifications described in this permit, including the reports, information, requests or notifications described in Parts I.H.3 through I.H.5 shall also be submitted to the New

Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Water Division (NHDES–WD) electronically to the Permittee’s assigned NPDES inspector at NHDES-WD or as a hardcopy to the following addresses:

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services
Water Division
Wastewater Engineering Bureau
29 Hazen Drive, P.O. Box 95
Concord, New Hampshire 03302-0095

8. Verbal Reports and Verbal Notifications

- a. Any verbal reports or verbal notifications, if required in Parts I and/or II of this permit, shall be made to both EPA and to the State. This includes verbal reports and notifications which require reporting within 24 hours (e.g., Part II.B.4.c. (2), Part II.B.5.c. (3), and Part II.D.1.e.).
- b. Verbal reports and verbal notifications shall be made to:

EPA ECAD at 617-918-1510
and
NHDES Assigned NPDES Inspector at 603-271-1493

I. STATE PERMIT CONDITIONS

1. The Permittee shall not at any time, either alone or in conjunction with any person or persons, cause directly or indirectly the discharge of waste into the said receiving water unless it has been treated in such a manner as will not lower the legislated water quality classification or interfere with the uses assigned to said water by the New Hampshire Legislature (RSA 485-A:12).
2. This NPDES discharge permit is issued by EPA under federal and state law. Upon final issuance by EPA, the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services-Water Division (NHDES-WD) may adopt this permit, including all terms and conditions, as a state permit pursuant to RSA 485-A:13.
3. EPA shall have the right to enforce the terms and conditions of this permit pursuant to federal law and NHDES-WD shall have the right to enforce the permit pursuant to state law, if the permit is adopted. Any modification, suspension, or revocation of this permit shall be effective only with respect to the agency taking such action, and shall not affect the validity or status of the permit as issued by the other agency.
4. Pursuant to New Hampshire Statute RSA 485-A13,I(c), any person responsible for a bypass or upset at a *wastewater facility* shall give immediate notice of a bypass or upset to all public or privately owned water systems drawing water from the same receiving water and located within 20 miles downstream of the point of discharge regardless of whether or not it is on the

same receiving water or on another surface water to which the receiving water is tributary. Wastewater facility is defined at RSA 485-A:2XIX as the structures, equipment, and processes required to collect, convey, and treat domestic and industrial wastes, and dispose of the effluent and sludge. The Permittee shall maintain a list of persons, and their telephone numbers, who are to be notified immediately by telephone. In addition, written notification, which shall be postmarked within 3 days of the bypass or upset, shall be sent to such persons.

5. The pH range of 6.5 to 8.0 Standard Units (S.U.) must be achieved in the final effluent unless the Permittee can demonstrate to NHDES-WD: 1) that the range should be widened due to naturally occurring conditions in the receiving water; or 2) that the naturally occurring receiving water pH is not significantly altered by the Permittee's discharge. The scope of any demonstration project must receive prior approval from NHDES-WD. In no case, shall the above procedure result in pH limits outside the range of 6.0 to 9.0 S.U., which is the federal effluent limitation guideline regulation for pH for secondary treatment and is found in 40 C.F.R. § 133.102(c).
6. Pursuant to New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules, Env-Wq 703.07(a):
 - a. Any person proposing to construct or modify any of the following shall submit an application for a sewer connection permit to the department:
 - (1) Any extension of a collector or interceptor, whether public or private, regardless of flow;
 - (2) Any wastewater connection or other discharge in excess of 5,000 gpd;
 - (3) Any wastewater connection or other discharge to a WWTP operating in excess of 80 percent design flow capacity or design loading capacity based on actual average flow or loading for 3 consecutive months;
 - (4) Any industrial wastewater connection or change in existing discharge of industrial wastewater, regardless of quality or quantity; and
 - (5) Any sewage pumping station greater than 50 gpm or serving more than one building.
 - (6) Any proposed sewer that serves more than one building or that requires a manhole at the connection.
7. For each new or increased discharge of industrial waste to the POTW, the Permittee shall submit, in accordance with Env-Wq 305.10(a) an "Industrial Wastewater Discharge Request."
8. Pursuant to Env-Wq 305.21, at a frequency no less than every five years, the Permittee shall submit to NHDES:
 - a. A copy of its current sewer use ordinance if it has been revised without department approval subsequent to any previous submittal to the department or a certification that no changes have been made.
 - b. A current list of all significant indirect dischargers to the POTW. At a minimum, the list shall include for each significant indirect discharger, its name and address, the name and

daytime telephone number of a contact person, products manufactured, industrial processes used, existing pretreatment processes, and discharge permit status.

- c. A list of all permitted indirect dischargers; and
 - d. A certification that the municipality is strictly enforcing its sewer use ordinance and all discharge permits it has issued.
9. When the effluent discharged for a period of three (3) consecutive months exceeds 80 percent of the 2.15 MGD design flow (1.72 MGD) or design loading capacity, the Permittee shall submit to the permitting authorities a projection of flows and loadings up to the time when the design capacity of the treatment facility will be reached, and a program for maintaining satisfactory treatment levels consistent with approved water quality management plans. Before the design flow will be reached, or whenever treatment necessary to achieve permit limits cannot be assured, the Permittee may be required to submit plans for facility improvements.
10. In accordance with Env-Wq 305.15(d), the Permittee shall not allocate or accept for treatment more than 90 percent of the headworks loading limits of its POTW.

ATTACHMENT A

USEPA REGION 1 FRESHWATER ACUTE TOXICITY TEST PROCEDURE AND PROTOCOL

I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall conduct acceptable acute toxicity tests in accordance with the appropriate test protocols described below:

- **Daphnid (Ceriodaphnia dubia) definitive 48 hour test.**
- **Fathead Minnow (Pimephales promelas) definitive 48 hour test.**

Acute toxicity test data shall be reported as outlined in Section VIII.

II. METHODS

The permittee shall use 40 CFR Part 136 methods. Methods and guidance may be found at:

http://water.epa.gov/scitech/methods/cwa/wet/disk2_index.cfm

The permittee shall also meet the sampling, analysis and reporting requirements included in this protocol. This protocol defines more specific requirements while still being consistent with the Part 136 methods. If, due to modifications of Part 136, there are conflicting requirements between the Part 136 method and this protocol, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of the Part 136 method.

III. SAMPLE COLLECTION

A discharge sample shall be collected. Aliquots shall be split from the sample, containerized and preserved (as per 40 CFR Part 136) for chemical and physical analyses required. The remaining sample shall be measured for total residual chlorine and dechlorinated (if detected) in the laboratory using sodium thiosulfate for subsequent toxicity testing. (Note that EPA approved test methods require that samples collected for metals analyses be preserved immediately after collection.) Grab samples must be used for pH, temperature, and total residual chlorine (as per 40 CFR Part 122.21).

Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater describes dechlorination of samples (APHA, 1992). Dechlorination can be achieved using a ratio of 6.7 mg/L anhydrous sodium thiosulfate to reduce 1.0 mg/L chlorine. If dechlorination is necessary, a thiosulfate control (maximum amount of thiosulfate in lab control or receiving water) must also be run in the WET test.

All samples held overnight shall be refrigerated at 1- 6°C.

IV. DILUTION WATER

A grab sample of dilution water used for acute toxicity testing shall be collected from the receiving water at a point immediately upstream of the permitted discharge's zone of influence at a reasonably accessible location. Avoid collection near areas of obvious road or agricultural runoff, storm sewers or other point source discharges and areas where stagnant conditions exist. In the case where an alternate dilution water has been agreed upon an additional receiving water control (0% effluent) must also be tested.

If the receiving water diluent is found to be, or suspected to be toxic or unreliable, an alternate standard dilution water of known quality with a hardness, pH, conductivity, alkalinity, organic carbon, and total suspended solids similar to that of the receiving water may be substituted **AFTER RECEIVING WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM THE PERMIT ISSUING AGENCY(S)**. Written requests for use of an alternate dilution water should be mailed with supporting documentation to the following address:

Director
Water Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-New
England 5 Post Office Sq., Suite 100 (06-5)
Boston, MA 02109-3912

and

Manager
Water Technical Unit (SEW)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
5 Post Office Sq., Suite 100 (OES04-4)
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Note: USEPA Region 1 retains the right to modify any part of the alternate dilution water policy stated in this protocol at any time. Any changes to this policy will be documented in the annual DMR posting.

See the most current annual DMR instructions which can be found on the EPA Region 1 website at <http://www.epa.gov/region1/enforcement/water/dmr.html> for further important details on alternate dilution water substitution requests.

It may prove beneficial to have the proposed dilution water source screened for suitability prior to toxicity testing. EPA strongly urges that screening be done prior to set up of a full definitive toxicity test any time there is question about the dilution water's ability to support acceptable performance as outlined in the 'test acceptability' section of the protocol.

V. TEST CONDITIONS

The following tables summarize the accepted daphnid and fathead minnow toxicity test conditions and test acceptability criteria:

EPA NEW ENGLAND EFFLUENT TOXICITY TEST CONDITIONS FOR THE DAPHNID, CERIODAPHNIA DUBIA 48 HOUR ACUTE TESTS¹

1.	Test type	Static, non-renewal
2.	Temperature (°C)	20 ± 1°C or 25 ± 1°C
3.	Light quality	Ambient laboratory illumination
4.	Photoperiod	16 hour light, 8 hour dark
5.	Test chamber size	Minimum 30 ml
6.	Test solution volume	Minimum 15 ml
7.	Age of test organisms	1-24 hours (neonates)
8.	No. of daphnids per test chamber	5
9.	No. of replicate test chambers per treatment	4
10.	Total no. daphnids per test concentration	20
11.	Feeding regime	As per manual, lightly feed YCT and <u>Selenastrum</u> to newly released organisms while holding prior to initiating test
12.	Aeration	None
13.	Dilution water ²	Receiving water, other surface water, synthetic water adjusted to the hardness and alkalinity of the receiving water (prepared using either Millipore Milli-Q ^R or equivalent deionized water and reagent grade chemicals according to EPA acute toxicity test manual) or deionized water combined with mineral water to appropriate hardness.
14.	Dilution series	≥ 0.5, must bracket the permitted RWC
15.	Number of dilutions	5 plus receiving water and laboratory water control and thiosulfate control, as necessary. An additional dilution at the permitted effluent concentration (% effluent) is required if it is not included in the dilution

series.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 16. Effect measured | Mortality-no movement of body or appendages on gentle prodding |
| 17. Test acceptability | 90% or greater survival of test organisms in dilution water control solution |
| 18. Sampling requirements | For on-site tests, samples must be used within 24 hours of the time that they are removed from the sampling device. For off-site tests, samples must first be used within 36 hours of collection. |
| 19. Sample volume required | Minimum 1 liter |

Footnotes:

1. Adapted from EPA-821-R-02-012.
2. Standard prepared dilution water must have hardness requirements to generally reflect the characteristics of the receiving water.

**EPA NEW ENGLAND TEST CONDITIONS FOR THE FATHEAD MINNOW
(PIMEPHALES PROMELAS) 48 HOUR ACUTE TEST¹**

1. Test Type	Static, non-renewal
2. Temperature (°C)	20 ± 1 ° C or 25 ± 1°C
3. Light quality	Ambient laboratory illumination
4. Photoperiod	16 hr light, 8 hr dark
5. Size of test vessels	250 mL minimum
6. Volume of test solution	Minimum 200 mL/replicate
7. Age of fish	1-14 days old and age within 24 hrs of each other
8. No. of fish per chamber	10
9. No. of replicate test vessels per treatment	4
10. Total no. organisms per concentration	40
11. Feeding regime	As per manual, lightly feed test age larvae using concentrated brine shrimp nauplii while holding prior to initiating test
12. Aeration	None, unless dissolved oxygen (D.O.) concentration falls below 4.0 mg/L, at which time gentle single bubble aeration should be started at a rate of less than 100 bubbles/min. (Routine D.O. check is recommended.)
13. dilution water ²	Receiving water, other surface water, synthetic water adjusted to the hardness and alkalinity of the receiving water (prepared using either Millipore Milli-Q ^R or equivalent deionized and reagent grade chemicals according to EPA acute toxicity test manual) or deionized water combined with mineral water to appropriate hardness.
14. Dilution series	≥ 0.5, must bracket the permitted RWC

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 15. Number of dilutions | 5 plus receiving water and laboratory water control and thiosulfate control, as necessary. An additional dilution at the permitted effluent concentration (% effluent) is required if it is not included in the dilution series. |
| 16. Effect measured | Mortality-no movement on gentle prodding |
| 17. Test acceptability | 90% or greater survival of test organisms in dilution water control solution |
| 18. Sampling requirements | For on-site tests, samples must be used within 24 hours of the time that they are removed from the sampling device. For off-site tests, samples are used within 36 hours of collection. |
| 19. Sample volume required | Minimum 2 liters |

Footnotes:

1. Adapted from EPA-821-R-02-012
2. Standard dilution water must have hardness requirements to generally reflect characteristics of the receiving water.

VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

At the beginning of a static acute toxicity test, pH, conductivity, total residual chlorine, oxygen, hardness, alkalinity and temperature must be measured in the highest effluent concentration and the dilution water. Dissolved oxygen, pH and temperature are also measured at 24 and 48 hour intervals in all dilutions. The following chemical analyses shall be performed on the 100 percent effluent sample and the upstream water sample for each sampling event.

<u>Parameter</u>	Effluent	Receiving Water	ML (mg/l)
Hardness ¹	x	x	0.5
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) ^{2, 3}	x		0.02
Alkalinity	x	x	2.0
pH	x	x	--
Specific Conductance	x	x	--
Total Solids	x		--
Total Dissolved Solids	x		--
Ammonia	x	x	0.1
Total Organic Carbon	x	x	0.5
Total Metals			
Cd	x	x	0.0005
Pb	x	x	0.0005
Cu	x	x	0.003
Zn	x	x	0.005
Ni	x	x	0.005
Al	x	x	0.02
Other as permit requires			

Notes:

- Hardness may be determined by:
 - APHA Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater , 21st Edition
 - Method 2340B (hardness by calculation)
 - Method 2340C (titration)
- Total Residual Chlorine may be performed using any of the following methods provided the required minimum limit (ML) is met.
 - APHA Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater , 21st Edition
 - Method 4500-CL E Low Level Amperometric Titration
 - Method 4500-CL G DPD Colorimetric Method
- Required to be performed on the sample used for WET testing prior to its use for toxicity testing.

VII. TOXICITY TEST DATA ANALYSIS

LC50 Median Lethal Concentration (Determined at 48 Hours)

Methods of Estimation:

- Probit Method
- Spearman-Kärber
- Trimmed Spearman-Kärber
- Graphical

See the flow chart in Figure 6 on p. 73 of EPA-821-R-02-012 for appropriate method to use on a given data set.

No Observed Acute Effect Level (NOAEL)

See the flow chart in Figure 13 on p. 87 of EPA-821-R-02-012.

VIII. TOXICITY TEST REPORTING

A report of the results will include the following:

- Description of sample collection procedures, site description
- Names of individuals collecting and transporting samples, times and dates of sample collection and analysis on chain-of-custody
- General description of tests: age of test organisms, origin, dates and results of standard toxicant tests; light and temperature regime; other information on test conditions if different than procedures recommended. Reference toxicant test data should be included.
- All chemical/physical data generated. (Include minimum detection levels and minimum quantification levels.)
- Raw data and bench sheets.
- Provide a description of dechlorination procedures (as applicable).
- Any other observations or test conditions affecting test outcome.

ATTACHMENT B
FRESHWATER CHRONIC
TOXICITY TEST PROCEDURE AND PROTOCOL
USEPA Region 1

I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall be responsible for the conduct of acceptable chronic toxicity tests using three fresh samples collected during each test period. The following tests shall be performed as prescribed in Part 1 of the NPDES discharge permit in accordance with the appropriate test protocols described below. (Note: the permittee and testing laboratory should review the applicable permit to determine whether testing of one or both species is required).

- **Daphnid (Ceriodaphnia dubia) Survival and Reproduction Test.**
- **Fathead Minnow (Pimephales promelas) Larval Growth and Survival Test.**

Chronic toxicity data shall be reported as outlined in Section VIII.

II. METHODS

Methods to follow are those recommended by EPA in: Short Term Methods For Estimating The Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Water to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, October 2002. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Water, Washington, D.C., EPA 821-R-02-013. The methods are available on-line at <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/WET/> . Exceptions and clarification are stated herein.

III. SAMPLE COLLECTION AND USE

A total of three fresh samples of effluent and receiving water are required for initiation and subsequent renewals of a freshwater, chronic, toxicity test. The receiving water control sample must be collected immediately upstream of the permitted discharge's zone of influence. Fresh samples are recommended for use on test days 1, 3, and 5. However, provided a total of three samples are used for testing over the test period, an alternate sampling schedule is acceptable. The acceptable holding times until initial use of a sample are 24 and 36 hours for on-site and off-site testing, respectively. A written waiver is required from the regulating authority for any hold time extension. All test samples collected may be used for 24, 48 and 72 hour renewals after initial use. All samples held for use beyond the day of sampling shall be refrigerated and maintained at a temperature range of 0-6° C.

All samples submitted for chemical and physical analyses will be analyzed according to Section VI of this protocol.

Sampling guidance dictates that, where appropriate, aliquots for the analysis required in this protocol shall be split from the samples, containerized and immediately preserved, or analyzed as per 40 CFR Part 136. EPA approved test methods require that samples collected for metals analyses be preserved immediately after collection. Testing for the presence of total residual chlorine (TRC) must be analyzed immediately or as soon as possible, for all effluent samples, prior to WET testing. TRC analysis may be performed on-site or by the toxicity testing laboratory and the samples must be dechlorinated, as necessary, using sodium thiosulfate prior to sample use for toxicity testing.

If any of the renewal samples are of sufficient potency to cause lethality to 50 percent or more of the test organisms in any of the test treatments for either species or, if the test fails to meet its permit limits, then chemical analysis for total metals (originally required for the initial sample only in Section VI) will be required on the renewal sample(s) as well.

IV. DILUTION WATER

Samples of receiving water must be collected from a location in the receiving water body immediately upstream of the permitted discharge's zone of influence at a reasonably accessible location. Avoid collection near areas of obvious road or agricultural runoff, storm sewers or other point source discharges and areas where stagnant conditions exist. EPA strongly urges that screening for toxicity be performed prior to the set up of a full, definitive toxicity test any time there is a question about the test dilution water's ability to achieve test acceptability criteria (TAC) as indicated in Section V of this protocol. The test dilution water control response will be used in the statistical analysis of the toxicity test data. All other control(s) required to be run in the test will be reported as specified in the Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) Instructions, Attachment F, page 2, Test Results & Permit Limits.

The test dilution water must be used to determine whether the test met the applicable TAC. When receiving water is used for test dilution, an additional control made up of standard laboratory water (0% effluent) is required. This control will be used to verify the health of the test organisms and evaluate to what extent, if any, the receiving water itself is responsible for any toxic response observed.

If dechlorination of a sample by the toxicity testing laboratory is necessary a "sodium thiosulfate" control, representing the concentration of sodium thiosulfate used to adequately dechlorinate the sample prior to toxicity testing, must be included in the test.

If the use of an alternate dilution water (ADW) is authorized, in addition to the ADW test control, the testing laboratory must, for the purpose of monitoring the receiving water, also run a receiving water control.

If the receiving water diluent is found to be, or suspected to be toxic or unreliable an ADW of known quality with hardness similar to that of the receiving water may be substituted. Substitution is species specific meaning that the decision to use ADW is made for each species and is based on the toxic response of that particular species. Substitution to an ADW is authorized in two cases. The first is the case where repeating a test due to toxicity in the site dilution water requires an **immediate decision** for ADW use be made by the permittee and toxicity testing laboratory. The second is in the case where two of the most recent documented incidents of unacceptable site dilution water toxicity requires ADW use in future WET testing.

For the second case, written notification from the permittee requesting ADW use **and** written authorization from the permit issuing agency(s) is required **prior to** switching to a long-term use of ADW for the duration of the permit.

Written requests for use of ADW must be mailed with supporting documentation to the following addresses:

Director
Water Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1
Five Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code 06-5
Boston, MA 02109-3912

and

Manager
Water Technical Unit (SEW)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Five Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code OES04-4
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Note: USEPA Region 1 retains the right to modify any part of the alternate dilution water policy stated in this protocol at any time. Any changes to this policy will be documented in the annual DMR posting.

See the most current annual DMR instructions which can be found on the EPA Region 1 website at <http://www.epa.gov/region1/enforcementandassistance/dmr.html> for further important details on alternate dilution water substitution requests.

V. TEST CONDITIONS AND TEST ACCEPTABILITY CRITERIA

Method specific test conditions and TAC are to be followed and adhered to as specified in the method guidance document, EPA 821-R-02-013. If a test does not meet TAC the test must be repeated with fresh samples within 30 days of the initial test completion date.

V.1. Use of Reference Toxicity Testing

Reference toxicity test results and applicable control charts must be included in the toxicity testing report.

If reference toxicity test results fall outside the control limits established by the laboratory for a specific test endpoint, a reason or reasons for this excursion must be evaluated, correction made and reference toxicity tests rerun as necessary.

If a test endpoint value exceeds the control limits at a frequency of more than one out of twenty then causes for the reference toxicity test failure must be examined and if problems are identified corrective action taken. The reference toxicity test must be repeated during the same month in which the exceedance occurred.

If two consecutive reference toxicity tests fall outside control limits, the possible cause(s) for the exceedance must be examined, corrective actions taken and a repeat of the reference toxicity test must take place immediately. Actions taken to resolve the problem must be reported.

V.1.a. Use of Concurrent Reference Toxicity Testing

In the case where concurrent reference toxicity testing is required due to a low frequency of testing with a particular method, if the reference toxicity test results fall slightly outside of laboratory established control limits, but the primary test met the TAC, the results of the primary test will be considered acceptable. However, if the results of the concurrent test fall well outside the established **upper** control limits i.e. ≥ 3 standard deviations for IC25 values and \geq two concentration intervals for NOECs, and even though the primary test meets TAC, the primary test will be considered unacceptable and must be repeated.

V.2. For the *C. dubia* test, the determination of TAC and formal statistical analyses must be performed using only the first three broods produced.

V.3. Test treatments must include 5 effluent concentrations and a dilution water control. An additional test treatment, at the permitted effluent concentration (% effluent), is required if it is not included in the dilution series.

VI. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

As part of each toxicity test's daily renewal procedure, pH, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen (DO) and temperature must be measured at the beginning and end of each 24-hour period in each test treatment and the control(s).

The additional analysis that must be performed under this protocol is as specified and noted in the table below.

<u>Parameter</u>	Effluent	Receiving Water	ML (mg/l)
Hardness ^{1, 4}	x	x	0.5
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) ^{2, 3, 4}	x		0.02
Alkalinity ⁴	x	x	2.0
pH ⁴	x	x	--
Specific Conductance ⁴	x	x	--
Total Solids ⁶	x		--
Total Dissolved Solids ⁶	x		--
Ammonia ⁴	x	x	0.1
Total Organic Carbon ⁶	x	x	0.5
Total Metals ⁵			
Cd	x	x	0.0005
Pb	x	x	0.0005
Cu	x	x	0.003
Zn	x	x	0.005
Ni	x	x	0.005
Al	x	x	0.02

Other as permit requires

Notes:

1. Hardness may be determined by:

- APHA Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater , 21st Edition
 - Method 2340B (hardness by calculation)
 - Method 2340C (titration)
2. Total Residual Chlorine may be performed using any of the following methods provided the required minimum limit (ML) is met.
 - APHA Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater , 21st Edition
 - Method 4500-CL E Low Level Amperometric Titration
 - Method 4500-CL G DPD Colorimetric Method
 - USEPA 1983. Manual of Methods Analysis of Water and Wastes
 - Method 330.5
 3. Required to be performed on the sample used for WET testing prior to its use for toxicity testing
 4. Analysis is to be performed on samples and/or receiving water, as designated in the table above, from all three sampling events.
 5. Analysis is to be performed on the initial sample(s) only unless the situation arises as stated in Section III, paragraph 4
 6. Analysis to be performed on initial samples only

VII. TOXICITY TEST DATA ANALYSIS AND REVIEW

A. Test Review

1. Concentration / Response Relationship

A concentration/response relationship evaluation is required for test endpoint determinations from both Hypothesis Testing and Point Estimate techniques. The test report is to include documentation of this evaluation in support of the endpoint values reported. The dose-response review must be performed as required in Section 10.2.6 of EPA-821-R-02-013.

Guidance for this review can be found at

<http://water.epa.gov/scitech/methods/cwa/> . In most cases, the review will result in one of the following three conclusions: (1) Results are reliable and reportable; (2) Results are anomalous and require explanation; or (3) Results are inconclusive and a retest with fresh samples is required.

2. Test Variability (Test Sensitivity)

This review step is separate from the determination of whether a test meets or does not meet TAC. Within test variability is to be examined for the purpose of evaluating test sensitivity. This evaluation is to be performed for the sub-lethal hypothesis testing endpoints reproduction and growth as required by the permit. The test report is to include documentation of this evaluation to support that the endpoint values reported resulted from a toxicity test of adequate sensitivity. This evaluation must be performed as required in Section 10.2.8 of EPA-821-R-02-013.

To determine the adequacy of test sensitivity, USEPA requires the calculation of test percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) values. In cases where NOEC determinations are made based on a non-parametric technique, calculation of a test PMSD value, for the sole purpose of assessing test sensitivity, shall be calculated using a comparable parametric statistical analysis technique. The calculated test PMSD is then compared to the upper and lower PMSD bounds shown for freshwater tests in Section 10.2.8.3, p. 52, Table 6 of EPA-821-R-02-013. The comparison will yield one of the following determinations.

- The test PMSD exceeds the PMSD upper bound test variability criterion in Table 6, the test results are considered highly variable and the test may not be sensitive enough to determine the presence of toxicity at the permit limit concentration (PLC). If the test results indicate that the discharge is not toxic at the PLC, then the test is considered insufficiently sensitive and must be repeated within 30 days of the initial test completion using fresh samples. If the test results indicate that the discharge is toxic at the PLC, the test is considered acceptable and does not have to be repeated.
- The test PMSD falls below the PMSD lower bound test variability criterion in Table 6, the test is determined to be very sensitive. In order to determine which treatment(s) are statistically significant and which are not, for the purpose of reporting a NOEC, the relative percent difference (RPD) between the control and each treatment must be calculated and compared to the lower PMSD boundary. See *Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in Whole Effluent Toxicity Applications Under the NPDES Program*, EPA 833-R-00-003, June 2002, Section 6.4.2. The following link: [Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in Whole Effluent Toxicity Applications Under the NPDES Program](#) can be used to locate the USEPA website containing this document. If the RPD for a treatment falls below the PMSD lower bound, the difference is considered statistically insignificant. If the RPD for a treatment is greater than the PMSD lower bound, then the treatment is considered statistically significant.
- The test PMSD falls within the PMSD upper and lower bounds in Table 6, the sub-lethal test endpoint values shall be reported as is.

B. Statistical Analysis

1. General - Recommended Statistical Analysis Method

Refer to general data analysis flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 43

For discussion on Hypothesis Testing, refer to EPA 821-R-02-013, Section 9.6

For discussion on Point Estimation Techniques, refer to EPA 821-R-02-013, Section 9.7

2. *Pimephales promelas*

Refer to survival hypothesis testing analysis flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 79

Refer to survival point estimate techniques flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 80

Refer to growth data statistical analysis flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 92

3. *Ceriodaphnia dubia*

Refer to survival data testing flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 168

Refer to reproduction data testing flowchart, EPA 821-R-02-013, page 173

VIII. TOXICITY TEST REPORTING

A report of results must include the following:

- Test summary sheets (2007 DMR Attachment F) which includes:
 - Facility name
 - NPDES permit number
 - Outfall number
 - Sample type
 - Sampling method
 - Effluent TRC concentration
 - Dilution water used
 - Receiving water name and sampling location
 - Test type and species
 - Test start date
 - Effluent concentrations tested (%) and permit limit concentration
 - Applicable reference toxicity test date and whether acceptable or not
 - Age, age range and source of test organisms used for testing
 - Results of TAC review for all applicable controls
 - Test sensitivity evaluation results (test PMSD for growth and reproduction)
 - Permit limit and toxicity test results
 - Summary of test sensitivity and concentration response evaluation

In addition to the summary sheets the report must include:

- A brief description of sample collection procedures
- Chain of custody documentation including names of individuals collecting samples, times and dates of sample collection, sample locations, requested analysis and lab receipt with time and date received, lab receipt personnel and condition of samples upon receipt at the lab(s)
- Reference toxicity test control charts
- All sample chemical/physical data generated, including minimum limits (MLs) and analytical methods used
- All toxicity test raw data including daily ambient test conditions, toxicity test chemistry, sample dechlorination details as necessary, bench sheets and statistical analysis
- A discussion of any deviations from test conditions
- Any further discussion of reported test results, statistical analysis and concentration-response relationship and test sensitivity review per species per endpoint

ATTACHMENT C

EPA - New England

Reassessment of Technically Based Industrial Discharge Limits

Under 40 CFR §122.21(j)(4), all Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with approved Industrial Pretreatment Programs (IPPs) shall provide the following information to the Director: a written evaluation of the need to revise local industrial discharge limits under 40 CFR §403.5(c)(1).

Below is a form designed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA - New England) to assist POTWs with approved IPPs in evaluating whether their existing Technically Based Local Limits (TBLLs) need to be recalculated. The form allows the permittee and EPA to evaluate and compare pertinent information used in previous TBLLs calculations against present conditions at the POTW.

Please read direction below before filling out form.

ITEM I.

- * In Column (1), list what your POTW's influent flow rate was when your existing TBLLs were calculated. In Column (2), list your POTW's present influent flow rate. Your current flow rate should be calculated using the POTW's average daily flow rate from the previous 12 months.
- * In Column (1) list what your POTW's SIU flow rate was when your existing TBLLs were calculated. In Column (2), list your POTW's present SIU flow rate.
- * In Column (1), list what dilution ratio and/or 7Q10 value was used in your old/expired NPDES permit. In Column (2), list what dilution ration and/or 7Q10 value is presently being used in your new/reissued NPDES permit.

The 7Q10 value is the lowest seven day average flow rate, in the river, over a ten year period. The 7Q10 value and/or dilution ratio used by EPA in your new NPDES permit can be found in your NPDES permit "Fact Sheet."

- * In Column (1), list the safety factor, if any, that was used when your existing TBLLs were calculated.
- * In Column (1), note how your bio-solids were managed when your existing TBLLs were calculated. In Column (2), note how your POTW is presently disposing of its biosolids and how your POTW will be disposing of its biosolids in the future.

ITEM II.

- * List what your existing TBLLs are - as they appear in your current Sewer Use Ordinance (SUO).

ITEM III.

- * Identify how your existing TBLLs are allocated out to your industrial community. Some pollutants may be allocated differently than others, if so please explain.

ITEM IV.

- * Since your existing TBLLs were calculated, identify the following in detail:
 - (1) if your POTW has experienced any upsets, inhibition, interference or pass-through as a result of an industrial discharge.
 - (2) if your POTW is presently violating any of its current NPDES permit limitations - include toxicity.

ITEM V.

- * Using current sampling data, list in Column (1) the average and maximum amount of pollutants (in pounds per day) received in the POTW's influent. Current sampling data is defined as data obtained over the last 24 month period.

All influent data collected and analyzed must be in accordance with 40 CFR §136. Sampling data collected should be analyzed using the lowest possible detection method(s), e.g. graphite furnace.

- * Based on your existing TBLLs, as presented in Item II., list in Column (2), for each pollutant the Maximum Allowable Headwork Loading (MAHL) values derived from an applicable environmental criteria or standard, e.g. water quality, sludge, NPDES, inhibition, etc. For more information, please see EPA's Local Limit Guidance Document (July 2004).

Item VI.

- * Using current sampling data, list in Column (1) the average and maximum amount of pollutants (in micrograms per liter) present your POTW's effluent. Current sampling data is defined as data obtained during the last 24 month period.

(Item VI. continued)

All effluent data collected and analyzed must be in accordance with 40 CFR §136. Sampling data collected should be analyzed using the lowest possible detection method(s), e.g. graphite furnace.

- * List in Column (2A) what the Water Quality Standards (WQS) were (in micrograms per liter) when your TBLLs were calculated, please note what hardness value was used at that time. Hardness should be expressed in milligram per liter of Calcium Carbonate.

List in Column (2B) the current WQSs or "Chronic Gold Book" values for each pollutant multiplied by the dilution ratio used in your new/reissued NPDES permit. For example, with a dilution ratio of 25:1 at a hardness of 25 mg/l - Calcium Carbonate (copper's chronic WQS equals 6.54 ug/l) the chronic NPDES permit limit for copper would equal 156.25 ug/l.

ITEM VII.

- * In Column (1), list all pollutants (in micrograms per liter) limited in your new/reissued NPDES permit. In Column (2), list all pollutants limited in your old/expired NPDES permit.

ITEM VIII.

- * Using current sampling data, list in Column (1) the average and maximum amount of pollutants in your POTW's biosolids. Current data is defined as data obtained during the last 24 month period. Results are to be expressed as total dry weight.

All biosolids data collected and analyzed must be in accordance with 40 CFR §136.

In Column (2A), list current State and/or Federal sludge standards that your facility's biosolids must comply with. Also note how your POTW currently manages the disposal of its biosolids. If your POTW is planning on managing its biosolids differently, list in Column (2B) what your new biosolids criteria will be and method of disposal.

In general, please be sure the units reported are correct and all pertinent information is included in your evaluation. If you have any questions, please contact your pretreatment representative at EPA - New England.

ITEM II.

EXISTING TBLs			
POLLUTANT	NUMERICAL LIMIT (mg/l) or (lb/day)	POLLUTANT	NUMERICAL LIMIT (mg/l) or (lb/day)

ITEM III.

Note how your existing TBLs, listed in Item II., are allocated to your Significant Industrial Users (SIUs), i.e. uniform concentration, contributory flow, mass proportioning, other. Please specify by circling.

ITEM IV.

Has your POTW experienced any upsets, inhibition, interference or pass-through from industrial sources since your existing TBLs were calculated?
If yes, explain.

Has your POTW violated any of its NPDES permit limits and/or toxicity test requirements?

If _____ yes, _____ explain.

ITEM V.

Using current POTW influent sampling data fill in Column (1). In Column (2), list your Maximum Allowable Headwork Loading (MAHL) values used to derive your TBLLs listed in Item II. In addition, please note the Environmental Criteria for which each MAHL value was established, i.e. water quality, sludge, NPDES etc.

Pollutant	Column (1) Influent Data Analyses		Column (2) MAHL Values (lb/day)	Criteria
	Maximum (lb/day)	Average (lb/day)		
Arsenic				
Cadmium				
Chromium				
Copper				
Cyanide				
Lead				
Mercury				
Nickel				
Silver				
Zinc				
Other (List)				

ITEM VI.

Using current POTW effluent sampling data, fill in Column (1). In Column (2A) list what the Water Quality Standards (Gold Book Criteria) were at the time your existing TBLLs were developed. List in Column (2B) current Gold Book values multiplied by the dilution ratio used in your new/reissued NPDES permit.

Pollutant	Column (1)		Columns (2A) (2B)	
	Effluent Data Analyses		Water Quality Criteria (Gold Book)	
	Maximum (ug/l)	Average (ug/l)	From TBLLs Today (ug/l)	(ug/l)
Arsenic				
*Cadmium				
*Chromium				
*Copper				
Cyanide				
*Lead				
Mercury				
*Nickel				
Silver				
*Zinc				
Other (List)				

*Hardness Dependent (mg/l - CaCO3)

ITEM VIII.

Using current POTW biosolids data, fill in Column (1). In Column (2A), list the biosolids criteria that was used at the time your existing TBLLs were calculated. If your POTW is planing on managing its biosolids differently, list in Column (2B) what your new biosolids criteria would be and method of disposal.

Pollutant	Column (1)	Biosolids	Columns	
	Data Analyses		(2A)	(2B)
	Average		Biosolids Criteria	From TBLLs
	(mg/kg)		New	
			(mg/kg)	(mg/kg)
Arsenic				
Cadmium				
Chromium				
Copper				
Cyanide				
Lead				
Mercury				
Nickel				
Silver				
Zinc				
Molybdenum				
Selenium				
Other (List)				

Attachment D

Industrial Pretreatment Program Annual Report Requirements

The Permittee shall provide to the Approval Authority with an annual report that briefly describes the POTW's program activities, including activities of all participating agencies, if more than one jurisdiction is involved in the local program. The report required by this section shall be submitted no later than one year after approval of the POTW's Pretreatment Program, and at least annually thereafter, and must include, at a minimum, the applicable required data in appendix A to 40 CFR Part 127. The report required by this section must also include a summary of changes to the POTW's pretreatment program that have not been previously reported to the Approval Authority and any other relevant information requested by the Approval Authority. As of December 21, 2020 all annual reports submitted in compliance with this section must be submitted electronically by the POTW Pretreatment Program to the Approval Authority or initial recipient, as defined in 40 CFR 127.2(b), in compliance with this section and 40 CFR Part 3 (including, in all cases, Subpart D to Part 3), 40 CFR 122.22, and 40 CFR Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, the Approval Authority may also require POTW Pretreatment Programs to electronically submit annual reports under this section if specified by a particular permit or if required to do so by state law.

The permitted shall submit to Approval Authority and the state permitting authority a report that contains the following information requested by EPA:

1. An updated list of the POTW's Industrial Users by category as set forth in 40 C.F.R. 403.8(f)(2)(i), to include:
 - a. Names and addresses, or a list of deletions and additions keyed to a previously submitted list. The POTW shall provide a brief explanation of each deletion. This list shall identify which Industrial Users are subject to categorical Pretreatment Standards and specify which Standards are applicable to each Industrial User. The list shall indicate which Industrial Users are subject to local standards that are more stringent than the categorical Pretreatment Standards. The POTW shall also list the Industrial Users that are subject only to local Requirements. The list must also identify Industrial Users subject to categorical Pretreatment Standards that are subject to reduced reporting requirements under paragraph (e)(3), and identify which Industrial Users are Non-Significant Categorical Industrial Users.
 - b. Permit status. Whether each SIU has an unexpired control mechanism and an explanation as to why any SIUs are operating without a current, unexpired control mechanism (e.g. permit);
 - c. Baseline monitoring reporting requirements for newly promulgated industries
 - d. In addition, a brief description of the industry and general activities;
2. A summary of compliance and enforcement activities during the preceding year, including the number of:

- a. significant industrial users inspected by POTW (include inspection dates for each industrial user),
 - b. significant industrial users sampled by POTW (include sampling dates for each industrial user),
 - c. compliance schedules issued (include list of subject users),
 - d. written notices of violations issued (include list of subject users),
 - e. administrative orders issued (include list of subject users),
 - f. criminal or civil suits filed (include list of subject users) and,
 - g. penalties obtained (include list of subject users and penalty amounts);
3. A narrative description of program effectiveness including present and proposed changes to the program, such as funding, staffing, ordinances, regulations, rules and/or statutory authority;
 4. The Permittee shall prepare annually a list of industrial users, which during the preceding twelve (12) months have significantly violated Pretreatment Standards or requirements 40 C.F.R. 403.8(f)(2)(vii). This list is to be published annually in a newspaper of general circulation in the Permittee's service area.
 5. A summary of all monitoring activities performed within the previous twelve (12) months. The following information shall be reported:

Total number of SIUs inspected; and
Total number of SIUs sampled.

- a. For all industrial users that were in Significant Non-Compliance during the previous twelve (12) months, provide the name of the violating industrial user; indicate the nature of the violations, the type and number of actions taken (administrative order, criminal or civil suit, fines or penalties collected, etc.) and current compliance status. Indicate if the company returned to compliance and the date compliance was attained. Determination of Significant Non-Compliance shall be performed.
6. A summary of all enforcement actions not covered by the paragraph above conducted in accordance with the approved Enforcement Response Plan.
 7. A description of actions being taken to reduce the incidence of significant violations by significant industrial users.
 8. A detailed description of all interference and pass-through that occurred during the past year.
 9. A thorough description of all investigations into interference and pass-through during the past year.

10. A description of monitoring, sewer inspections and evaluations which were done during the past year to detect interference and pass-through, specifying parameters and frequencies;
11. The Permittee shall analyze the treatment facility influent and effluent at least Annually for the presence of the toxic pollutants listed in 40 CFR Part 122 Appendix D (NPDES Application Testing Requirements) Table III as follows:
 - Antimony
 - Arsenic
 - Beryllium
 - Cadmium
 - Chromium
 - Copper
 - Lead
 - Mercury
 - Nickel
 - Selenium
 - Silver
 - Thallium
 - Zinc
 - Cyanide
 - Phenols

The sampling program shall consist of one 24-hour flow-proportioned composite and at least one grab sample that is representative of the flows received by the POTW. The composite shall consist of hourly flow-proportioned grab samples taken over a 24-hour period if the sample is collected manually or shall consist of a minimum of 48 samples collected at 30 minute intervals if an automated sampler is used. Cyanide shall be taken as a grab sample during the same period as the composite sample. Sampling and preservation shall be consistent with 40 CFR Part 136. All analytical procedures and method detection limits must be specified when reporting the results of such analyses.

12. The Permittee shall analyze the treatment facility sludge (biosolids) prior to disposal, for the presence of toxic pollutants listed above in 40 CFR Part 122 Appendix D (NPDES Application Testing Requirements) Table III at least once per year. If the Permittee does not dispose of biosolids during the calendar year, the Permittee shall certify to that in the Pretreatment Annual Report and the monitoring requirements in this paragraph shall be suspended for that calendar year.
 - a. The Permittee shall use sample collection and analysis procedures as approved for use under 40 CFR Part 503 or specified in the EPA Region 8 General Permit for biosolids.
13. The summary shall include an evaluation of influent sampling results versus threshold inhibitory concentrations for the Wastewater Treatment System and effluent sampling results versus water quality standards. Such a comparison shall be based on the sampling program described in the paragraphs above or any similar sampling program described in this Permit.
14. Identification of the specific locations, if any, designated by the Permittee for receipt (discharge) of trucked or hauled waste, if modified;
15. Information as required by the Approval Authority or state permitting authority on the discharge to the POTW from the following activities:
 - (A) Ground water clean-up from underground storage tanks;
 - (B) Trucked or hauled waste; and,
 - (C) Groundwater clean-up from RCRA or Superfund sites.
16. A description of all changes made during the previous calendar year to the Permittee's pretreatment program that were not submitted as substantial or non-substantial modifications to EPA.
17. The date of the latest adoption of local limits and an indication as to whether or not the Town is under a State or Federal compliance schedule that includes steps to be taken to revise local limits.
18. Any other information that may be deemed necessary by the Approval Authority.

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)¹

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A. GENERAL CONDITIONS	
1. <u>Duty to Comply</u>	2
2. <u>Permit Actions</u>	3
3. <u>Duty to Provide Information</u>	4
4. <u>Oil and Hazardous Substance Liability</u>	4
5. <u>Property Rights</u>	4
6. <u>Confidentiality of Information</u>	4
7. <u>Duty to Reapply</u>	4
8. <u>State Authorities</u>	4
9. <u>Other laws</u>	5
B. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF POLLUTION CONTROLS	
1. <u>Proper Operation and Maintenance</u>	5
2. <u>Need to Halt or Reduce Not a Defense</u>	5
3. <u>Duty to Mitigate</u>	5
4. <u>Bypass</u>	5
5. <u>Upset</u>	6
C. MONITORING AND RECORDS	
1. <u>Monitoring and Records</u>	7
2. <u>Inspection and Entry</u>	8
D. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	
1. <u>Reporting Requirements</u>	8
a. Planned changes	8
b. Anticipated noncompliance	8
c. Transfers	9
d. Monitoring reports	9
e. Twenty-four hour reporting	9
f. Compliance schedules	10
g. Other noncompliance	10
h. Other information	10
i. Identification of the initial recipient for NPDES electronic reporting data	11
2. <u>Signatory Requirement</u>	11
3. <u>Availability of Reports</u>	11
E. DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
1. <u>General Definitions</u>	11
2. <u>Commonly Used Abbreviations</u>	20

¹Updated July 17, 2018 to fix typographical errors.

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Duty to Comply

The Permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA or Act) and is grounds for enforcement action; for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application.

- a. The Permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, or standards for sewage sludge use or disposal, even if the permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.
- b. Penalties for Violations of Permit Conditions: The Director will adjust the civil and administrative penalties listed below in accordance with the Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule (83 Fed. Reg. 1190-1194 (January 10, 2018) and the 2015 amendments to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. § 2461 note. See Pub. L.114-74, Section 701 (Nov. 2, 2015)). These requirements help ensure that EPA penalties keep pace with inflation. Under the above-cited 2015 amendments to inflationary adjustment law, EPA must review its statutory civil penalties each year and adjust them as necessary.

(1) Criminal Penalties

- (a) *Negligent Violations.* The CWA provides that any person who negligently violates permit conditions implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act is subject to criminal penalties of not less than \$2,500 nor more than \$25,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a negligent violation, a person shall be subject to criminal penalties of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation or by imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both.
- (b) *Knowing Violations.* The CWA provides that any person who knowingly violates permit conditions implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act is subject to a fine of not less than \$5,000 nor more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a knowing violation, a person shall be subject to criminal penalties of not more than \$100,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment of not more than 6 years, or both.
- (c) *Knowing Endangerment.* The CWA provides that any person who knowingly violates permit conditions implementing Sections 301, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act and who knows at that time that he or she is placing another person in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than \$250,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 15 years, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a knowing

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

endangerment violation, a person shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 30 years, or both. An organization, as defined in Section 309(c)(3)(B)(iii) of the Act, shall, upon conviction of violating the imminent danger provision, be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000,000 and can be fined up to \$2,000,000 for second or subsequent convictions.

- (d) *False Statement.* The CWA provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this permit shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. If a conviction of a person is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment is a fine of not more than \$20,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than 4 years, or both. The Act further provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this permit, including monitoring reports or reports of compliance or non-compliance shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 per violation, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months per violation, or by both.
- (2) *Civil Penalties.* The CWA provides that any person who violates a permit condition implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed the maximum amounts authorized by Section 309(d) of the Act, the 2015 amendments to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. § 2461 note, and 40 C.F.R. Part 19. *See* Pub. L.114-74, Section 701 (Nov. 2, 2015); 83 Fed. Reg. 1190 (January 10, 2018).
- (3) *Administrative Penalties.* The CWA provides that any person who violates a permit condition implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act is subject to an administrative penalty as follows:
- (a) *Class I Penalty.* Not to exceed the maximum amounts authorized by Section 309(g)(2)(A) of the Act, the 2015 amendments to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. § 2461 note, and 40 C.F.R. Part 19. *See* Pub. L.114-74, Section 701 (Nov. 2, 2015); 83 Fed. Reg. 1190 (January 10, 2018).
- (b) *Class II Penalty.* Not to exceed the maximum amounts authorized by Section 309(g)(2)(B) of the Act the 2015 amendments to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. § 2461 note, and 40 C.F.R. Part 19. *See* Pub. L.114-74, Section 701 (Nov. 2, 2015); 83 Fed. Reg. 1190 (January 10, 2018).

2. Permit Actions

This permit may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

condition.

3. Duty to Provide Information

The Permittee shall furnish to the Director, within a reasonable time, any information which the Director may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this permit, or to determine compliance with this permit. The Permittee shall also furnish to the Director, upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.

4. Oil and Hazardous Substance Liability

Nothing in this permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action or relieve the Permittee from responsibilities, liabilities or penalties to which the Permittee is or may be subject under Section 311 of the CWA, or Section 106 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA).

5. Property Rights

This permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege.

6. Confidentiality of Information

a. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 2, any information submitted to EPA pursuant to these regulations may be claimed as confidential by the submitter. Any such claim must be asserted at the time of submission in the manner prescribed on the application form or instructions or, in the case of other submissions, by stamping the words "confidential business information" on each page containing such information. If no claim is made at the time of submission, EPA may make the information available to the public without further notice. If a claim is asserted, the information will be treated in accordance with the procedures in 40 C.F.R. Part 2 (Public Information).

b. Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied:

- (1) The name and address of any permit applicant or Permittee;
- (2) Permit applications, permits, and effluent data.

c. Information required by NPDES application forms provided by the Director under 40 C.F.R. § 122.21 may not be claimed confidential. This includes information submitted on the forms themselves and any attachments used to supply information required by the forms.

7. Duty to Reapply

If the Permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the Permittee must apply for and obtain a new permit. The Permittee shall submit a new application at least 180 days before the expiration date of the existing permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the Director. (The Director shall not grant permission for applications to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.)

8. State Authorities

Nothing in Parts 122, 123, or 124 precludes more stringent State regulation of any activity

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

covered by the regulations in 40 C.F.R. Parts 122, 123, and 124, whether or not under an approved State program.

9. Other Laws

The issuance of a permit does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of State or local law or regulations.

B. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF POLLUTION CONTROLS

1. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems which are installed by a Permittee only when the operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.

2. Need to Halt or Reduce Not a Defense

It shall not be a defense for a Permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.

3. Duty to Mitigate

The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

4. Bypass

a. Definitions

- (1) *Bypass* means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility.
- (2) *Severe property damage* means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources which can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production.

- b. *Bypass not exceeding limitations*. The Permittee may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded, but only if it also is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions of paragraphs (c) and (d) of this Section.

c. Notice

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

- (1) *Anticipated bypass.* If the Permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice, if possible at least ten days before the date of the bypass. As of December 21, 2020 all notices submitted in compliance with this Section must be submitted electronically by the Permittee to the Director or initial recipient, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b), in compliance with this Section and 40 C.F.R. Part 3 (including, in all cases, Subpart D to Part 3), § 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, Permittees may be required to report electronically if specified by a particular permit or if required to do so by state law.
- (2) *Unanticipated bypass.* The Permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in paragraph D.1.e. of this part (24-hour notice). As of December 21, 2020 all notices submitted in compliance with this Section must be submitted electronically by the Permittee to the Director or initial recipient, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b), in compliance with this Section and 40 C.F.R. Part 3 (including, in all cases, Subpart D to Part 3), § 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, Permittees may be required to report electronically if specified by a particular permit or required to do so by law.

d. *Prohibition of bypass.*

- (1) Bypass is prohibited, and the Director may take enforcement action against a Permittee for bypass, unless:
 - (a) Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;
 - (b) There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass which occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventative maintenance; and
 - (c) The Permittee submitted notices as required under paragraph 4.c of this Section.
- (2) The Director may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Director determines that it will meet the three conditions listed above in paragraph 4.d of this Section.

5. Upset

- a. *Definition.* *Upset* means an exceptional incident in which there is an unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Permittee. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

- improper operation.
- b. *Effect of an upset.* An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of paragraph B.5.c. of this Section are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review.
 - c. *Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset.* A Permittee who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs, or other relevant evidence that:
 - (1) An upset occurred and that the Permittee can identify the cause(s) of the upset;
 - (2) The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated; and
 - (3) The Permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in paragraph D.1.e.2.b. (24-hour notice).
 - (4) The Permittee complied with any remedial measures required under B.3. above.
 - d. *Burden of proof.* In any enforcement proceeding the Permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

C. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

1. Monitoring and Records

- a. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.
- b. Except for records of monitoring information required by this permit related to the Permittee's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least 5 years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. § 503), the Permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for this permit, for a period of at least 3 years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Director at any time.
- c. Records of monitoring information shall include:
 - (1) The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
 - (2) The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;
 - (3) The date(s) analyses were performed;
 - (4) The individual(s) who performed the analyses;
 - (5) The analytical techniques or methods used; and
 - (6) The results of such analyses.
- d. Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. § 136 unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. Subchapters N or O.
- e. The Clean Water Act provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this permit shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. If a conviction of a person is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment is a fine of not more than \$20,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than 4 years, or both.

2. Inspection and Entry

The Permittee shall allow the Director, or an authorized representative (including an authorized contractor acting as a representative of the Administrator), upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:

- a. Enter upon the Permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of this permit;
- b. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;
- c. Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this permit; and
- d. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the Clean Water Act, any substances or parameters at any location.

D. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1. Reporting Requirements

- a. *Planned Changes*. The Permittee shall give notice to the Director as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required only when:
 - (1) The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 40 C.F.R. § 122.29(b); or
 - (2) The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants which are subject neither to effluent limitations in the permit, nor to notification requirements at 40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1).
 - (3) The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Permittee's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan.
- b. *Anticipated noncompliance*. The Permittee shall give advance notice to the Director of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements.

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

- c. *Transfers.* This permit is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Director. The Director may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the permit to change the name of the Permittee and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the Clean Water Act. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.61; in some cases, modification or revocation and reissuance is mandatory.
- d. *Monitoring reports.* Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified elsewhere in this permit.
 - (1) Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) or forms provided or specified by the Director for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. As of December 21, 2016 all reports and forms submitted in compliance with this Section must be submitted electronically by the Permittee to the Director or initial recipient, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b), in compliance with this Section and 40 C.F.R. Part 3 (including, in all cases, Subpart D to Part 3), § 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, Permittees may be required to report electronically if specified by a particular permit or if required to do so by State law.
 - (2) If the Permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by the permit using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. § 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. Subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Director.
 - (3) Calculations for all limitations which require averaging or measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified by the Director in the permit.
- e. *Twenty-four hour reporting.*
 - (1) The Permittee shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. A written report shall also be provided within 5 days of the time the Permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written report shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports must include the data described above (with the exception of time of discovery) as well as the type of event (combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events), type of sewer overflow structure (e.g., manhole, combined sewer overflow outfall), discharge volumes untreated by the treatment works treating domestic sewage, types of human health and environmental impacts of the sewer overflow event, and whether the noncompliance was related to wet weather. As of December 21, 2020 all

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events submitted in compliance with this section must be submitted electronically by the Permittee to the Director or initial recipient, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b), in compliance with this Section and 40 C.F.R. Part 3 (including, in all cases Subpart D to Part 3), § 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, Permittees may be required to electronically submit reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section by a particular permit or if required to do so by state law. The Director may also require Permittees to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section.

- (2) The following shall be included as information which must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph.
 - (a) Any unanticipated bypass which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).
 - (b) Any upset which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit.
 - (c) Violation of a maximum daily discharge limitation for any of the pollutants listed by the Director in the permit to be reported within 24 hours. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(g).
 - (3) The Director may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports under paragraph D.1.e. of this Section if the oral report has been received within 24 hours.
- f. *Compliance Schedules.* Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date.
- g. *Other noncompliance.* The Permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under paragraphs D.1.d., D.1.e., and D.1.f. of this Section, at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in paragraph D.1.e. of this Section. For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports shall contain the information described in paragraph D.1.e. and the applicable required data in Appendix A to 40 C.F.R. Part 127. As of December 21, 2020 all reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events submitted in compliance with this section must be submitted electronically by the Permittee to the Director or initial recipient, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b), in compliance with this Section and 40 C.F.R. Part 3 (including, in all cases, Subpart D to Part 3), §122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. Part 127 is not intended to undo existing requirements for electronic reporting. Prior to this date, and independent of Part 127, Permittees may be required to electronically submit reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section by a particular permit or if required to do so by state law. The Director may also require Permittees to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this Section.
- h. *Other information.* Where the Permittee becomes aware that it failed to submit any

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Director, it shall promptly submit such facts or information.

- i. *Identification of the initial recipient for NPDES electronic reporting data.* The owner, operator, or the duly authorized representative of an NPDES-regulated entity is required to electronically submit the required NPDES information (as specified in Appendix A to 40 C.F.R. Part 127) to the appropriate initial recipient, as determined by EPA, and as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(b). EPA will identify and publish the list of initial recipients on its Web site and in the FEDERAL REGISTER, by state and by NPDES data group (see 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(c) of this Chapter). EPA will update and maintain this listing.

2. Signatory Requirement

- a. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Director shall be signed and certified. *See* 40 C.F.R. §122.22.
- b. The CWA provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this permit, including monitoring reports or reports of compliance or non-compliance shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 per violation, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months per violation, or by both.

3. Availability of Reports.

Except for data determined to be confidential under paragraph A.6. above, all reports prepared in accordance with the terms of this permit shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the State water pollution control agency and the Director. As required by the CWA, effluent data shall not be considered confidential. Knowingly making any false statements on any such report may result in the imposition of criminal penalties as provided for in Section 309 of the CWA.

E. DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1. General Definitions

For more definitions related to sludge use and disposal requirements, see EPA Region 1's NPDES Permit Sludge Compliance Guidance document (4 November 1999, modified to add regulatory definitions, April 2018).

Administrator means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, or an authorized representative.

Applicable standards and limitations means all, State, interstate, and federal standards and limitations to which a "discharge," a "sewage sludge use or disposal practice," or a related activity is subject under the CWA, including "effluent limitations," water quality standards, standards of performance, toxic effluent standards or prohibitions, "best management practices," pretreatment standards, and "standards for sewage sludge use or disposal" under Sections 301, 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 403 and 405 of the CWA.

Application means the EPA standard national forms for applying for a permit, including any additions, revisions, or modifications to the forms; or forms approved by EPA for use in

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

“approved States,” including any approved modifications or revisions.

Approved program or *approved State* means a State or interstate program which has been approved or authorized by EPA under Part 123.

Average monthly discharge limitation means the highest allowable average of “daily discharges” over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all “daily discharges” measured during a calendar month divided by the number of “daily discharges” measured during that month.

Average weekly discharge limitation means the highest allowable average of “daily discharges” over a calendar week, calculated as the sum of all “daily discharges” measured during a calendar week divided by the number of “daily discharges” measured during that week.

Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) means schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures, and other management practices to prevent or reduce the pollution of “waters of the United States.” BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site runoff, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

Bypass see B.4.a.1 above.

C-NOEC or “*Chronic (Long-term Exposure Test) – No Observed Effect Concentration*” means the highest tested concentration of an effluent or a toxicant at which no adverse effects are observed on the aquatic test organisms at a specified time of observation.

Class I sludge management facility is any publicly owned treatment works (POTW), as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 501.2, required to have an approved pretreatment program under 40 C.F.R. § 403.8 (a) (including any POTW located in a State that has elected to assume local program responsibilities pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 403.10 (e)) and any treatment works treating domestic sewage, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.2, classified as a Class I sludge management facility by the EPA Regional Administrator, or, in the case of approved State programs, the Regional Administrator in conjunction with the State Director, because of the potential for its sewage sludge use or disposal practice to affect public health and the environment adversely.

Contiguous zone means the entire zone established by the United States under Article 24 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

Continuous discharge means a “discharge” which occurs without interruption throughout the operating hours of the facility, except for infrequent shutdowns for maintenance, process changes, or similar activities.

CWA means the Clean Water Act (formerly referred to as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972) Public Law 92-500, as amended by Public Law 95-217, Public Law 95-576, Public Law 96-483 and Public Law 97-117, 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*

CWA and regulations means the Clean Water Act (CWA) and applicable regulations promulgated thereunder. In the case of an approved State program, it includes State program requirements.

Daily Discharge means the “discharge of a pollutant” measured during a calendar day or any

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

other 24-hour period that reasonably represents the calendar day for purposes of sampling. For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the “daily discharge” is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurements, the “daily discharge” is calculated as the average measurement of the pollutant over the day.

Direct Discharge means the “discharge of a pollutant.”

Director means the Regional Administrator or an authorized representative. In the case of a permit also issued under Massachusetts’ authority, it also refers to the Director of the Division of Watershed Management, Department of Environmental Protection, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Discharge

- (a) When used without qualification, *discharge* means the “discharge of a pollutant.”
- (b) As used in the definitions for “interference” and “pass through,” *discharge* means the introduction of pollutants into a POTW from any non-domestic source regulated under Section 307(b), (c) or (d) of the Act.

Discharge Monitoring Report (“DMR”) means the EPA uniform national form, including any subsequent additions, revisions, or modifications for the reporting of self-monitoring results by Permittees. DMRs must be used by “approved States” as well as by EPA. EPA will supply DMRs to any approved State upon request. The EPA national forms may be modified to substitute the State Agency name, address, logo, and other similar information, as appropriate, in place of EPA’s.

Discharge of a pollutant means:

- (a) Any addition of any “pollutant” or combination of pollutants to “waters of the United States” from any “point source,” or
- (b) Any addition of any pollutant or combination of pollutants to the waters of the “contiguous zone” or the ocean from any point source other than a vessel or other floating craft which is being used as a means of transportation.

This definition includes additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channeled by man; discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances owned by a State, municipality, or other person which do not lead to a treatment works; and discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances, leading into privately owned treatment works. This term does not include an addition of pollutants by any “indirect discharger.”

Effluent limitation means any restriction imposed by the Director on quantities, discharge rates, and concentrations of “pollutants” which are “discharged” from “point sources” into “waters of the United States,” the waters of the “contiguous zone,” or the ocean.

Effluent limitation guidelines means a regulation published by the Administrator under section 304(b) of CWA to adopt or revise “effluent limitations.”

Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) means the United States Environmental Protection

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

Agency.

Grab Sample means an individual sample collected in a period of less than 15 minutes.

Hazardous substance means any substance designated under 40 C.F.R. Part 116 pursuant to Section 311 of CWA.

Incineration is the combustion of organic matter and inorganic matter in sewage sludge by high temperatures in an enclosed device.

Indirect discharger means a nondomestic discharger introducing “pollutants” to a “publicly owned treatment works.”

Interference means a discharge (see definition above) which, alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources, both:

- (a) Inhibits or disrupts the POTW, its treatment processes or operations, or its sludge processes, use or disposal; and
- (b) Therefore is a cause of a violation of any requirement of the POTW’s NPDES permit (including an increase in the magnitude or duration of a violation) or of the prevention of sewage sludge use or disposal in compliance with the following statutory provisions and regulations or permits issued thereunder (or more stringent State or local regulations): Section 405 of the Clean Water Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) (including title II, more commonly referred to as the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and including State regulations contained in any State sludge management plan prepared pursuant to Subtitle D of the SDWA), the Clean Air Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.

Landfill means an area of land or an excavation in which wastes are placed for permanent disposal, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile.

Land application is the spraying or spreading of sewage sludge onto the land surface; the injection of sewage sludge below the land surface; or the incorporation of sewage sludge into the soil so that the sewage sludge can either condition the soil or fertilize crops or vegetation grown in the soil.

Land application unit means an area where wastes are applied onto or incorporated into the soil surface (excluding manure spreading operations) for agricultural purposes or for treatment and disposal.

LC₅₀ means the concentration of a sample that causes mortality of 50% of the test population at a specific time of observation. The LC₅₀ = 100% is defined as a sample of undiluted effluent.

Maximum daily discharge limitation means the highest allowable “daily discharge.”

Municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) unit means a discrete area of land or an excavation that receives household waste, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile, as those terms are defined under 40 C.F.R. § 257.2. A MSWLF unit also may receive other types of RCRA Subtitle D wastes, such as commercial solid waste, nonhazardous sludge, very small quantity generator waste and industrial solid waste. Such a landfill may be

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

publicly or privately owned. A MSWLF unit may be a new MSWLF unit, an existing MSWLF unit or a lateral expansion. A construction and demolition landfill that receives residential lead-based paint waste and does not receive any other household waste is not a MSWLF unit.

Municipality

- (a) When used without qualification *municipality* means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body created by or under State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under Section 208 of CWA.
- (b) As related to sludge use and disposal, *municipality* means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (including an intermunicipal Agency of two or more of the foregoing entities) created by or under State law; an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization having jurisdiction over sewage sludge management; or a designated and approved management Agency under Section 208 of the CWA, as amended. The definition includes a special district created under State law, such as a water district, sewer district, sanitary district, utility district, drainage district, or similar entity, or an integrated waste management facility as defined in Section 201 (e) of the CWA, as amended, that has as one of its principal responsibilities the treatment, transport, use or disposal of sewage sludge.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System means the national program for issuing, modifying, revoking and reissuing, terminating, monitoring and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements, under Sections 307, 402, 318, and 405 of the CWA. The term includes an “approved program.”

New Discharger means any building, structure, facility, or installation:

- (a) From which there is or may be a “discharge of pollutants;”
- (b) That did not commence the “discharge of pollutants” at a particular “site” prior to August 13, 1979;
- (c) Which is not a “new source;” and
- (d) Which has never received a finally effective NPDES permit for discharges at that “site.”

This definition includes an “indirect discharger” which commences discharging into “waters of the United States” after August 13, 1979. It also includes any existing mobile point source (other than an offshore or coastal oil and gas exploratory drilling rig or a coastal oil and gas exploratory drilling rig or a coastal oil and gas exploratory drilling rig or a coastal oil and gas developmental drilling rig) such as a seafood processing rig, seafood processing vessel, or aggregate plant, that begins discharging at a “site” for which it does not have a permit; and any offshore or coastal mobile oil and gas exploratory drilling rig or coastal mobile oil and gas developmental drilling rig that commences the discharge of pollutants after August 13, 1979, at a “site” under EPA’s permitting jurisdiction for which it is not covered by an individual or general permit and which is located in an area determined by the Director in the issuance of a final permit to be in an area of biological concern. In determining whether an area is an area of biological concern, the Director shall consider the factors specified in 40 C.F.R. §§ 125.122 (a) (1) through (10).

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

An offshore or coastal mobile exploratory drilling rig or coastal mobile developmental drilling rig will be considered a “new discharger” only for the duration of its discharge in an area of biological concern.

New source means any building, structure, facility, or installation from which there is or may be a “discharge of pollutants,” the construction of which commenced:

- (a) After promulgation of standards of performance under Section 306 of CWA which are applicable to such source, or
- (b) After proposal of standards of performance in accordance with Section 306 of CWA which are applicable to such source, but only if the standards are promulgated in accordance with Section 306 within 120 days of their proposal.

NPDES means “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.”

Owner or operator means the owner or operator of any “facility or activity” subject to regulation under the NPDES programs.

Pass through means a Discharge (see definition above) which exits the POTW into waters of the United States in quantities or concentrations which, alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources, is a cause of a violation of any requirement of the POTW’s NPDES permit (including an increase in the magnitude or duration of a violation).

Pathogenic organisms are disease-causing organisms. These include, but are not limited to, certain bacteria, protozoa, viruses, and viable helminth ova.

Permit means an authorization, license, or equivalent control document issued by EPA or an “approved State” to implement the requirements of Parts 122, 123, and 124. “Permit” includes an NPDES “general permit” (40 C.F.R § 122.28). “Permit” does not include any permit which has not yet been the subject of final agency action, such as a “draft permit” or “proposed permit.”

Person means an individual, association, partnership, corporation, municipality, State or Federal agency, or an agent or employee thereof.

Person who prepares sewage sludge is either the person who generates sewage sludge during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works or the person who derives a material from sewage sludge.

pH means the logarithm of the reciprocal of the hydrogen ion concentration measured at 25° Centigrade or measured at another temperature and then converted to an equivalent value at 25° Centigrade.

Point Source means any discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to, any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, landfill leachate collection system, vessel or other floating craft from which pollutants are or may be discharged. This term does not include return flows from irrigated agriculture or agricultural storm water runoff (see 40 C.F.R. § 122.3).

Pollutant means dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, filter backwash, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

(except those regulated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 *et seq.*)), heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water. It does not mean:

- (a) Sewage from vessels; or
- (b) Water, gas, or other material which is injected into a well to facilitate production of oil or gas, or water derived in association with oil and gas production and disposed of in a well, if the well is used either to facilitate production or for disposal purposes is approved by the authority of the State in which the well is located, and if the State determines that the injection or disposal will not result in the degradation of ground or surface water resources.

Primary industry category means any industry category listed in the NRDC settlement agreement (*Natural Resources Defense Council et al. v. Train*, 8 E.R.C. 2120 (D.D.C. 1976), *modified* 12 E.R.C. 1833 (D.D.C. 1979)); also listed in Appendix A of 40 C.F.R. Part 122.

Privately owned treatment works means any device or system which is (a) used to treat wastes from any facility whose operator is not the operator of the treatment works and (b) not a “POTW.”

Process wastewater means any water which, during manufacturing or processing, comes into direct contact with or results from the production or use of any raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product.

Publicly owned treatment works (POTW) means a treatment works as defined by Section 212 of the Act, which is owned by a State or municipality (as defined by Section 504(4) of the Act). This definition includes any devices and systems used in the storage, treatment, recycling and reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature. It also includes sewers, pipes and other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW Treatment Plant. The term also means the municipality as defined in Section 502(4) of the Act, which has jurisdiction over the indirect discharges to and the discharges from such a treatment works.

Regional Administrator means the Regional Administrator, EPA, Region I, Boston, Massachusetts.

Secondary industry category means any industry which is not a “primary industry category.”

Septage means the liquid and solid material pumped from a septic tank, cesspool, or similar domestic sewage treatment system, or a holding tank when the system is cleaned or maintained.

Sewage Sludge means any solid, semi-solid, or liquid residue removed during the treatment of municipal waste water or domestic sewage. Sewage sludge includes, but is not limited to, solids removed during primary, secondary, or advanced waste water treatment, scum, septage, portable toilet pumpings, type III marine sanitation device pumpings (33 C.F.R. Part 159), and sewage sludge products. Sewage sludge does not include grit or screenings, or ash generated during the incineration of sewage sludge.

Sewage sludge incinerator is an enclosed device in which only sewage sludge and auxiliary fuel are fired.

Sewage sludge unit is land on which only sewage sludge is placed for final disposal. This does

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS

(April 26, 2018)

not include land on which sewage sludge is either stored or treated. Land does not include waters of the United States, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.2.

Sewage sludge use or disposal practice means the collection, storage, treatment, transportation, processing, monitoring, use, or disposal of sewage sludge.

Significant materials includes, but is not limited to: raw materials; fuels; materials such as solvents, detergents, and plastic pellets; finished materials such as metallic products; raw materials used in food processing or production; hazardous substance designated under Section 101(14) of CERCLA; any chemical the facility is required to report pursuant to Section 313 of title III of SARA; fertilizers; pesticides; and waste products such as ashes, slag and sludge that have the potential to be released with storm water discharges.

Significant spills includes, but is not limited to, releases of oil or hazardous substances in excess of reportable quantities under Section 311 of the CWA (see 40 C.F.R. §§ 110.10 and 117.21) or Section 102 of CERCLA (see 40 C.F.R. § 302.4).

Sludge-only facility means any “treatment works treating domestic sewage” whose methods of sewage sludge use or disposal are subject to regulations promulgated pursuant to section 405(d) of the CWA, and is required to obtain a permit under 40 C.F.R. § 122.1(b)(2).

State means any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or an Indian Tribe as defined in the regulations which meets the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 123.31.

Store or storage of sewage sludge is the placement of sewage sludge on land on which the sewage sludge remains for two years or less. This does not include the placement of sewage sludge on land for treatment.

Storm water means storm water runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.

Storm water discharge associated with industrial activity means the discharge from any conveyance that is used for collecting and conveying storm water and that is directly related to manufacturing, processing, or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant.

Surface disposal site is an area of land that contains one or more active sewage sludge units.

Toxic pollutant means any pollutant listed as toxic under Section 307(a)(1) or, in the case of “sludge use or disposal practices,” any pollutant identified in regulations implementing Section 405(d) of the CWA.

Treatment works treating domestic sewage means a POTW or any other sewage sludge or waste water treatment devices or systems, regardless of ownership (including federal facilities), used in the storage, treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal or domestic sewage, including land dedicated for the disposal of sewage sludge. This definition does not include septic tanks or similar devices.

For purposes of this definition, “domestic sewage” includes waste and waste water from humans or household operations that are discharged to or otherwise enter a treatment works. In States where there is no approved State sludge management program under Section 405(f) of the CWA, the Director may designate any person subject to the standards for sewage sludge use and

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

disposal in 40 C.F.R. Part 503 as a “treatment works treating domestic sewage,” where he or she finds that there is a potential for adverse effects on public health and the environment from poor sludge quality or poor sludge handling, use or disposal practices, or where he or she finds that such designation is necessary to ensure that such person is in compliance with 40 C.F.R. Part 503.

Upset see B.5.a. above.

Vector attraction is the characteristic of sewage sludge that attracts rodents, flies, mosquitoes, or other organisms capable of transporting infectious agents.

Waste pile or pile means any non-containerized accumulation of solid, non-flowing waste that is used for treatment or storage.

Waters of the United States or waters of the U.S. means:

- (a) All waters which are currently used, were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;
- (b) All interstate waters, including interstate “wetlands;”
- (c) All other waters such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, “wetlands”, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds the use, degradation, or destruction of which would affect or could affect interstate or foreign commerce including any such waters:
 - (1) Which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purpose;
 - (2) From which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; or
 - (3) Which are used or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce;
- (d) All impoundments of waters otherwise defined as waters of the United States under this definition;
- (e) Tributaries of waters identified in paragraphs (a) through (d) of this definition;
- (f) The territorial sea; and
- (g) “Wetlands” adjacent to waters (other than waters that are themselves wetlands) identified in paragraphs (a) through (f) of this definition.

Waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of CWA (other than cooling ponds as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 423.11(m) which also meet the criteria of this definition) are not waters of the United States. This exclusion applies only to manmade bodies of water which neither were originally created in waters of the United States (such as disposal area in wetlands) nor resulted from the impoundment of waters of the United States. Waters of the United States do not include prior converted cropland.

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

Notwithstanding the determination of an area's status as prior converted cropland by any other federal agency, for the purposes of the Clean Water Act, the final authority regarding Clean Water Act jurisdiction remains with EPA.

Wetlands means those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.

Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) means the aggregate toxic effect of an effluent measured directly by a toxicity test.

Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID) means the region of initial mixing surrounding or adjacent to the end of the outfall pipe or diffuser ports, provided that the ZID may not be larger than allowed by mixing zone restrictions in applicable water quality standards.

2. Commonly Used Abbreviations

BOD	Five-day biochemical oxygen demand unless otherwise specified
CBOD	Carbonaceous BOD
CFS	Cubic feet per second
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
Chlorine	
Cl ₂	Total residual chlorine
TRC	Total residual chlorine which is a combination of free available chlorine (FAC, see below) and combined chlorine (chloramines, etc.)
TRO	Total residual chlorine in marine waters where halogen compounds are present
FAC	Free available chlorine (aqueous molecular chlorine, hypochlorous acid, and hypochlorite ion)
Coliform	
Coliform, Fecal	Total fecal coliform bacteria
Coliform, Total	Total coliform bacteria
Cont.	Continuous recording of the parameter being monitored, i.e. flow, temperature, pH, etc.
Cu. M/day or M ³ /day	Cubic meters per day
DO	Dissolved oxygen

NPDES PART II STANDARD CONDITIONS
(April 26, 2018)

kg/day	Kilograms per day
lbs/day	Pounds per day
mg/L	Milligram(s) per liter
mL/L	Milliliters per liter
MGD	Million gallons per day
Nitrogen	
Total N	Total nitrogen
NH ₃ -N	Ammonia nitrogen as nitrogen
NO ₃ -N	Nitrate as nitrogen
NO ₂ -N	Nitrite as nitrogen
NO ₃ -NO ₂	Combined nitrate and nitrite nitrogen as nitrogen
TKN	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen as nitrogen
Oil & Grease	Freon extractable material
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
Surfactant	Surface-active agent
Temp. °C	Temperature in degrees Centigrade
Temp. °F	Temperature in degrees Fahrenheit
TOC	Total organic carbon
Total P	Total phosphorus
TSS or NFR	Total suspended solids or total nonfilterable residue
Turb. or Turbidity	Turbidity measured by the Nephelometric Method (NTU)
µg/L	Microgram(s) per liter
WET	“Whole effluent toxicity”
ZID	Zone of Initial Dilution

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NEW ENGLAND - REGION 1
5 POST OFFICE SQUARE, SUITE 100
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109-3912**

FACT SHEET

**DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)
PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO
THE CLEAN WATER ACT (CWA)**

NPDES PERMIT NUMBER: NH0100471

PUBLIC NOTICE START AND END DATES: May 20, 2020 – June 18, 2020

NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

Town of Milford, NH
Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility
c/o Town Hall
1 Union Square
Milford, NH 03055

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility
564 Nashua St
Milford, NH 03055

NAME AND ADDRESS OF CO-PERMITTEE:

The Town of Wilton is co-permittee for specific activities required by the permit, as set forth in Sections 3.1, 5.4, and 5.5 of this Fact Sheet, and Parts I.B, I.C, and I.D of the Draft Permit. The responsible municipal department is:

Town of Wilton
Sewer Commission
42 Main St, P.O. Box 83
Wilton, NH 03086

RECEIVING WATER AND CLASSIFICATION:

Souhegan River
Hydrologic Basin Code: 01070002
Class B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Proposed Action4

2 Statutory and Regulatory Authority4

2.1 Technology-Based Requirements.....4

2.2 Water Quality Based Requirements.....5

2.2.1 Water Quality Standards5

2.2.2 Anti-degradation6

2.2.3 Assessment and Listing of Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads.6

2.2.4 Reasonable Potential7

2.2.5 State Certification7

2.3 Effluent Flow Requirements8

2.4 Monitoring and Reporting Requirements9

2.4.1 Monitoring Requirements9

2.4.2 Reporting Requirements.....10

2.5 Standard Conditions.....11

2.6 Anti-backsliding11

3 Description of Facility and Discharge11

3.1 Location and Type of Facility11

3.1.1 Treatment Process Description.....12

3.1.2 Collection System Description12

4 Description of Receiving Water and Dilution.....13

4.1 Receiving Water13

4.2 Ambient Data13

4.3 Available Dilution13

5 Proposed Effluent Limitations and Conditions14

5.1 Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements14

5.1.1 Effluent Flow.....14

5.1.2 Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (CBOD₅)15

5.1.3 CBOD₅ Concentration Limits.....15

5.1.4 Total Suspended Solids (TSS).....16

5.1.5 Eighty-Five Percent (85%) CBOD₅ and TSS Removal Requirement18

5.1.6 pH.....18

5.1.7 Bacteria18

5.1.8 Dissolved Oxygen.....19

5.1.9 Ammonia.....19

5.1.10 Nutrients.....23

5.1.11 Metals.....27

5.1.12 Whole Effluent Toxicity32

5.2 Industrial Pretreatment Program.....33

5.3 Sludge Conditions.....34

5.4 Infiltration/Inflow (I/I).....34

5.5 Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System.....34

5.6 Standard Conditions.....35

6 Federal Permitting Requirements35

6.1 Endangered Species Act35

6.2 Essential Fish Habitat37

7 Public Comments, Hearing Requests and Permit Appeals38

8 Administrative Record.....39

FIGURES

Figure 1: Location of the Milford WWTF40
Figure 2: Location of the Milford WWTF Outfall.....41
Figure 3: Milford WWTF Flow Diagram.....1

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Monitoring Data Summary

Appendix B – Metals Reasonable Potential and Limits

Appendix C – EPA Region 1 NPDES Permitting Approach for Publicly Owned Treatment Works that Include Municipal Satellite Sewage Collection Systems

1 Proposed Action

The Town of Milford (the “Permittee”) has applied to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to discharge from the Treatment Plant (the “Facility”) into the designated receiving water.

The permit currently in effect was issued on February 8, 2000 with an effective date of March 24, 2000 and expired on March 24, 2005 (the “2000 Permit”). The Permittee filed an application for permit reissuance with EPA dated September 23, 2004, as required by 40 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 122.6. Since the permit application was deemed timely and complete by EPA on December 23, 2004, the Facility’s 2000 Permit has been administratively continued pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.6 and § 122.21(d). EPA and the State conducted a site visit on April 23, 2019.

The NPDES Permit is issued by EPA under federal law, New Hampshire construes Title L, Water Management and Protection, Chapters 485-A, Water Pollution and Waste Disposal, to authorize the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) to “consider” a federal NPDES permit to be a State surface water discharge permit. As such, all the terms and conditions of the permit may, therefore, be incorporated into and constitute a discharge permit issued by NHDES.

2 Statutory and Regulatory Authority

Congress enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, codified at 33 U.S.C. § 1251-1387 and commonly known as the Clean Water Act (CWA), “to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.” CWA § 101(a). To achieve this objective, the CWA makes it unlawful for any person to discharge any pollutant into the waters of the United States from any point source, except as authorized by specific permitting sections of the CWA, one of which is § 402. *See* CWA §§ 301(a), 402(a). Section 402(a) established one of the CWA’s principal permitting programs, the NPDES Permit Program. Under this section, EPA may “issue a permit for the discharge of any pollutant or combination of pollutants” in accordance with certain conditions. CWA § 402(a). NPDES permits generally contain discharge limitations and establish related monitoring and reporting requirements. *See* CWA § 402(a)(1) and (2). The regulations governing EPA’s NPDES permit program are generally found in 40 C.F.R. §§ 122, 124, 125, and 136.

“Congress has vested in the Administrator [of EPA] broad discretion to establish conditions for NPDES permits” in order to achieve the statutory mandates of Section 301 and 402. *Arkansas v. Oklahoma*, 503 U.S. 91, 105 (1992). *See also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.4(d), 122.44(d)(1), 122.44(d)(5).

CWA §§ 301 and 306 provide for two types of effluent limitations to be included in NPDES permits: “technology-based” effluent limitations (TBELs) and “water quality-based” effluent limitations (WQBELs). *See* CWA §§ 301, 304(d); 40 C.F.R. Parts 122, 125, 131.

2.1 Technology-Based Requirements

Technology-based limitations, generally developed on an industry-by-industry basis, reflect a specified level of pollutant reducing technology available and economically achievable for the type of facility being permitted. *See* CWA § 301(b). As a class, publicly owned treatment works

(POTWs) must meet performance-based requirements based on available wastewater treatment technology. *See* CWA § 301(b)(1)(B). The performance level for POTWs is referred to as “secondary treatment.” Secondary treatment is comprised of technology-based requirements expressed in terms of CBOD₅, TSS and pH. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 133.

Under § 301(b)(1) of the CWA, POTWs must have achieved effluent limits based upon secondary treatment technology by July 1, 1997. Since all statutory deadlines for meeting various treatment technology-based effluent limitations established pursuant to the CWA have expired, when technology-based effluent limits are included in a permit, compliance with those limitations is from the date the issued permit becomes effective. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 125.3(a)(1).

2.2 Water Quality Based Requirements

The CWA and federal regulations require that effluent limitations based on water quality considerations be established for point source discharges when such limitations are necessary to meet state or federal water quality standards that are applicable to the designated receiving water. This is necessary when less stringent TBELs would interfere with the attainment or maintenance of water quality criteria in the receiving water. *See* § 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.44(d)(1) and 122.44(d)(5).

2.2.1 Water Quality Standards

The CWA requires that each state develop water quality standards (WQSs) for all water bodies within the State. *See* CWA § 303 and 40 C.F.R. § 131.10-12. Generally, WQSs consist of three parts: 1) beneficial designated use or uses for a water-body or a segment of a water-body; 2) numeric or narrative water quality criteria sufficient to protect the assigned designated use(s); and 3) anti-degradation requirements to ensure that once a use is attained it will not be degraded and to protect high quality and National resource waters. *See* CWA § 303(c)(2)(A) and 40 C.F.R. § 131.12. The applicable State WQSs can be found in the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules, Surface Water Quality Regulations, Chapter Env-Wq 1700 *et seq.* Also *See* generally, Title 50, Water Management and Protection, Chapters 485-A, Water Pollution and Waste Disposal.

As a matter of state law, state WQSs specify different water body classifications, each of which is associated with certain designated uses and numeric and narrative water quality criteria. When using chemical-specific numeric criteria to develop permit limitations, acute and chronic aquatic life criteria and human health criteria are used and expressed in terms of maximum allowable in-stream pollutant concentrations. In general, aquatic-life acute criteria are considered applicable to daily time periods (maximum daily limit) and aquatic-life chronic criteria are considered applicable to monthly time periods (average monthly limit). Chemical-specific human health criteria are typically based on lifetime chronic exposure and, therefore, are typically applicable to monthly average limits.

When permit effluent limits are necessary for a pollutant to meet narrative water quality criteria, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits in one of three ways: based on a “calculated numeric criterion for the pollutant which the permitting authority demonstrates will attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria and fully protect the designated use,” on a “case-by-case basis” using CWA § 304(a) recommended water quality criteria, supplemented as necessary by other relevant information; or, in certain circumstances, based on an indicator parameter. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A-C).

2.2.2 Anti-degradation

Federal regulations found at 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 require states to develop and adopt a statewide anti-degradation policy that maintains and protects existing in-stream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect these existing uses. In addition, the anti-degradation policy ensures that high quality waters which exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and support recreation in and on the water, are maintained unless the State finds that allowing degradation is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located.

The New Hampshire Anti-Degradation Policy, found at Env-Wq 1708, applies to any new or increased activity that would lower water quality or affect existing or designated uses, including increased loadings to a water body from an existing activity. The anti-degradation regulations focus on protecting high quality waters and maintaining water quality necessary to protect existing uses. Discharges that cause “significant degradation” are defined in NH WQS (Env-Wq 1708.09(a)) as those that use 20% or more of the remaining assimilative capacity for a water quality parameter in terms of either concentration or mass of pollutants or flow rate for water quantity. Where NHDES determined that a proposed increase would cause a significant increase, the applicant must provide documentation to demonstrate that the lowering of water quality is necessary, will provide net economic or social benefit in the area in which the water body is located, and that the benefits of the activity outweigh the environmental impact caused by the lower water quality. *See* Env-Wq 1708.10(b).

This permit is being reissued with effluent limitations sufficiently stringent to satisfy the State’s antidegradation requirements, including the protection of the existing uses of the receiving water.

2.2.3 Assessment and Listing of Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads.

The objective of the CWA is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters. To meet this goal, the CWA requires states to develop information on the quality of their water resources and report this information to EPA, the U.S. Congress, and the public. To this end, the EPA released guidance on November 19, 2001, for the preparation of an integrated “List of Waters” that could combine reporting elements of both § 305(b) and § 303(d) of the CWA. The integrated list format allows states to provide the status of all their assessed waters in one list. States choosing this option must list each water body or segment in one of the following five categories: 1) Unimpaired and not threatened for all designated uses; 2) Unimpaired waters for some uses and not assessed for others; 3) Insufficient information to make assessments for any uses; 4) Impaired or threatened for one or more uses but not requiring the calculation of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL); and 5) Impaired or threatened for one or more uses and requiring a TMDL.

A TMDL is a planning tool and potential starting point for restoration activities with the ultimate goal of attaining water quality standards. A TMDL is essentially a pollution budget designed to restore the health of an impaired water body. A TMDL typically identifies the source(s) of the pollutant from direct and indirect discharges, determines the maximum load of the pollutant that can be discharged to a specific water body while maintaining WQSs for designated uses, and allocates that load to the various pollutant sources, including point source discharges, subject to NPDES permits. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 130.7.

For impaired waters where a TMDL has been developed for a particular pollutant and the TMDL

includes a waste load allocation for a NPDES permitted discharge, the effluent limit in the permit may not exceed the waste load allocation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).

2.2.4 Reasonable Potential

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1), NPDES permits must contain any requirements in addition to TBELs necessary to achieve water quality standards established under § 303 of the CWA. In addition, limitations “must control any pollutant or pollutant parameter (conventional, non-conventional, or toxic) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality”. *See* 40 C.F.R.

§ 122.44(d)(1)(i). There is reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion if the projected or actual in-stream concentration exceeds the applicable criterion. If the permitting authority determines that a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to such an excursion, the permit must contain WQBELs for the pollutant. *See* 40 C.F.R. 122.44(d)(1)(iii).

If the permitting authority determines that the discharge of a pollutant will cause, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above WQSS, the permit must contain WQBELs for that pollutant. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(i).

2.2.5 State Certification

EPA may not issue a permit unless the State Water Pollution Control Agency with jurisdiction over the receiving water(s) either certifies that the effluent limitations contained in the permit are stringent enough to assure that the discharge will not cause the receiving water to violate the State WQSS or it is deemed that the state has waived its right to certify. Regulations governing state certification are set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 124.53 and § 124.55. EPA has requested permit certification by the State pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 124.53 and expects that the Draft Permit will be certified.

If the State believes that any conditions more stringent than those contained in the Draft Permit are necessary to meet the requirements of either the CWA §§ 208(e), 301, 302, 303, 306 and 307 or the appropriate requirements of State law, the State should include such conditions and, in each case, cite the CWA or State law reference upon which that condition is based. Failure to provide such a citation waives the right to certify as to that condition. The only exception to this is that the sludge conditions/requirements implementing § 405(d) of the CWA are not subject to the § 401 State Certification requirements. Reviews and appeals of limitations and conditions attributable to State certification shall be made through the applicable procedures of the State and may not be made through the applicable procedures of 40 C.F.R. § 124.

In addition, the State should provide a statement of the extent to which any condition of the Draft Permit can be made less stringent without violating the requirements of State law. Since the State’s certification is provided prior to permit issuance, any failure by the State to provide this statement waives the State’s right to certify or object to any less stringent condition.

It should be noted that under CWA § 401, EPA’s duty to defer to considerations of state law is intended to prevent EPA from relaxing any requirements, limitations or conditions imposed by state law. Therefore, “[a] State may not condition or deny a certification on the grounds that State law allows a less stringent permit condition.” *See* 40 C.F.R. § 124.55(c). In such an

instance, the regulation provides that, “The Regional Administrator shall disregard any such certification conditions or denials as waivers of certification.” *Id.* EPA regulations pertaining to permit limits based upon water quality standards and state requirements are contained in 40 C.F.R. § 122.4 (d) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d).

2.3 Effluent Flow Requirements

Sewage treatment plant discharge is encompassed within the definition of “pollutant” and is subject to regulation under the CWA. The CWA defines “pollutant” to mean, *inter alia*, “municipal...waste” and “sewage...discharged into water.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(6).

Generally, EPA uses effluent flow both to determine whether an NPDES permit needs certain effluent limitations and to calculate the limitations themselves. EPA practice is to use effluent flow as a reasonable and important worst-case condition in EPA’s reasonable potential and WQBEL calculations to ensure compliance with WQSs under § 301(b)(1)(C). Should the effluent flow exceed the flow assumed in these calculations, the in-stream dilution would be reduced, and the calculated effluent limitations may not be sufficiently protective (i.e. might not meet WQSs). Further, pollutants that do not have the reasonable potential to exceed WQSs at the lower discharge flow may have reasonable potential at a higher flow due to the decreased dilution. In order to ensure that the assumptions underlying the EPA’s reasonable potential analyses and permit effluent limitation derivations remain sound for the duration of the permit, EPA may ensure the validity of its “worst-case” wastewater effluent flow assumptions through imposition of permit conditions for effluent flow.¹ In this regard, the effluent flow limitation is a component of WQBELs because the WQBELs are premised on a maximum level flow. The effluent flow limit is also necessary to ensure that other pollutants remain at levels that do not have a reasonable potential to exceed WQSs.

The limitation on wastewater effluent flow is within EPA’s authority to condition a permit to carry out the objectives of the Act. *See* CWA §§ 402(a)(2) and 301(b)(1)(C); 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.4(a) and (d); 122.43 and 122.44(d). A condition on the discharge designed to ensure the WQBEL and reasonable potential calculations account for “worst case” conditions is encompassed by the references to “condition” and “limitations” in CWA §§ 402 and 301 and implementing regulations, as they are designed to assure compliance with applicable water quality regulations, including antidegradation. Regulating the quantity of pollutants in the discharge through a restriction on the quantity of wastewater effluent is consistent with the overall structure and purposes of the CWA.

In addition, as provided in Part II.B.1 of this permit and 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e), the permittee is required to properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control. Operating the facilities wastewater treatment systems as designed includes operating within the facility’s design wastewater effluent flow.

EPA has also included the effluent flow limit in the permit to minimize or prevent infiltration

¹ EPA’s regulations regarding “reasonable potential” require EPA to consider “where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water,” *id.* 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(ii). *Both* the effluent flow and receiving water flow may be considered when assessing reasonable potential. *In re Upper Blackstone Water Pollution Abatement Dist.*, 14 E.A.D. 577, 599 (EAB 2010). EPA guidance directs that this “reasonable potential: analysis be based on “worst-case” conditions. *See In re Washington Aquaduct Water Supply Sys.* 11 E.A.D. 565, 584 (EAB 2004)

and inflow (I/I) that may result in unauthorized discharges and compromise proper operation and maintenance of the facility. Improper operation and maintenance may result in non-compliance with permit effluent limitations. Infiltration is groundwater that enters the collection system through physical defects such as cracked pipes or deteriorated joints. Inflow is extraneous flow added to the collection system that enters the collection system through point sources such as roof leaders, yard and area drains, sump pumps, manhole covers, tide gates, and cross connections from storm water systems. Significant I/I in a collection system may displace sanitary flow, reducing the capacity available for treatment and the operating efficiency of the treatment works and to properly operate and maintain the treatment works.

Furthermore, the extraneous flow due to significant I/I greatly increases the potential for sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) in separate systems. Consequently, the effluent flow limit is a permit condition that relates to the permittee's duty to mitigate (*i.e.*, minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment) and to properly operate and maintain the treatment works. *See* 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(d), (e).

2.4 Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

2.4.1 Monitoring Requirements

Sections 308(a) and 402(a)(2) of the CWA and the implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. Parts 122, 124, 125, and 136 authorize EPA to include monitoring and reporting requirements in NPDES permits.

The monitoring requirements included in this permit have been established to yield data representative of the discharges under the authority of §§ 308(a) and 402(a)(2) of the CWA, and consistent with 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(j), 122.43(a), 122.44(i) and 122.48. The monitoring requirements included in this permit specify routine sampling and analysis, which will provide ongoing, representative information on the levels of regulated constituents in the wastewater discharge streams. The monitoring program is needed to assess effluent characteristics, evaluate permit compliance, and determine if additional permit conditions are necessary to ensure compliance with technology-based and water quality-based requirements, including WQSs. EPA and/or the state may use the results of the chemical analyses conducted pursuant to this permit, as well as national water quality criteria developed pursuant to § 304(a)(1) of the CWA, state water quality criteria, and any other appropriate information or data, to develop numerical effluent limitations for any pollutants, including, but not limited to, those pollutants listed in Appendix D of 40 C.F.R. § 122. Therefore, the monitoring requirements in this permit are included for specific regulatory use in carrying out the CWA.

NPDES permits require that the approved analytical procedures found in 40 C.F.R. § 136 be used for sampling and analysis unless other procedures are explicitly specified. Permits also include requirements necessary to comply with the *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): Use of Sufficiently Sensitive Test Methods for Permit Applications and Reporting Rule*.² This Rule requires that where EPA-approved methods exist, NPDES applicants must use sufficiently sensitive EPA-approved analytical methods when quantifying the presence of

² Federal Register, Vol. 79, No. 160, Tuesday, August 19, 2014; FR Doc. 2014-19557.

pollutants in a discharge. Further, the permitting authority must prescribe that only sufficiently sensitive EPA-approved methods be used for analyses of pollutants or pollutant parameters under the permit. The NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(e)(3) (completeness), 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(i)(1)(iv) (monitoring requirements) and/or as cross referenced at 40 C.F.R. § 136.1(c) (applicability) indicate that an EPA-approved method is sufficiently sensitive where:

- The method minimum level³ (ML) is at or below the level of the applicable water quality criterion or permit limitation for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter; or
- In the case of permit applications, the ML is above the applicable water quality criterion, but the amount of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in a facility's discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or parameter in the discharge; or
- The method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 126 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter I, subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter.

2.4.2 Reporting Requirements

The Draft Permit requires the Permittee to report monitoring results obtained during each calendar month to EPA and the State electronically using NetDMR. The Permittee must submit a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) for each calendar month no later than the 15th day of the month following the completed reporting period.

NetDMR is a national web-based tool enabling regulated CWA permittees to submit DMRs electronically via a secure internet application to EPA through the Environmental Information Exchange Network. NetDMR has eliminated the need for participants to mail in paper forms to EPA under 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41 and 403.12. NetDMR is accessible through EPA's Central Data Exchange at <https://cdx.epa.gov/>. Further information about NetDMR can be found on the EPA NetDMR support portal webpage.⁴

With the use of NetDMR, the Permittee is no longer required to submit hard copies of DMRs and reports to EPA and the State unless otherwise specified in the Draft Permit. In most cases, reports required under the permit shall be submitted to EPA as an electronic attachment through NetDMR. Certain exceptions are provided in the permit, such as for providing written notifications required under the Part II Standard Conditions.

³ The term "minimum level" refers to either the sample concentration equivalent to the lowest calibration point in a method or a multiple of the method detection limit (MDL). Minimum levels may be obtained in several ways: They may be published in a method; they may be sample concentrations equivalent to the lowest acceptable calibration point used by a laboratory; or they may be calculated by multiplying the MDL in a method, or the MDL determined by a lab, by a factor. EPA is considering the following terms related to analytical method sensitivity to be synonymous: "quantitation limit," "reporting limit," "level of quantitation," and "minimum level." *See Federal Register*, Vol. 79, No. 160, Tuesday, August 19, 2014; FR Doc. 2014-19557.

⁴ <https://netdmr.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/209616266-EPA-Region-1-NetDMR-Information>

2.5 Standard Conditions

The standard conditions, included as Part II of the Draft Permit, are based on applicable regulations found in the Code of Federal Regulations. *See generally* 40 C.F.R. Part 122.

2.6 Anti-backsliding

The CWA's anti-backsliding requirements prohibit a permit from being renewed, reissued or modified to include with less stringent limitations or conditions than those contained in a previous permit except in compliance with one of the specified exceptions to those requirements. See CWA §§ 402(o) and 303(d)(4) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l). Anti-backsliding provisions apply to effluent limits based on technology, water quality and/or state certification requirements.

All proposed limitations in the Draft Permit are at least as stringent as limitations included in the 2000 Permit unless specific conditions exist to justify relaxation in accordance with CWA § 402(o) or § 303(d)(4). Discussion of any less stringent limitations and corresponding exceptions to anti-backsliding provisions is provided in the sections that follow.

3 Description of Facility and Discharge

3.1 Location and Type of Facility

The location of the treatment plant and Outfall 001 to the Souhegan River are shown in Figures 1 & 2. The latitude and longitude of the outfall is 42°52' 24.56⁰ N, 71°36' 55.45⁰ W.

The Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) is a secondary wastewater treatment facility that is engaged in the collection and treatment of municipal wastewater. Currently, the Facility serves approximately 3,200 residents in the Towns of Milford and Wilton with the collection system primarily focused in the town center (Nashua St corridor).

The Facility has a design flow of 2.15 MGD, the annual average daily flow reported in the 2004 application was 1.42 MGD and the average for the last 5 years has been 1.38 MGD, as summarized in Appendix A. The system is a separate system with no combined sewers. Wastewater is comprised of mostly domestic sewage with some industrial sewage.

There are 5 industrial users that discharge to the POTW:

- (1) Saint-Gobain Crystals, 33 Powers St, consisting of industrial (875 gpd) and sanitary (660 gpd) wastewater which contributes an average of 1,535 gallons per day.
- (2) Hitchiner Manufacturing Co., Inc, 594 Elm Street, consisting of industrial (33,200 gpd) and sanitary (6,435 gpd) wastewater which contributes an average of 39,655 gallons per day.
- (3) Special Hermetics Products, Inc, 39 Souhegan Street, Wilton, NH 03068, consisting of industrial (146 gpd) and sanitary (540 gpd) wastewater which contributes an average of 686 gallons per day.
- (4) Marmon Utility, L.L.C., 53 Old Wilton Rd., consisting of industrial (6,725 gpd) and sanitary (2,115 gpd) wastewater which contributes an average of 8,840 gallons per day.

Pollutants introduced into POTWs by a non-domestic source shall not pass through the POTW untreated or interfere with the operation or performance of the treatment works.

A quantitative description of the discharge in terms of effluent parameters, based on monitoring data submitted by the permittee from March 2014 through February 2019 is provided in Appendix A of this Fact Sheet.

The Draft Permit includes the Town of Wilton, New Hampshire as a co-permittee. Wilton owns and operates a sanitary wastewater collection system that flows to the Milford WWTF for treatment. Wilton is a co-permittee for specific activities pertaining to proper operation and maintenance of their respective collection systems (*See* Part I.C and I.D of the Draft Permit). With a letter sent November 18, 2019, EPA waived application requirements for Wilton on the basis that a single permit application executed by Milford is sufficient. The Draft Permit proposes that co-permittee responsibilities under the new permit be limited to those responsibilities applicable to a municipal sewage collection system. The legal basis for including municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees is described in *In re Charles River Pollution Control District*, 16 E.A.D. 623 (EAB 2015)⁵. See Appendix C for more information about EPA’s permitting approach for POTWs that include co-permittees.

3.1.1 Treatment Process Description

The Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility (“WWTF”) is an activated sludge treatment plant. Influent enters the Facility and flows through a mechanical screen, and then PAC (polyaluminum chloride) is added for copper treatment. The influent is then sent into primary clarifiers. From there, sludge is shipped off-site, and the wastewater is sent on to an aeration basin with activated sludge, and then onto a secondary clarifier. Effluent from the secondary clarifiers then flows through a Parshall flume, UV disinfection, cascade aeration, and an effluent diffuser, before entering the Souhegan River. A flow diagram of the Treatment Facility is shown in Figure 3.

Waste sludge is pumped from the clarifiers’ return sludge lines to an aerated sludge holding tank and then dewatered. The dried sludge is then shipped off-site to Merrimack, NH. The average annual mass of sludge shipped is 224.5 dry metric tons.

3.1.2 Collection System Description

The Milford WWTF is served by a separate sewer system. A separate sanitary sewer conveys domestic, industrial and commercial sewage, but not stormwater. It is part of a “two pipe system” consisting of separate sanitary sewers and storm sewers. The two systems have no interconnections; the sanitary sewer leads to the wastewater treatment plant and the storm sewers discharge to a local water body.

⁵ The decision is available at:
[https://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/EAB_Web_Docket.nsf/Published%20and%20Unpublished%20Decisions/F89699D1A0710BCF85257DE200717A93/\\$File/Charles%20River%20Decision%20Vol%2016.pdf](https://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/EAB_Web_Docket.nsf/Published%20and%20Unpublished%20Decisions/F89699D1A0710BCF85257DE200717A93/$File/Charles%20River%20Decision%20Vol%2016.pdf)

4 Description of Receiving Water and Dilution

4.1 Receiving Water

The Milford WWTF discharges through Outfall 001 into the Souhegan River, within Segment NHRIV700060906-16, which is 3.3 miles in length. The Souhegan then flows into the Merrimack River. The Souhegan River is part of the Merrimack River Watershed, which discharges into the Atlantic Ocean, at Newburyport, MA.

The Souhegan River has been classified as a Class B warm water by the State of New Hampshire According to New Hampshire's WQS (RSA 485-A:8), "*Class B waters shall be of the second highest quality and shall have no objectionable physical characteristics, shall contain a dissolved oxygen content of at least 75 percent of saturation, and shall contain not more than either a geometric mean based on at least 3 samples obtained over a 60-day period of 126 Escherichia coli per 100 milliliters, or greater than 406 Escherichia coli per 100 milliliters in any one sample; and for designated beach areas shall contain not more than a geometric mean based on at least 3 samples obtained over a 60-day period of 47 Escherichia coli per 100 milliliters, or 88 Escherichia coli per 100 milliliters in any one sample; unless naturally occurring. There shall be no disposal of sewage or waste into said waters except those which have received adequate treatment to prevent the lowering of the biological, physical, chemical or bacteriological characteristics below those given above, nor shall such disposal of sewage or waste be inimical to aquatic life or to the maintenance of aquatic life in said receiving waters. The pH range for said waters shall be 6.5 to 8.0 except when due to natural causes. Any stream temperature increase associated with the discharge of treated sewage, waste or cooling water, water diversions, or releases shall not be such as to appreciably interfere with the uses assigned to this class.*"

EPA notes that the State of New Hampshire adopted new criteria into their state water quality standard regulations in December 2016 and submitted them to EPA for review and approval. Although the new criteria have not yet been approved by EPA, the Draft Permit is being proposed with effluent limits derived to meet the new criteria in anticipation of a state certification condition to do so.

4.2 Ambient Data

A summary of the ambient data collected in the receiving water upstream of the discharge in the vicinity of the outfall that is referenced in this Fact Sheet can be found in Appendix A of this Fact Sheet.

4.3 Available Dilution

To ensure that discharges do not cause or contribute to violations of WQS under all expected conditions, WQBELs are derived assuming critical conditions for the receiving water⁶. The critical flow in rivers and streams is some measure of the low flow of that river or stream. For rivers and streams where flows are not regulated by dams, State WQSs require that effluent dilution be calculated based on the receiving water lowest observed mean river flow for seven

⁶ EPA Permit Writer's Manual, Section 6.2.4

consecutive days, recorded over a 10-year recurrence interval, or 7-day 10-year low flow (7Q10).

The 7Q10 flow used in the Draft Permit has been extrapolated from flow data from the most recent 30 years for the Souhegan River, at Merrimack U.S. Geological Survey gage 01094000. The 7Q10 discharge was calculated by adjusting the gage reading based on the Dingman ratio proration method.

A. 7Q10 at USGS 01094000: Downstream USGS Souhegan River at Merrimack Gage, NH October 1, 2001 - April 17, 2019⁷

= 12.7 cubic feet per second (cfs)

B. Dingman⁸ 7Q10 upstream of Outfall = 7.60 cfs

C. Dingman 7Q10 upstream of Gage = 9.91 cfs

$7Q10 = A \times (B/C)$

7Q10 = 9.74 cfs (just downstream of the outfall)

The dilution factor (DF) at the 7Q10 flow of 9.74 cfs in the receiving water downstream of the discharge, Q_s , and the Facility's design flow of 3.33 cfs, Q_d , was calculated (including a 0.9 factor to account for 10% reserve assimilative capacity) as shown below:

$$DF = 0.9 \times 9.74 \text{ cfs} / 3.33 \text{ cfs} = 2.63$$

5 Proposed Effluent Limitations and Conditions

The proposed effluent limitations and conditions derived under the CWA and State WQSs are described below. These proposed effluent limitations and conditions, the basis of which are discussed throughout this Fact Sheet, may be found in Part I of the Draft Permit.

5.1 Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements

In addition to the State and Federal regulations described in Section 2, data submitted by the permittee in their permit application as well as in monthly discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) and in WET test reports from 2014 to 2019 were used to identify the pollutants of concern and to evaluate the discharge during the effluent limits development process (*See Appendix A*).

5.1.1 Effluent Flow

There is no effluent flow limit in the 2000 Permit. In their 2004 renewal application, Milford listed 2.15 MGD as their design flow. A review of DMR data in Appendix A, from March 2014 through February 2019 shows that the reported monthly average flows have averaged 1.38 MGD, with a range of 0.69 MGD – 2.53 MGD.

⁷ There is no data available going back 30 years for gages near the WWTF, but data of at least 15 years is considered scientifically valid, as per *US EPA Low Flow Statistics Tools: A How-To Handbook for Permit Writers*, § 4.1

⁸ Dingman, S.L., and S.C Lawlor, 1995. Estimating Low-Flow Quantiles from Drainage-Basin Characteristics in New Hampshire and Vermont, American Water Resources Association, Water Resources Bulletin, pp 243-256.

The Draft Permit proposes a 2.15 MGD rolling average flow limit based on the design flow reported in the 2004 permit application. The Draft Permit requires that flow be measured continuously and that the rolling annual average flow, as well as the average monthly and maximum daily flow for each month be reported. The rolling annual average flow is calculated as the average of the flow for the reporting month and 11 previous months.

5.1.2 Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (CBOD₅)

5.1.3 CBOD₅ Concentration Limits

The CBOD₅ limits in the 2000 Permit were continued from the 1993 permit, and based on the 1991 Souhegan River WLA study⁹. The summer (June 1 through October 31) average monthly limit is 7 mg/L, the average weekly limit is 14 mg/L, and the daily max limit is 16 mg/L. The winter CBOD₅ average monthly limit was 10 mg/L, the average weekly limit was 23 mg/L, and the daily max limit was 25 mg/L.

A review of DMR data submitted from 2014 through 2019 shows that there have been 4 permit violations of CBOD₅ concentration limits. For more detail, see Appendix A, the Milford DMR.

The Draft Permit proposes the same CBOD₅ concentration limits as in the 2000 Permit as no new WLAs have been established and there have been no changes to the secondary treatment standards. The monitoring frequency remains twice per week.

5.1.3.1 CBOD₅ Mass Limits

The summer mass based CBOD₅ limits in the 2000 Permit of 126 lb/day (monthly average) and 251 lb/day (weekly average) were based on the 1991 Souhegan River WLA study. The winter mass-based limits of 179 lb/day (monthly average) and 412 lb/day (weekly average) were also based on the Souhegan WLA study.

The DMR data submitted from 2014 through 2019 shows that there has been 1 permit violation of CBOD₅ mass limits. For more detail, see Appendix A, the Milford DMR.

CBOD Mass Loading Calculations:

Calculations of maximum allowable loads for average monthly and average weekly CBOD₅ are based on the following equation:

$$L = C_d * Q_d * 8.345$$

Where:

L = Maximum allowable load in lb/day.

C_d = Maximum allowable effluent concentration for reporting period in mg/L
(reporting periods are average monthly and average weekly)

Q_d = Design flow of Facility

⁹ New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, *Souhegan River Wasteload Allocation Study, Milford/Amherst Area*, 1991.

8.345 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/L and design flow in MGD to lb/day.

Summer Limits:

Monthly Average:	$7 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 126 \text{ lb/day}$
Weekly Average:	$14 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 251 \text{ lb/day}$
Daily Max:	$16 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 287 \text{ lb/day}$

Winter Limits:

Monthly Average:	$10 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 179 \text{ lb/day}$
Weekly Average:	$23 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 412 \text{ lb/day}$
Daily Max:	$25 \text{ mg/L} * 2.15 \text{ MGD} * 8.345 = 448 \text{ lb/day}$

The Draft Permit proposes the same CBOD₅ mass limits as in the 2000 Permit as no new WLAs have been established and there have been no changes to the secondary treatment standards. The monitoring frequency remains twice per week.

5.1.4 Total Suspended Solids (TSS)

Solids could include inorganic (e.g. silt, sand, clay and insoluble hydrated metal oxides) and organic matter (e.g. flocculated colloids and compounds that contribute to color). Solids can clog fish gills, resulting in an increase in susceptibility to infection and asphyxiation. Suspended solids can increase turbidity in receiving waters and reduce light penetration through the water column or settle to form bottom deposits in the receiving water. Suspended solids also provide a medium for the transport of other adsorbed pollutants, such as metals, which may accumulate in settled deposits that can have a long-term impact on the water column through cycles of re-suspension.

5.1.4.1 TSS Concentration Limits

The summer TSS limits in the 2000 Permit (effective June 1 through October 31) were established in the 1991 Souhegan River wasteload allocation (WLA)¹⁰ study; the average monthly limit is 15 mg/L, the average weekly limit is 25 mg/L, and the daily max is 30 mg/L. The winter TSS limits in the 2000 Permit (effective November 1-May 31) were also based on the WLA study; the average monthly limit is 15 mg/L, the average weekly limit is 30 mg/L, and the daily max is 35 mg/L.

A review of DMR data submitted from March 2014 through February 2019 shows that there have been 16 permit violations of TSS concentration limits, and the facility was considered to be

¹⁰ New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, *Souhegan River Wasteload Allocation Study, Milford/Amherst Area*, 1991.

in “significant non-compliance” for exceeding its effluent TSS monthly average concentration limits in excess of 40% for at least 2 months during 2 consecutive quarter review periods and in any excess for at least 4 months during 2 consecutive quarter review periods¹¹. For more detail, see Appendix A.

The Draft Permit proposes the same TSS concentration limits as in the 2000 Permit as no new WLAs have been established and there have been no changes to the secondary treatment standards. The monitoring frequency remains twice per week.

5.1.4.2 TSS Mass Limits

The summer mass based TSS limits in the 2000 Permit of 269 lb/day (monthly average), 448 lb/day (weekly average), and 538 lb (daily max) were based on the 1991 WLAs. The winter mass-based limits of 269 lb/day (monthly average), 538 lb/day (weekly average), and 628 lb (daily max) were also based on the 1991 WLAs.

A review of DMR data submitted from 2014 through 2019 shows that there have been 18 permit violations of TSS mass limits. For more detail, see Appendix A.

TSS Mass Loading Calculations:

Calculations of maximum allowable loads for average monthly and average weekly TSS are based on the following equation:

$$L = C_d * Q_d * 8.345$$

Where:

L = Maximum allowable load in lb/day.

C_d = Maximum allowable effluent concentration for reporting period in mg/L
(reporting periods are average monthly and average weekly)

Q_d = Design flow of Facility

8.345 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/L and design flow in MGD to lb/day.

Summer Limits:

Monthly Average:	15 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 269 lb/day
Weekly Average:	25 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 448 lb/day
Daily Max:	30 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 538 lb/day

Winter Limits:

Monthly Average:	15 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 269 lb/day
Weekly Average:	30 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 538 lb/day
Daily Max:	35 mg/L * 2.15 MGD * 8.345 = 628 lb/day

¹¹ Impairments Added to Categories 4A, 4B, or 4C of the 2016 305(b) Report, *New Hampshire DES, November 2017*

The Draft Permit proposes the same TSS mass limits as in the 2000 Permit as no new WLAs have been established and there have been no changes to the secondary treatment standards. The monitoring frequency remains twice per week.

5.1.5 Eighty-Five Percent (85%) CBOD₅ and TSS Removal Requirement

In accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. § 133.102(a)(3), (4) and (b)(3), the 0001 Permit requires that the 30-day average percent removal for CBOD₅ and TSS be not less than 85%. A review of DMR data from 2014 through 2019 shows that CBOD₅ and TSS removal percentages averaged 98% and 98%, respectively. There were no violations of the 85% removal requirement for CBOD₅ or TSS during that period.

The requirement to achieve 85% CBOD₅ and TSS removal has been carried forward into the Draft Permit.

5.1.6 pH

The hydrogen ion concentration in an aqueous solution is represented by the pH using a logarithmic scale of 0 to 14 standard units (S.U.). Solutions with pH 7.0 S.U. are neutral, while those with pH less than 7.0 S.U. are acidic and those with pH greater than 7.0 S.U. are basic. Discharges with pH values markedly different from the receiving water pH can have a detrimental effect on the environment. Sudden pH changes can kill aquatic life. pH can also have an indirect effect on the toxicity of other pollutants in the water.

The pH limits in the 2000 Permit were consistent with the requirements of New Hampshire's WQS at RSA 485-A:8 II, "The pH for said (Class B) waters shall be 6.5 to 8.0 except when due to natural causes." The monitoring frequency is once per day. A review of DMR data submitted 2014 through 2019 shows that there has been 1 violation of the pH limitations. During that time pH values ranged from 6.4 to 7.6 standard units.

The pH requirements in the 2000 Permit are carried forward into the Draft Permit as there has been no change in the WQS with regards to pH.

5.1.7 Bacteria

The 2000 Permit includes effluent limitations for bacteria using Escherichia Coli (E. Coli) bacteria as the indicator bacteria to protect seasonal recreational uses in the receiving water year-round. A review of DMR data shows that the permittee has had 1 monthly average violation, and 10 daily maximum violations, of the monthly and maximum daily E. Coli limits of the 2000 Permit, which are 126 cfu/100 mL and 406 cfu/100 mL, respectively. These limits are in line with RSA 485 A:8¹². Discussion with the plant operator revealed these occurred during storm events that combined with snow melt, resulting in heavy overflows into the facility. The monthly geometric mean was 4.7 cfu/100mL, and the daily maximum geometric mean was 47.1 cfu/mL. The maximum E. Coli count reported over the last 60 months was 2,420 cfu/100 mL. The proposed limits and sampling frequency are the same as in the 2000 permit.

¹² New Hampshire Revised Statutes, Title L – Water Management and Protection Chapter 485-A, *Water Pollution and Waste Disposal, Section 485-A:8 – Standards for Classification of Surface Waters of the State*

5.1.8 Dissolved Oxygen

The 2000 Permit includes a dissolved oxygen minimum limit of 6.0 mg/L. This requirement was established to assure that dissolved oxygen levels remain above the state water quality standard of 5.0 mg/L, particularly during low flow periods.

Review of the monitoring data, provided in Appendix A, shows average DO of 9.17 mg/L from 2014 to 2019 with a range from 7.4 to 11.2 mg/L.

In accordance with anti-backsliding regulations, the dissolved oxygen minimum limit will remain at 6.0 mg/L, with sampling frequency staying at 3 times per week.

5.1.9 Ammonia

Nitrogen in the form of ammonia can reduce the receiving stream's dissolved oxygen concentration through nitrification and can be toxic to aquatic life, particularly at elevated temperatures.

EPA notes that the State of New Hampshire adopted new criteria into their WQSs in December 2016 and submitted them to EPA for review and approval. Although the new criteria have not yet been approved by EPA, the Draft Permit is being proposed with effluent limits derived to meet the new criteria in anticipation of a state certification to do so.

Summer Ammonia Limits

The 2000 Permit includes warm weather (June 1 through October 31) seasonal ammonia limits that were established to address the need to reduce the oxygen demanding component of the nitrogen cycle, and also reflect a need to reduce ammonia toxicity. As such, the 2000 Permit includes a monthly average limit of 7.3 mg/L, a daily maximum limit of 10 mg/L, and a maximum daily load of 179 lb/day, for ammonia-nitrogen during the warm weather period.

Review of the monitoring data from 2014 to 2019, provided in Appendix A, shows that in the summer the monthly average ammonia in the effluent averaged 1.98 mg/L (range 0 to 27.6 mg/L), the reported daily maximum ammonia concentration averaged 4.63 mg/L (range 0 to 32.7 mg/L), and the daily maximum ammonia load averaged 43.3 lb (range 0 lb to 277.8 lb). There were 2 violations of the average monthly limit, 4 violations of the daily max concentration, and 2 violations of the daily max load.

The applicable ammonia water quality criteria are pH and, for the chronic criteria, temperature dependent and can be derived using EPA-recommended ammonia criteria from the document: *Update of Ammonia Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia*, 1999 (EPA 822-R-99-014). These are the freshwater ammonia criteria in EPA's *National Recommended Water Quality Criteria*, 2002 (EPA 822-R-02-047) document, which are included by reference in the New Hampshire WQS (See Env-Wq 1700). At pH of 7.0, average summer temperature of 25°C, and assuming salmonids present, the acute criteria is 11 mg/L and the chronic criteria is 1.4 mg/L.

Acute Ammonia-Nitrogen, Warm Weather:

The calculations below test the adequacy of the 2000 permit acute limits for meeting water quality criteria

Downstream Ammonia Concentration (acute)
(June 1 – October 30)

$$Q_D C_D = Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S$$

Where

Q_D	=	Streamflow below outfall	=	6.30 MGD ($Q_E + Q_S$)
Q_E	=	Discharge flow	=	2.15 MGD
C_E	=	Discharge concentration	=	10 mg/L (2000 permit acute limit)
Q_S	=	Upstream flow	=	4.15 MGD (7Q10)
C_S	=	Upstream concentration	=	0.0 mg/L (median from tox report data)
C_D	=	Concentration below outfall		

Solving for downstream concentration,

$$C_D = (Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S) / Q_D$$

$$C_D = \frac{(2.15 \text{ MGD} \times 10 \text{ mg/L}) + (4.15 \text{ MGD} \times 0.0 \text{ mg/L})}{6.30 \text{ MGD}}$$

$$C_D = 3.41 \text{ mg/L, which is less than the applicable acute criteria of 11 mg/L.}$$

Therefore, 10 mg/L is protective of water quality, and is adequate as a daily maximum limit.

Chronic Ammonia-Nitrogen, Warm Weather:

The calculations below test the adequacy of the 2000 permit chronic limits for meeting water quality criteria

Downstream Ammonia Concentration (chronic)
(June 1 – October 30)

$$Q_D C_D = Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S$$

Where

Q_D	=	Streamflow below outfall	=	6.30 MGD ($Q_E + Q_S$)
Q_E	=	Discharge flow	=	2.15 MGD
C_E	=	Discharge concentration	=	7.3 mg/L (2000 permit chronic limit)
Q_S	=	Upstream flow	=	4.15 MGD (7Q10)
C_S	=	Upstream concentration	=	0.0 mg/L (median from tox report data)
C_D	=	Concentration below outfall		

Solving for downstream concentration,

$$C_D = (Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S) / Q_D$$

$$C_D = \frac{(2.15 \text{ MGD} \times 7.3 \text{ mg/L}) + (4.15 \text{ MGD} \times 0.0 \text{ mg/L})}{6.30 \text{ MGD}}$$

$$C_D = 2.49 \text{ mg/L, which is greater than the applicable chronic criteria of 1.4 mg/L.}$$

To find the effluent concentration necessary to meet downstream water quality criteria, the mass-balance equation can be rearranged as:

$$C_E = (Q_D C_D - Q_S C_S) / Q_E$$

Which yields a monthly average discharge concentration limit of 4.1 mg/L.

The Draft Permit continues the summer ammonia acute effluent limit of 10 mg/L from the 2000 Permit and the daily maximum load of 179 lb/day, but lowers the summer ammonia chronic effluent limit to 4.1 mg/L, to ensure that water quality criteria are met. The monitoring frequency remains at 2/week.

Winter Ammonia Limits

The 2000 Permit includes a monthly average cold weather (November 1 through May 31) ammonia-nitrogen effluent limit of 19.4 mg/L to address chronic toxicity. There are no daily limits in the 2000 Permit, although there are daily maximum concentration, and daily maximum load, reporting requirements.

Review of the monitoring data from 2014 to 2019, provided in Appendix A, shows that in the winter the monthly average ammonia in the effluent averaged 0.846 mg/L (range 0 to 6.2 mg/L), the daily maximum concentration averaged 2.53 mg/L (range 0 to 9.2 mg/L), and the daily maximum load averaged 44.5 lb (range 0 to 187.2 lb). There were no violations of the winter ammonia limits.

At pH of 7.0, average winter temperature of 5°C, and assuming salmonids present, the acute and chronic ammonia criteria are 24 mg/L and 4.4 mg/L, respectively.

Acute Ammonia-Nitrogen, Cold Weather:

The 2000 Permit does not include a cold weather daily maximum effluent limit.

To determine whether the effluent has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance above the in-stream water quality criteria for ammonia nitrogen, the following mass-balance is used to project the in-stream concentration downstream from the discharge.

Downstream Ammonia Concentration (acute)
(November 1 – May 31)

$$Q_D C_D = Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S$$

Where

Q_D	=	Streamflow below outfall	=	6.30 MGD ($Q_E + Q_S$)
Q_E	=	Discharge flow	=	2.15 MGD
C_E	=	Discharge concentration	=	9.5 mg/L (95 th percentile daily max)
Q_S	=	Upstream flow	=	4.15 MGD (7Q10)
C_S	=	Upstream concentration	=	0.0 mg/L (median from tox report data)
C_D	=	Concentration below outfall		

Solving for downstream concentration,

$$C_D = (Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S) / Q_D$$

$$C_D = \frac{(2.15 \text{ MGD} \times 9.5 \text{ mg/L}) + (4.15 \text{ MGD} \times 0.0 \text{ mg/L})}{6.30 \text{ MGD}}$$

$$C_D = 3.24 \text{ mg/L, which is less than applicable acute criteria of 24 mg/L.}$$

Therefore, there is not reasonable potential for ammonia to cause or contribute to a violation of the acute ammonia criteria in the wintertime, and the cold-weather daily maximum concentration and load report requirements from the 2000 permit are continued, with the same reporting requirement of 2/week.

Chronic Ammonia-Nitrogen, Cold Weather

The calculations below test the adequacy of the 2000 permit chronic limits for meeting water quality criteria

Downstream Ammonia Concentration (chronic)
(November 1 – May 31)

$$Q_D C_D = Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S$$

Where

Q_D	=	Streamflow below outfall	=	6.30 MGD ($Q_E + Q_S$)
Q_E	=	Discharge flow	=	2.15 MGD
C_E	=	Discharge concentration	=	19.4 mg/L (2000 permit chronic limit)
Q_S	=	Upstream flow	=	4.15 MGD (7Q10)
C_S	=	Upstream concentration	=	0.0 mg/L (median from tox report data)
C_D	=	Concentration below outfall		

Solving for downstream concentration,

$$C_D = (Q_D C_D + Q_S C_S) / Q_R$$

$$C_D = \frac{(2.15 \text{ MGD} \times 19.4 \text{ mg/L}) + (4.15 \text{ MGD} \times 0.0 \text{ mg/L})}{6.30 \text{ MGD}}$$

6.30 MGD

$$C_D = 6.62 \text{ mg/L, which is greater than applicable chronic criteria of 4.4 mg/L.}$$

To find the effluent concentration necessary to meet downstream water quality criteria, the mass-balance equation can be rearranged as:

$$C_E = (Q_D C_D - Q_S C_S) / Q_E$$

Which yields a monthly average discharge concentration limit of 12.9 mg/L.

The Draft Permit continues the winter ammonia daily maximum concentration reporting requirement from the 2000 Permit, but lowers the winter ammonia monthly average effluent limit to 12.9 mg/L, to ensure that water quality criteria are met. The monitoring frequency remains at 2/week.

5.1.10 Nutrients

Nutrients are compounds containing nitrogen and phosphorus. Although nitrogen and phosphorus are essential for plant growth, high concentrations of these nutrients can cause eutrophication, a condition in which aquatic plant and algal growth is excessive. Plant and algae respiration and decomposition reduces dissolved oxygen in the water, creating poor habitat for fish and other aquatic animals. Recent studies provide evidence that both phosphorus and nitrogen can play a role in the eutrophication of certain ecosystems. However, typically phosphorus is the limiting nutrient triggering eutrophication in fresh water ecosystems and nitrogen in marine or estuarine ecosystems.

5.1.10.1 Total Nitrogen

The Souhegan River is a part of the Merrimack River watershed, which is a large and densely populated watershed including 40 POTW discharges in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. EPA estimates that approximately 15,000 lb/day of nitrogen is discharged by POTWs into the fresh water portion of the watershed and another 2,000 lb/day into the marine portion. Recent nitrogen

data collected by CDM Smith in 2014 and 2016 in the estuarine portions of the Merrimack River indicate elevated total nitrogen and chlorophyll 'a' levels. High nutrient concentrations can lead to increased levels of chlorophyll 'a', therefore chlorophyll 'a' can be an indicator of elevated nutrient concentrations. In samples with salinity greater than 10 ppt, total nitrogen ranged from 0.442 to 1.67 mg/L while chlorophyll 'a' ranged from 4 to 42 µg/L¹³. EPA collected samples on outgoing tides in 2017 in this area and found total nitrogen levels in the range of 0.62 mg/L to 1.3 mg/L and chlorophyll 'a' ranging from 2 to 11 µg/L in samples with salinity greater than 10 ppt. EPA is concerned about the impacts that these nitrogen levels may be having on aquatic life in the estuary as most of these results are outside the range typically found in healthy estuaries in Massachusetts.¹⁴ However, more data is necessary to determine whether there is reasonable potential for nitrogen discharges from the facility to cause or contribute to a violation of the Massachusetts narrative nutrient criteria in the Merrimack River estuary, particularly data that characterizes aquatic life designated uses that may be affected in this area so that the narrative criteria can be interpreted numerically. In the meantime, EPA finds that quantifying the load of total nitrogen from this facility and others in the Merrimack River watershed is an important step to understanding the loading of nitrogen from point sources and their potential impact on the estuary.

There are no nitrogen limits, or report requirements, in the 2000 Permit.

The Draft Permit includes weekly monitoring and reporting requirements for total nitrate plus total nitrite, total Kjeldahl nitrogen and total nitrogen, year-round. The monitoring data will provide additional information on the fate of nitrogen through the treatment process and the impact to the Souhegan and Merrimack rivers. The Agencies recommend the Permittee factor in treatment methods to reduce nitrogen in the effluent for any planned upgrades at the treatment plant, as nitrogen limits may be included in subsequent permits.

5.1.10.2 Phosphorus

While phosphorus is an essential nutrient for the growth of aquatic plants, it can stimulate rapid plant growth in freshwater ecosystems when it is present in high quantities. The excessive growth of aquatic plants and algae within freshwater systems negatively impacts water quality and can interfere with the attainment of designated uses by: 1) increasing oxygen demand within the water body to support an increase in both plant respiration and the biological breakdown of dead organic (plant) matter; 2) causing an unpleasant appearance and odor; 3) interfering with navigation and recreation; 4) reducing water clarity; 5) reducing the quality and availability of suitable habitat for aquatic life; 6) producing toxic cyanobacteria during certain algal blooms. Cultural (or accelerated) eutrophication is the term used to describe dense and excessive plant growth in a water body that results from nutrients entering the system as a result of human activities. Discharges from municipal and industrial wastewater treatment plants, agriculture runoff, and stormwater are examples of human-derived (i.e. anthropogenic) sources of nutrients in surface waters.

¹³ CDM Smith/US Army Corps of Engineers New England District, *Merrimack River Watershed Assessment Study - Phase III Final Monitoring Data Report August 2017*, Appendix C.

¹⁴Howes, Brian, et al, *Site-Specific Nitrogen Thresholds for Southeastern Massachusetts Embayments: Critical Indicators Interim Report*, Massachusetts Estuaries Project, December 22, 2003.

The 2000 Permit does not include any phosphorus monitoring or reporting requirements.

The New Hampshire Surface Water Quality Regulations contain a narrative criterion, which limits phosphorus to the level that will not impair a water body's designated use. Specifically, Env-Wq 1703.14(b) states that, "Class B waters shall contain no phosphorus or nitrogen in such concentrations that would impair any existing or designated uses, unless naturally occurring." Env-Wq 1703.14(c), further states that, "Existing discharges containing either phosphorus or nitrogen which encourage cultural eutrophication shall be treated to remove phosphorus or nitrogen to ensure attainment and maintenance of water quality standards." Cultural eutrophication is defined in Env-Wq 1702.15 as, "... the human-induced addition of wastes that contain nutrients to surface waters, resulting in excessive plant growth or a decrease in dissolved oxygen, or both."

In the absence of numeric criteria for phosphorus, EPA uses nationally recommended criteria and other technical guidance to develop effluent limitations for the discharge of phosphorus. EPA has published national guidance documents that contain recommended total phosphorus criteria and other indicators of eutrophication. EPA's 1986 Quality Criteria for Water (the "Gold Book") recommends that in-stream phosphorus concentrations not exceed 0.05 mg/L in any stream entering a lake or reservoir, 0.1 mg/L for any stream not discharging directly to lakes or impoundments, and 0.025 mg/L within a lake or reservoir. For this segment of the Souhegan, the 0.09 mg/L would apply downstream of the discharge, as New Hampshire regulations require a 10% assimilative capacity in addition to the EPA standards.

More recently, EPA has released recommended Ecoregional Nutrient Criteria, established as part of an effort to reduce problems associated with excess nutrients in water bodies in specific areas of the country. The published criteria represent conditions in waters within ecoregions that are minimally impacted by human activities, and thus free from the effects of cultural eutrophication. Milford is located within Ecoregion XIV, Eastern Coastal Plains. The recommended total phosphorus criteria for this ecoregion, found in Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations: Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria, Rivers and Streams in Ecoregion XIV (EPA December 2000) is 31.25 µg/L (0.03125 mg/L).

EPA uses the effects-based Gold Book threshold as a general target applicable in free-flowing streams. As the Gold Book notes, there are natural conditions of a water body that can result in either increased or reduced eutrophication response to phosphorus inputs; in some waters more stringent phosphorus reductions may be needed, while in some others a higher total phosphorus threshold could be assimilated without inducing a eutrophic response. In this case, EPA is not aware of any evidence that the Souhegan River is unusually susceptible to eutrophication impacts, so that the 90 µg/L threshold appears sufficient in this receiving water. EPA is not aware of evidence of factors that are reducing eutrophic response in the Souhegan downstream of the discharge .

Elevated concentration of *chlorophyll a*, excessive algal and macrophyte growth, and low levels of dissolved oxygen are all effects of nutrient enrichment. The relationship between these factors and high in-stream total phosphorus concentrations is well documented in scientific literature, including guidance developed by EPA to address nutrient over-enrichment (*Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual – Rivers and Streams*, EPA July 2000 [EPA-822-B-00-002]).

Along these lines, segment NHRIV70006906-18 of the Souhegan River downstream of the discharge is impaired for dissolved oxygen (DO) which may be attributed to eutrophic impacts of excessive nutrients. Although the impairment is based on older data, the downstream DO

concentration has been measured below 5.0 mg/L as recently as 2017. This supports the need for reduced phosphorus loads into the receiving water.

EPA is using the Gold Book criteria in this permit, as its recommendations are from an effects-based approach.

Since the most recent upstream phosphorus data available was from 2007, and there were only 4 data points, EPA did not have recent data that could be considered representative of the upstream receiving water concentration. Therefore, EPA will use an assumed upstream phosphorus concentration of 0 mg/L and proposes ambient phosphorus data to be collected during the life of the permit, as described below. EPA notes that this ambient data will be used in future analysis of reasonable potential and may result in a more stringent phosphorus limit.

The following mass balance is used to project the effluent concentration, C_E , of total phosphorus that is necessary to ensure that the discharge does not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards under critical conditions.

$$C_E = \frac{Q_D C_D - Q_S C_S}{Q_E}$$

Where:

Q_S = 7Q10 flow upstream of facility (4.15 MGD)

Q_E = Facility design flow (2.15 MGD)

Q_D = combined stream flow (7Q10 + effluent flow) (6.30 MGD)

C_S = median upstream total phosphorus concentration (0.0 mg/L)

C_D = downstream phosphorus concentration target (0.09 mg/L)

C_E = effluent total phosphorus concentration (mg/L)

In order to meet the downstream phosphorus concentration of 0.09 mg/L, this calculation yields an effluent concentration of 0.26 mg/L for the Milford WWTP under critical conditions. In their 2004 permit application, Milford listed an average phosphorus discharge of 3.71 mg/L. That is approximately 14 times the discharge concentration that would have the reasonable potential to violate water quality standards under critical conditions. Although this effluent data is quite old, the facility has not undergone any facility upgrades which would significantly reduce the amount of phosphorus expected to be in the effluent to below the level that would trigger reasonable potential (i.e., 0.26 mg/L). Therefore, there is clearly a need for a phosphorus limit in order to ensure that the discharge does not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards.

Mass-based limit analysis

Phosphorus can also be viewed in terms of mass loading, which requires that Milford not exceed its permitted phosphorus loading. To ensure a mass-based limit is protective under the worst-case conditions, the limit is calculated using the lowest expected receiving water flow and effluent flow. Hence, the upstream 7Q10 receiving water flow (4.15 MGD) and the lowest monthly average effluent flow during the review period (0.69 MGD, See Attachment A) are used. The numeric mass-based limit is determined based on the following equations:

$$Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S = Q_D C_D \times (0.90)$$

and

$$M_E = Q_E C_E \times 8.345$$

Substituting ($Q_D C_D$) with ($M_E/8.345$) in the first equation and solving for M_E results in:

$$M_E = (Q_D C_D \times (0.90) - Q_S C_S) \times 8.345$$

where:

M_E = mass-based phosphorus limit

Q_E = effluent flow in MGD (lowest monthly average effluent flow = 0.69 MGD)

C_E = effluent phosphorus concentration in mg/L

Q_S = upstream 7Q10 flow (4.15 MGD)

C_S = upstream river phosphorus concentration (0.0 mg/L)

Q_D = downstream flow (4.84 MGD)

C_D = downstream river phosphorus concentration (Gold Book target = 0.100 mg/L)

0.90 = factor to reserve 10% assimilative capacity

8.345 = factor to convert from MGD * mg/L to lb/day

Solving for M_E gives the maximum allowable mass the facility may discharge without violating water quality standards. This allowable discharge is 3.6 lb/day which is equivalent to 0.63 mg/L at the facility's lowest monthly average effluent flow of 0.69 MGD, or 0.31 mg/L at the average flow of 1.38 MGD, or 0.20 mg/L at the design flow of 2.15 mg/L. In comparison, the potential concentration-based limit of 0.26 mg/L would be more stringent at effluent flows below 1.66 MGD and the potential mass-based effluent limit of 3.6 lb/day would be more stringent at effluent flows above 1.66 MGD.

Based on this analysis, the Draft Permit proposes a monthly average phosphorus limit of 3.6 lb/day effective from April 1 through October 31, with sampling at 2/month. EPA is soliciting comments regarding whether the application of a concentration-based limit of 0.26 mg/L in lieu of the mass-based limit of 3.6 lb/day would be more appropriate. In addition, the Draft Permit proposes seasonal monitoring of upstream phosphorus concentrations to ensure that sufficient information is available to reevaluate the effluent limits when the permit is next reissued.

Schedules of compliance to meet water quality based effluent limits may be included in permits only when the state's water quality standards clearly authorize such schedules and where the limits are established to meet a water quality standard that is either newly adopted, revised, or interpreted after July 1, 1977. New Hampshire regulations for schedules of compliance in NPDES Permits can be found at Env-Wq 1701.03. Finally, the permitting authority must make a reasonable determination that a schedule of compliance is "appropriate" and that compliance is required "as soon as possible." See 40 CFR §122.47(a), §122.47(a)(1). As this is a new limit which the facility is likely to require an upgrade to comply, a compliance schedule has been proposed in the Draft Permit.

5.1.11 Metals

Dissolved fractions of certain metals in water can be toxic to aquatic life. Therefore, there is a need to limit toxic metal concentrations in the effluent where aquatic life may be impacted. For

the development of the Draft Permit, analyses were completed to evaluate whether there is reasonable potential for effluent discharges to cause or contribute to exceedances of the water quality criteria for aluminum, nickel, and zinc, and to evaluate whether the limits in the 2000 Permit for cadmium, copper and lead continue to be necessary and protective, given the updated upstream hydrologic and chemical characteristics of the receiving water described earlier in this Fact Sheet. A summary of recent metals compliance and monitoring results is provided in Appendix A.

5.1.11.1 Applicable Metals Criteria

State water quality criteria for cadmium, copper, lead, nickel and zinc are established in terms of dissolved metals. However, many inorganic components of domestic wastewater, including metals, are in particulate form, and differences in the chemical composition between the effluent and the receiving water affects the partitioning of metals between the particulate and dissolved fractions as the effluent mixes with the receiving water, often resulting in a transition from the particulate to dissolved form (*The Metals Translator: Guidance for Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit from a Dissolved Criterion* (USEPA 1996 [EPA-823-B96-007])). Consequently, quantifying only the dissolved fraction of metals in the effluent prior to discharge may not accurately reflect the biologically-available portion of metals in the receiving water. Regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.45(c) require, with limited exceptions, that effluent limits for metals in NPDES permits be expressed as total recoverable metals.

The criteria for cadmium, copper, lead, nickel and zinc are hardness-dependent using the equations in NH Env Wq-1703. The estimated hardness of the Souhegan downstream of the treatment plant during critical low flow periods and design discharge flow was calculated based on median ambient and effluent hardness data as reported in the Facility's whole effluent toxicity tests conducted from 2014 through 2019. The source data can be seen in Appendices A and B.

The following mass balance equation was used to estimate the hardness of the receiving water, C_D , downstream of the discharge location.

$$C_D = \frac{Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S}{Q_D}$$

$$= 61.7 \text{ mg/L}$$

Where:

Q_S = 7Q10 river stream flow upstream of Facility = 4.15 MGD

Q_E = Design discharge flow from Facility = 2.15 MGD

Q_D = Combined stream flow (7Q10 + plant flow) = 6.30 MGD

C_S = Median upstream hardness concentration = 16.0 mg/L

C_E = Median Facility effluent hardness concentration = 150.0 mg/L

New Hampshire aluminum criteria are not hardness dependent and should be applied in terms of acid-soluble aluminum (See Table 1703-1, Note S). However, without site-specific data showing the fraction of downstream aluminum in the acid-soluble form, EPA assumes that the ratio of acid soluble to total recoverable aluminum is 1:1. The NH freshwater acute and chronic criteria for aluminum is 750 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and 87 $\mu\text{g/L}$, respectively for both the EPA-approved WQS and the NH adopted WQS.

Appendix B summarizes the calculation of the acute and chronic total recoverable criteria for each metal using the estimated receiving water hardness of 61.7 mg/L. For metals with hardness-based water quality criteria, the criteria were calculated using the equations for hardness-based water quality criteria, the criteria were calculated using the equations in NH Env Wq-1703. Table 1 below shows a summary of the criteria from Appendix B, after being multiplied by 0.9, to account for 10% reserve assimilative capacity:

Table 1: Summary of Acute and Chronic Total Recoverable Fresh Water Criteria Calculation for Metals

Metal	Total Recoverable Criteria	
	Acute Criteria (CMC) (µg/L)	Chronic Criteria (CCC) (µg/L)
Aluminum	675	78.3
Cadmium	1.07	0.48
Copper	8.00	5.56
Lead	39.76	1.55
Nickel	280.76	31.22
Zinc	71.66	71.66

5.1.11.2 Reasonable Potential Analysis and Limit Derivation

To determine whether the effluent has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance above the in-stream water quality criteria for each metal, the following mass balance is used to project in-stream metal concentrations downstream from the discharge.

$$Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S = Q_D C_D$$

Solving for the receiving water metals concentration downstream of the discharge, C_D yields:

$$C_D = \frac{Q_E C_E + Q_S C_S}{Q_D}$$

Where:

Q_E = design discharge flow from plant = 2.15 MGD

C_E = effluent metals concentration, in µg/L (95th percentile¹⁵)

Q_S = 7Q10 stream flow upstream of the plant = 4.15 MGD

C_S = upstream metals concentration, in µg/L (median)

Q_D = combined stream flow (7Q10 + plant flow) = 6.30 MGD

Reasonable potential is then determined by comparing this resultant in-stream concentration (for both acute and chronic conditions) with the criteria (multiplied by 0.9 to reserve 10% of the assimilative capacity as required by Env-Wq 1705.01) for each metal. In EPA's Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991, commonly known as the "TSD", box 3-2 describes the statistical approach in determining if there is reasonable potential for an excursion above the maximum allowable concentration. If

¹⁵ The Facility's effluent concentrations (from Appendix A) were characterized assuming a lognormal distribution to determine the estimated 95th percentile of the daily maximum (See results in Appendix B).

there is reasonable potential (for either acute or chronic conditions), the appropriate limit is then calculated by rearranging the above mass balance to solve for the effluent concentration (C_d) using the criterion as the resultant in-stream concentration (C_r). *See* Appendix B for the results of the metals analysis.

For any metal with an existing limit in the 2000 Permit, a reasonable potential determination is not applicable, so the table indicates “N/A” for reasonable potential. In such cases, the same mass balance equation is used to determine if a more stringent limit would be required to meet WQS under current conditions. The limit is determined to be the more stringent of either (1) the existing limit or (2) the calculated effluent concentration (C_d) allowable to meet WQS based on current conditions. However, if the mass balance indicates that a less stringent effluent concentration (C_d) would meet WQS under current conditions, a case-by-case analysis must be done to determine if backsliding is allowable based on the exceptions found at 40 CFR § 122.44(1)(2)(i).

5.1.11.3 Aluminum

The 2000 Permit includes a report requirement for total recoverable aluminum as part of WET testing. Review of the monitoring data from 2014 to 2019, provided in Appendix A, shows that the monthly average aluminum in the effluent averaged 313 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (range 140 to 500 $\mu\text{g/L}$). The aluminum criteria are not hardness dependent.

The reasonable potential analysis in Appendix B shows that there is reasonable potential to exceed 78.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$, therefore, this Draft Permit proposes a monthly average effluent limit of 87.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$, with sampling 2/month. There is no new acute limit in the Draft Permit.

The Draft Permit includes a 3-year compliance schedule to meet the new aluminum limit in anticipation of an expected revision to the New Hampshire freshwater aluminum criteria. EPA finalized new aluminum criteria recommendations in December 2018 which are dependent on pH, dissolved organic carbon and hardness and which may be higher than New Hampshire’s current criteria. Although New Hampshire is considering adopting EPA’s 2018 aluminum criteria recommendations as state water quality criteria, it has not yet done so. EPA has therefore determined that it is appropriate to include a schedule of compliance, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §122.47, in the Draft Permit which provides the permittee with a 3-year period to achieve compliance with the final aluminum effluent limit. Additionally, the permittee may apply for a permit modification to allow additional time for compliance if New Hampshire has adopted new aluminum criteria but has not yet submitted the criteria to EPA for review or EPA has not yet acted on the new criteria. If new aluminum criteria are adopted by New Hampshire and approved by EPA, and before the final aluminum effluent limit goes into effect, the permittee may apply for a permit modification to amend the permit based on the new criteria. If warranted by the new criteria and a reasonable potential analysis, EPA may relax or remove the effluent limit to the extent consistent with anti-degradation requirements. Such relaxation or removal would not trigger anti-backsliding requirements as those requirements do not apply to effluent limits which have yet to take effect pursuant to a schedule of compliance. *See American Iron and Steel Institute v. EPA*, 115 F.3d 979, 993 n.6 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (“EPA interprets §402 to allow later relaxation of [an effluent limit] so long as the limit has yet to become effective.”)]

5.1.11.4 Cadmium

The 2000 Permit includes a monthly cadmium limit of 3.0 µg/L, and an acute cadmium limit of 3.4 µg/L. Because the permit already includes limits for cadmium, a reasonable potential analysis is not applicable. Instead the analysis in Appendix B demonstrates that the existing limit is not stringent enough to meet water quality standards under current conditions. Therefore, the proposed limits in the Draft Permit have been lowered to an acute cadmium limit of 3.1 µg/L, and a chronic cadmium limit of 1.4 µg/L, with 2/month sampling frequency.

5.1.11.5 Copper

The 2000 Permit includes a monthly average copper limit of 10.1 µg/L and a maximum daily copper limit of 13.5 µg/L, based on an assumed hardness of 25 mg/L. The Permittee has not been able to consistently achieve these limits and was considered in “significant non-compliance” for exceeding its interim effluent copper monthly average concentration limits in January 2015¹⁶. Monthly average concentrations have ranged from 2.8 µg/L to 29.2 µg/L and averaged 9.2 µg/L from March 2014 through February 2019. Daily maximum concentrations ranged from 4 µg/L to 45.1 µg/L, and averaged 10.5 µg/L, over that same period.

The applicable acute and chronic water quality criteria for copper, expressed as total copper, are now 8.00 µg/L and 5.56 µg/L, respectively. These criteria are higher than those used in calculating the 2000 Permit limits because site specific hardness estimate of 61.7 mg/L CaCO₃ is being used to evaluate copper for the Draft Permit.

Ambient copper levels in the Souhegan, upstream of the discharge, were measured in samples taken for WET testing and are provided in Appendix B. The median of these samples is 1 µg/L total copper.

Since the Permittee has not been able to meet the previous copper effluent limits, an exception to the anti-backsliding regulation at 40 CFR § 122.44(l)(2)(i)(E) applies because the Permittee has properly operated and maintained the facility but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitation. Therefore, the limit is able to backslide to the most stringent of either (1) the new effluent concentration (C_d) determined to meet WQS under present conditions or (2) the level of compliance achieved by the facility (based on the 95th percentile of the effluent data). In this case, the new acute limit is based on the level of compliance achieved by the facility (based on the 95th percentile of the effluent data, i.e., 16.2 µg/L) and the new chronic limit is based on the new effluent concentration (C_d) determined to meet WQS under present conditions (i.e., to achieve the chronic criterion of 5.56 µg/L downstream). See Appendix B for details of these mass-balance calculations.

Therefore, EPA has revised the effluent limits in the Draft Permit for copper to an average monthly limit of 14.4 µg/L and a maximum daily limit of 16.2 µg/L, with 2/month sampling.

¹⁶ Impairments Added to Categories 4A, 4B, or 4C of the 2016 305(b) Report, *New Hampshire DES, November 2017*

5.1.11.6 Chromium

The 2000 permit includes a report requirement for chromium as part of WET testing. All readings, both ambient and effluent, were non-detects. The quarterly report requirement is continued in the Draft Permit.

5.1.11.7 Lead

The 2000 Permit includes a monthly lead limit of 2.0 µg/L, and an acute lead limit of 51 µg/L. There were no violations of the lead limits from March 2014 – February 2019, as can be seen in Appendix A. Those limits are protective of water quality, and therefore are continued in the Draft Permit, along with the sampling frequency of 2/month.

5.1.11.8 Nickel

The 2000 permit includes a report requirement for nickel as part of WET testing. All ambient readings were non-detects at a detection threshold of 2 µg/L, and all effluent samples were well below the acute (280 µg/L) and chronic (31.22 µg/L) criteria, as shown in Appendices A and B. The quarterly report requirement is continued in the Draft Permit as part of the WET test.

5.1.11.9 Zinc

The 2000 permit includes a report requirement for zinc as part of WET testing. Based on a reasonable potential analysis of the provided data (see Appendix B), the effluent zinc from Milford WWTF does not have reasonable potential to violate the 71.66 µg/L water quality criteria. The quarterly report requirement is continued in the Draft Permit as part of the WET test.

5.1.12 Whole Effluent Toxicity

CWA §§ 402(a)(2) and 308(a) provide EPA and States with the authority to require toxicity testing. Section 308 specifically describes biological monitoring methods as techniques that may be used to carry out objectives of the CWA. Whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing is conducted to ensure that the additivity, antagonism, synergism and persistence of the pollutants in the discharge do not cause toxicity, even when the pollutants are present at low concentrations in the effluent. The inclusion of WET requirements in the Draft Permit will assure that the Facility does not discharge combinations of pollutants into the receiving water in amounts that would affect aquatic life or human health.

In addition, under § 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on WQSs. Under certain narrative State WQSs, and §§ 301, 303 and 402 of the CWA, EPA and the States may establish toxicity-based limitations to implement the narrative “no toxics in toxic amounts”. New Hampshire statute and regulations state that, *“all surface waters shall be free from toxic substances or chemical constituents in concentrations or combination that injure or are inimical to plants, animals, humans, or aquatic life...”* (N.H. RSA 485-A:8, VI and the N.H. Code of Administrative Rules, PART Env-Wq 1730.21(a)(1)).

National studies conducted by the EPA have demonstrated that domestic sources, as well as industrial sources, contribute toxic constituents to POTWs. These constituents include metals, chlorinated solvents, aromatic hydrocarbons and others. Some of these constituents may cause

synergistic effects, even if they are present in low concentrations. Because of the source variability and contribution of toxic constituents in domestic and industrial sources, EPA assumes that there is a reasonable potential for this discharge to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the “no toxics in toxic amounts” narrative water quality standard.

In accordance with EPA guidance, whole effluent chronic effects are regulated by limiting the highest measured continuous concentration of an effluent that causes no observed chronic effect on a representative standard test organism, known as the chronic No Observed Effect Concentration (C-NOEC). Whole effluent acute effects are regulated by limiting the concentration that is lethal to 50% of the test organisms, known as the LC₅₀. According to this policy dischargers having a dilution factor less than 10 are required to conduct acute and chronic toxicity testing four times per year for two species. Additionally, for discharges with dilution factors less than 10, the C-NOEC effluent limit should be greater than or equal to the receiving water concentration and the LC₅₀ limit should be greater than or equal to 100%.

The chronic and acute WET limits in the 2000 Permit are: C-NOEC greater than or equal to 28%; and LC₅₀ greater than or equal to 100%, respectively, using the daphnid, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (*C. dubia*), and the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*) as the test species. The Facility has consistently met these limits, with only one violation (December 2014) as can be seen in Appendix A.

Based on the potential for toxicity from domestic and industrial contributions, the state narrative water quality criterion, the dilution factor of 2.63, and in accordance with EPA national and regional policy and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d), the C-NOEC limit in the Draft Permit is changed to 38% (i.e., $100/DF = 100/2.63 = 38\%$) with the same test organism and the testing frequency as the 2000 Permit. Toxicity testing must be performed in accordance with the updated EPA Region 1 WET test procedures and protocols specified in Attachments A and B of the Draft Permit (USEPA Region 1 Freshwater Acute Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, February 2011 and USEPA Region 1 Freshwater Chronic Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, March 2013).

In addition, EPA’s 2018 *National Recommended Water Quality Criteria* for aluminum are calculated based on water chemistry parameters that include dissolved organic carbon (DOC), hardness and pH. Since aluminum monitoring is required as part of each WET test, an accompanying new testing and reporting requirement for DOC, in conjunction with each WET test, is warranted in order to assess potential impacts of aluminum in the receiving water.

5.2 Industrial Pretreatment Program

The Permittee is required to administer a pretreatment program based on the authority granted under 40 C.F.R. 122.44(j), 40 C.F.R. Part 403 and Section 307 of the Act. The Permittee's pretreatment program received EPA approval on February 13, 1990 and, as a result, appropriate pretreatment program requirements were incorporated into the previous permit, which were consistent with that approval and federal pretreatment regulations in effect when the permit was issued.

The Federal Pretreatment Regulations in 40 C.F.R. Part 403 were amended in October 1988, in July 1990, and again in October 2005. Those amendments established new requirements for implementation of pretreatment programs. Upon reissuance of this NPDES permit, the permittee is obligated to modify its pretreatment program to be consistent with current Federal

Regulations. Those activities that the permittee must address include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) develop and enforce EPA approved specific effluent limits (technically-based local limits); 2) revise the local sewer-use ordinance or regulation, as appropriate, to be consistent with Federal Regulations; 3) develop an enforcement response plan; 4) implement a slug control evaluation program; 5) track significant noncompliance for industrial users; and 6) establish a definition of and track significant industrial users.

These requirements are necessary to ensure continued compliance with the POTW's NPDES permit and its sludge use or disposal practices.

In addition to the requirements described above, the Draft Permit requires the Permittee to submit to EPA in writing, within 180 days of the permit's effective date, a description of proposed changes to permittee's pretreatment program deemed necessary to assure conformity with current federal pretreatment regulations. These requirements are included in the Draft Permit to ensure that the pretreatment program is consistent and up-to-date with all pretreatment requirements in effect. Lastly, the Permittee must continue to submit, annually by March 1st, a pretreatment report detailing the activities of the program for the twelve-month period ending 60 days prior to the due date.

5.3 Sludge Conditions

Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act requires that EPA develop technical standards regarding the use and disposal of sewage sludge. On February 19, 1993, EPA promulgated technical standards. These standards are required to be implemented through permits. The conditions in the permit satisfy this requirement.

5.4 Infiltration/Inflow (I/I)

Infiltration is groundwater that enters the collection system through physical defects such as cracked pipes, or deteriorated joints. Inflow is extraneous flow entering the collection system through point sources such as roof leaders, yard and area drains, sump pumps, manhole covers, tide gates, and cross connections from storm water systems. Significant I/I in a collection system may displace sanitary flow, reducing the capacity and the efficiency of the treatment works and may cause bypasses to secondary treatment. It greatly increases the potential for sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) in separate systems, and combined sewer overflows (CSOs) in combined systems.

The Draft Permit includes a requirement for the permittee and co-permittee to control infiltration and inflow (I/I) within the sewer collections system it owns and operates. The permittee and co-permittee shall develop an I/I removal program commensurate with the severity of I/I in the collection system. This program may be scaled down in sections of the collection system that have minimal I/I.

5.5 Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System

The standard permit conditions for 'Proper Operation and Maintenance', found at 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e), require the proper operation and maintenance of permitted wastewater systems and related facilities to achieve permit conditions. The requirements at 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d) impose a 'duty to mitigate' upon the permittee, which requires that "all reasonable steps be taken to

minimize or prevent any discharge violation of the permit that has a reasonable likelihood of adversity affecting human health or the environment. EPA maintains that an I/I removal program is an integral component of ensuring permit compliance with the requirements of the permit under the provisions at 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d) and (e).

General requirements for proper operation and maintenance, and mitigation have been included in Part II of the permit. Specific permit conditions have also been included in Part I.C. and I.D. of the Draft Permit. These requirements include mapping of the wastewater collection system, preparing and implementing a collection system operation and maintenance plan, reporting of unauthorized discharges including SSOs, maintaining an adequate maintenance staff, performing preventative maintenance, controlling inflow and infiltration to separate sewer collection systems (combined systems are not subject to I/I requirements) to the extent necessary to prevent SSOs and I/I related effluent violations at the Wastewater Treatment Facility and maintaining alternate power where necessary. These requirements are included to minimize the occurrence of permit violations that have a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

Several of the requirements in the Draft Permit are not included in the 2000 Permit, including collection system mapping, and preparation of a collection system operation and maintenance plan. EPA has determined that these additional requirements are necessary to ensure the proper operation and maintenance of the collection system and has included schedules for completing these requirements in the Draft Permit.

Because Wilton owns and operates a collection system that discharges to the Milford WWTF, they have been included as co-permittee for the specific permit requirements discussed in the paragraph above. The historical background and legal framework underlying this co-permittee approach is set forth in Attachment E to this Fact Sheet, EPA Region 1 NPDES Permitting Approach for Publicly Owned Treatment Works that Include Municipal Satellite Sewage Collection Systems.

5.6 Standard Conditions

The standard conditions of the permit are based on 40 C.F.R. §122, Subparts A, C, and D and 40 C.F.R. § 124, Subparts A, D, E, and F and are consistent with management requirements common to other permits.

6 Federal Permitting Requirements

6.1 Endangered Species Act

Section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA), grants authority and imposes requirements on Federal agencies regarding endangered or threatened species of fish, wildlife, or plants (listed species) and habitat of such species that has been designated as critical (a “critical habitat”).

Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires every Federal agency, in consultation with and with the assurance of the Secretary of Interior, to ensure that any action it authorizes, funds or carries out, in the United States or upon the high seas, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) administers Section 7 consultations for freshwater species. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service

(NOAA Fisheries) administers Section 7 consultations for marine and anadromous species.

The Federal action being considered in this case is EPA's proposed NPDES permit for the Facility. The Draft Permit is intended to replace the 2000 Permit in governing the Facility. As the federal agency charged with authorizing the discharge from this Facility, EPA determines potential impacts to federally listed species, and initiates consultation, when required under § 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

EPA has reviewed the federal endangered or threatened species of fish, wildlife, and plants in the expected action area of the outfall to determine if EPA's proposed NPDES permit could potentially impact any such listed species. For protected species under the jurisdiction of the USFWS, one listed threatened species, the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), was identified as potentially occurring in the action area of the Milford WWTF.¹⁷

According to the USFWS, the threatened northern long-eared bat is found in "winter – mines and caves, summer – wide variety of forested habitats. This species is not aquatic, so the Facility discharge will have no direct effect on this mammal. Further, the permit action is also expected to have no indirect effect on the species because it is not expected to impact insects, the primary prey of the northern long-eared bat. Therefore, the proposed permit action is deemed to have no impact on this listed species.

Based on the review of the habitat of the species under the jurisdiction of the USFWS listed above, EPA has determined that no federally protected species or their critical habitat overlap with the action area of the Facility. Therefore, ESA section 7 consultation with USFWS will not be required.

In addition, there are no known federally listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries within the vicinity of the Milford discharge.¹⁸ Therefore, ESA consultation with NOAA Fisheries will not be required for this discharge.

At the beginning of the public comment period, EPA notified USFWS and NOAA Fisheries Protected Resources Division that the Draft Permit and Fact Sheet were available for review and provided a link to the EPA NPDES Permit website to allow direct access to the documents.

Initiation of consultation is required and shall be requested by the EPA or by USFWS/NOAA Fisheries where discretionary Federal involvement or control over the action has been retained or is authorized by law and: (a) If new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered in the analysis; (b) If the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in this analysis; or (c) If a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action. No take is anticipated or exempted. If there is any incidental take of a listed species, initiation of consultation would be required.

¹⁷ See §7 resources for USFWS at <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>.

¹⁸ See <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/map/greater-atlantic-region-esa-section-7-mapper>

6.2 Essential Fish Habitat

Under the 1996 Amendments (PL 104-267) to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (*see* 16 U.S.C. § 1801 *et seq.*, 1998), EPA is required to consult with the NOAA Fisheries if EPA's action or proposed actions that it funds, permits, or undertakes, "may adversely impact any essential fish habitat." 16 U.S.C. § 1855(b).

The Amendments broadly define "essential fish habitat" (EFH) as: "waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." 16 U.S.C. § 1802(10). "Adverse impact" means any impact that reduces the quality and/or quantity of EFH 50 C.F.R. § 600.910(a). Adverse effects may include direct (e.g., contamination or physical disruption), indirect (e.g., loss of prey, reduction in species' fecundity), or site specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions.

EFH is only designated for fish species for which federal Fisheries Management Plans exist. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1855(b)(1)(A). EFH designations for New England were approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 3, 1999.

The Souhegan River, as part of the Merrimack River drainage, has been given EFH designation for riverine systems at 42°52' 24.56⁰ N, 71°36' 55.45⁰ W, as determined by the NOAA EFH Mapper.¹⁹ Anadromous Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) is the only managed species believed to be present during one or more lifestages within the area which encompasses the discharge site. EPA has concluded that the limits and conditions contained in the Draft Permit minimize adverse effects to Atlantic Salmon EFH for the following reasons:

EPA's Finding of all Potential Impacts to EFH Species

- This Draft Permit action does not constitute a new source of pollutants. It is the reissuance of an existing NPDES permit;
- The facility withdraws no water from the Souhegan River, so no life stages of EFH species are vulnerable to impingement or entrainment;
- Acute toxicity tests will be conducted four times a year to ensure that the discharge does not present toxicity problems;
- Total suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand, total residual chlorine, fecal coliform, Enterococci, pH, dissolved oxygen, total cadmium, total copper, ammonia nitrogen, total phosphorus, total aluminum and total lead are regulated by the Draft Permit to meet water quality standards;
- The Draft Permit prohibits the discharge of pollutants or combination of pollutants in toxic amounts;

¹⁹ Table 31. <https://www.habitat.noaa.gov/application/efhmapper/atlanticSalmonEFH.pdf>

- The effluent limitations and conditions in the Draft Permit were developed to be protective of all aquatic life; and
- The Draft Permit prohibits violations of the state water quality standards.

EPA believes that the conditions and limitations contained within the Milford WWTP Draft Permit adequately protects all aquatic life, including EFH designated for Atlantic salmon in the receiving water. Further mitigation is not warranted. Should adverse impacts to EFH be detected as a result of this permit action, or if new information is received that changes the basis for EPA's conclusions, NOAA Fisheries Habitat Division will be contacted and an EFH consultation will be re-initiated.

At the beginning of the public comment period, EPA notified NOAA Fisheries Habitat Division that the Draft Permit and Fact Sheet were available for review and provided a link to the EPA NPDES Permit website to allow direct access to the documents.

In addition to this Fact Sheet and the Draft Permit, information to support EPA's finding was included in a letter under separate cover that will be sent to the NOAA Fisheries Habitat Division during the public comment period.

7 Public Comments, Hearing Requests and Permit Appeals

All persons, including applicants, who believe any condition of the Draft Permit is inappropriate must raise all issues and submit all available arguments and all supporting material for their arguments in full by the close of the public comment period, to:

Doug MacLean
EPA New England, Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite-100 (6-4)
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Telephone: (617) 918-1608
Email: maclean.douglas@epa.gov

Prior to the close of the public comment period, any person may submit a request in writing for a public hearing to consider the Draft Permit to EPA and the State Agency. Such requests shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. A public meeting may be held if the criteria stated in 40 C.F.R. § 124.12 are satisfied. In reaching a final decision on the Draft Permit, the EPA will respond to all significant comments and make these responses available to the public at EPA's Boston office.

Following the close of the comment period, and after any public hearings, if such hearings are held, the EPA will issue a Final Permit decision, forward a copy of the final decision to the applicant, and provide a copy or notice of availability of the final decision to each person who has submitted written comments or requested notice. Within 30 days following the notice of the Final Permit decision, any interested person may submit a petition for review of the permit to EPA's Environmental Appeals Board consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 124.19.

8 Administrative Record

The administrative record on which this Draft Permit is based may be accessed by appointment at EPA's Boston office between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays from:

Doug MacLean
EPA New England, Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite-100 (6-4)
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Telephone: (617) 918-1608
Email: maclean.douglas@epa.gov

May 2020
Date

Ken Moraff, Director
Water Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Figure 1: Location of the Milford WWTF





Figure 2: Location of the Milford WWTF Outfall



Figure 3: Milford WWTF Flow Diagram



Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Flow	Flow	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5
	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave
Units	MGD	MGD	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Effluent Limit	Report	Report	126	179	10	7	14	23
Minimum	0.69	1.01	7	14.2	0	0	0	1.8
Maximum	2.53	4.51	73	156.9	10.8	8.5	12.4	29.4
Average	1.38	1.96	28.7	47.1	3.38	2.46	4.43	6.1
No. of Violations	N/A	N/A	0	0	1	1	0	1
3/31/2014	1.63	4.51		52.7	4.5			5.4
4/30/2014	2.17	3.57		73	3.4			6.6
5/31/2014	1.62	2.23		42.9	2.9			5
6/30/2014	1.17	1.42	18.4			0	3.6	
7/31/2014	1.08	1.26	19.5			2.1	3.4	
8/31/2014	0.96	1.28	11			1.3	2.2	
9/30/2014	0.93	1.05	10.5			0	2.2	
10/31/2014	1.12	2.15	47.5			3.9	6.6	
11/30/2014	1.2	1.42		14.2	0			4.6
12/31/2014	1.97	3.1		15.9	0			2.5
1/31/2015	1.44	1.85		114.7	9.3			29.4
2/28/2015	1.17	1.25		34.3	3.5			4.2
3/31/2015	1.58	2.41		151.9	10.8			17.7
4/30/2015	2.08	2.59		156.9	8.8			14.8
5/31/2015	1.43	1.59		93	7.6			13.8
6/30/2015	1.4	1.75	44.1			3.6	8.2	
7/31/2015	1.29	1.85	18.4			0	2.6	
8/31/2015	1.02	1.26	7			0	0	
9/30/2015	1.03	1.79	22.6			2.6	3.6	
10/31/2015	1.11	1.38	21			2.2	3.4	
11/30/2015	1.14	1.25		38.1	4			5.6
12/31/2015	1.28	1.62		29.9	2.8			3.4
1/31/2016	1.36	1.85		37.2	3.4			4.4
2/29/2016	1.52	2.44		61.8	4.1			7.8
3/31/2016	1.68	2.19		34.4	2.4			4.9
4/30/2016	1.47	1.76		18	0			2.8
5/31/2016	1.23	1.4		24.7	2.3			4.8
6/30/2016	1.09	1.22	34			3.9	4.2	
7/31/2016	0.96	1.12	24.3			3	6.8	

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Flow	Flow	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5
	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave
Units	MGD	MGD	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Effluent Limit	Report	Report	126	179	10	7	14	23
8/31/2016	1	1.08	26.1			3.2	5.6	
9/30/2016	0.82	1.01	14.5			2.1	2.8	
10/31/2016	0.72	1.11	14.7			2.5	4.6	
11/30/2016	0.69	1.03		25.4	4.2			5.6
12/31/2016	0.8	1.22		43.5	5			8.1
1/31/2017	1.39	1.92		37.9	3.1			3.8
2/28/2017	1.35	2		36.5	3.4			4.6
3/31/2017	1.44	1.99		47.4	3.5			7.7
4/30/2017	2.06	3.55		54	2.5			5
5/31/2017	1.77	2.39		38.9	2.7			3
6/30/2017	1.51	2.21	24.8			0	3.5	
7/31/2017	1.08	1.21	12.6			0	2.8	
8/31/2017	0.97	1.11	26.1			3.2	3.6	
9/30/2017	1.01	1.37	73			8.5	12.4	
10/31/2017	1.17	3.03	51.9			5.5	7.9	
11/30/2017	1.61	2.11		27.3	2			4.6
12/31/2017	1.25	1.4		16.9	1.6			1.8
1/31/2018	1.47	2.14		26.4	2.2			2.8
2/28/2018	1.72	2.16		44.6	3.2			4.8
3/31/2018	1.78	2.33		31.6	2.1			3
4/30/2018	1.82	2.63		27.5	1.7			1.9
5/31/2018	1.37	1.76		17.2	1.5			2
6/30/2018	1.11	1.65	20.2			2.2	3.8	
7/31/2018	1.14	1.34	27			2.7	3	
8/31/2018	1.65	2.33	59.7			4.3	6.5	
9/30/2018	1.74	3.92	59.8			2.7	4.7	
10/31/2018	1.63	2.07	28.5			2	2.8	
11/30/2018	2.53	3.39		107.5	4.5			10.4
12/31/2018	1.91	2.93		28	1.8			2.7
1/31/2019	1.59	2.85		23.4	1.8			2.1
2/28/2019	1.47	1.67		19.9	1.6			2

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5
	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave Min
Units	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	%
Effluent Limit	251	412	287	448	16	25	85
Minimum	15.2	20.4	19.5	23.4	2.4	2	95.2
Maximum	137.4	380	225.7	454	12.4	35.1	100
Average	50	90.5	60.5	111	5.2	7.27	98.8
No. of Violations	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
3/31/2014		64.3		74.5		6.7	97.8
4/30/2014		179		223.4		7.5	97.3
5/31/2014		80.8		111.7		6	98.9
6/30/2014	33		33		3.8		100
7/31/2014	33		42.4		4.2		99.3
8/31/2014	19.2		19.5		2.4		99.7
9/30/2014	18.7		21		2.6		100
10/31/2014	96.8		148.9		8.3		98.8
11/30/2014		52.8		33		3.6	100
12/31/2014		55.8		57.9		2.8	100
1/31/2015		380		454		35.1	95.2
2/28/2015		41.2		44.8		4.4	98.7
3/31/2015		239.9		308.4		22.4	96.5
4/30/2015		276		361.8		19.1	95.7
5/31/2015		167.8		185.1		15.4	97.2
6/30/2015	107.4		108.8		8.3		98.9
7/31/2015	37.6		41.7		2.7		100
8/31/2015	15.2		30.3		3.3		100
9/30/2015	31		36.1		4.2		99.3
10/31/2015	33.8		35.7		3.7		99.3
11/30/2015		52.6		58.4		5.6	98.9
12/31/2015		38.6		48.9		4.1	99.1
1/31/2016		46		52.9		5	98.6
2/29/2016		147.2		266.7		13.1	98.2
3/31/2016		76.5		76.5		4.9	98.7
4/30/2016		37.5		44.5		3.4	100
5/31/2016		48.7		66.1		6.6	99.3
6/30/2016	35.7		64.3		7.2		99.1
7/31/2016	59		42.4		5.4		99.3

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5	CBOD5
	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave Min
Units	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	%
Effluent Limit	251	412	287	448	16	25	85
8/31/2016	44.9		44.9		5.6		99.1
9/30/2016	21		23.3		3.1		99.4
10/31/2016	26.1		29.4		5.5		99.3
11/30/2016		36.6		47.3		7	98.8
12/31/2016		70.5		86.5		9.6	98.2
1/31/2017		48.8		51.1		4.8	98.6
2/28/2017		55		59.2		4.7	98.7
3/31/2017		110.6		132.9		9.1	98.3
4/30/2017		139.2		150.9		5.6	98.6
5/31/2017		47.8		50.8		3.2	98.6
6/30/2017	47		55.1		3.8		100
7/31/2017	28.8		27.1		3		100
8/31/2017	31.8		40.7		5.3		99.2
9/30/2017	118.2		118.2		12.4		97.1
10/31/2017	64		73.6		9		98.4
11/30/2017		60.6		63.8		4.9	99.3
12/31/2017		20.4		23.4		2	99.6
1/31/2018		36.8		47.9		3.5	99.2
2/28/2018		57.6		66.1		5.5	98.8
3/31/2018		46.2		49.9		3.2	98.8
4/30/2018		39.2		48.3		2.2	99.3
5/31/2018		27.6		30.8		2.1	99.4
6/30/2018	36.2		41.4		4.2		99.3
7/31/2018	32		53.6		4.9		99.1
8/31/2018	92.9		103.2		7.2		98.3
9/30/2018	137.4		225.7		6.9		99.1
10/31/2018	48.2		51.8		3		99.2
11/30/2018		270.6		413		14.6	97.4
12/31/2018		63.2		50.7		2.5	99
1/31/2019		30		33.8		2.3	99.2
2/28/2019		23.3		25.1		2.1	99.3

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max
Units	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d
Effluent Limit	269	15	25	30	448	538	538	628
Minimum	31.3	2.7	4.4	4.4	37.3	47.6	44.9	56.1
Maximum	811	36.2	18.6	161.4	266.1	3794.6	398.3	7515.5
Average	112	8.57	9.1	21.2	100	360	124	528
No. of Violations	6	5	0	5	0	6	0	6
3/31/2014	121.6	10.6		13.1		150.2		168.2
4/30/2014	158.2	7.9		12		323.6		363.5
5/31/2014	124.2	8.4		15.2		247.8		342.4
6/30/2014	76.7	7.9	11.3		102.1		102.4	
7/31/2014	72.1	7.9	10.9		99.1		121.1	
8/31/2014	34	4.1	5		43.6		57.4	
9/30/2014	35.6	4.4	5.2		44		49.1	
10/31/2014	120.8	10.2	18.6		266.1		398.3	
11/30/2014	67.2	6.7		10.9		123.7		93.7
12/31/2014	94.4	5.5		7.1		159.8		170.6
1/31/2015	408.8	32.9		107.5		1386.4		1539.2
2/28/2015	89	9.2		12.5		122.5		126.2
3/31/2015	413.7	29		46.6		754.8		863.7
4/30/2015	282.3	16		30		546.1		548
5/31/2015	273.9	22.4		48		587.6		641.6
6/30/2015	114.3	9.4	17.9		236.8		269.3	
7/31/2015	68.3	6	8.2		107.6		129.7	
8/31/2015	38.3	4.1	5		49.4		58.7	
9/30/2015	47.6	5.4	7.8		70		75	
10/31/2015	70.2	7.4	8.6		77.4		78.5	
11/30/2015	108.9	11.2		15.2		147.8		167.9
12/31/2015	96.8	9		10		116.8		141.1
1/31/2016	102.7	9.2		10.8		134		146.2
2/29/2016	171.4	10.9		24.1		467.8		875.6
3/31/2016	103.3	7.2		10.8		168		192.5
4/30/2016	57.5	4.6		7.8		110.4		94
5/31/2016	64.7	6.2		10.4		103.9		143.2
6/30/2016	83	9.4	11		94.6		160.7	
7/31/2016	49.6	6	16.4		141		68.1	

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS	TSS
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Weekly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max
Units	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d	lb/d
Effluent Limit	269	15	25	30	448	538	538	628
8/31/2016	37.5	4.6	6.8		54.2		58.3	
9/30/2016	34.2	4.9	5.2		37.3		45.9	
10/31/2016	34.2	5.7	6.8		40.1		44.9	
11/30/2016	45.3	7.6		9.2		55.8		59
12/31/2016	95.9	11.1		18		157.7		216.3
1/31/2017	95.9	7.9		8.4		118.8		124.8
2/28/2017	100	9.2		12.4		147.4		171.4
3/31/2017	116.6	8.7		21.8		312.7		389.9
4/30/2017	113.5	5.8		8		225.8		226.4
5/31/2017	78.1	5.4		6.4		103.4		105.1
6/30/2017	64.7	4.7	5.6		100.5		132.2	
7/31/2017	35.9	4	4.6		42.2		52.3	
8/31/2017	39.9	4.9	6		53.1		54.6	
9/30/2017	114.4	14.2	17.8		131.4		181.2	
10/31/2017	121.8	11.8	17.2		223		230.9	
11/30/2017	92.8	6.9		12.2		160.4		177.6
12/31/2017	39.5	3.7		4.6		54.5		56.1
1/31/2018	58.4	4.8		7.3		97.6		123.2
2/28/2018	125	9.1		16.4		197.8		264.4
3/31/2018	61.1	4.1		6.2		95.4		87.9
4/30/2018	69.6	4.3		6.2		127.2		149.2
5/31/2018	31.3	2.7		4.4		47.6		64.6
6/30/2018	37.9	4.1	6		57.6		78.8	
7/31/2018	48.2	4.8	5		52.4		83.1	
8/31/2018	64.5	4.9	9.2		102.5		121.9	
9/30/2018	89.6	4.3	7		208.2		353.3	
10/31/2018	43.5	3	4.4		74.6		89.8	
11/30/2018	368.3	14.8		38.3		1055.9		1952
12/31/2018	61.7	4		5.4		126.8		113.6
1/31/2019	811	36.2		161.4		3794.6		7515.5
2/28/2019	35.9	3		4.4		55		56.5

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	TSS	TSS	TSS	pH	pH	E. coli	E. coli	DO
	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave Min	Minimum	Maximum	Monthly Geometric Mean	Daily Max	Minimum
Units	mg/L	mg/L	%	SU	SU	#/100mL	#/100mL	mg/L
Effluent Limit	30	35	85	6.5	8	126	406	6
Minimum	5.2	4.8	85.8	6.4	6.9	1	1	7.4
Maximum	26.8	316	99.4	7.1	7.6	180.6	2419.6	11.2
Average	10.7	28.5	97.5	6.78	7.25	11.6	272	9.17
No. of Violations	0	6	0	1	0	1	10	0
3/31/2014		15	96.5	6.6	7.1	10.4	2419.6	8.6
4/30/2014		12.2	96.6	6.6	7.2	1.9	13.5	10.8
5/31/2014		18.4	97.8	6.8	7.4	2.3	10.9	10.2
6/30/2014	11.8		98.3	6.9	7.4	1.1	2	9.1
7/31/2014	12.4		98.4	6.9	7.5	1	1	8.6
8/31/2014	6.2		99.3	7.1	7.4	1.2	3.1	8.3
9/30/2014	5.6		99.3	7.1	7.4	3.1	66.3	7.5
10/31/2014	22.2		98	6.9	7.3	5	648.8	8.4
11/30/2014		9.2	98.8	6.9	7.2	15.5	547.5	9.5
12/31/2014		7.2	97.5	6.8	7.2	3.4	42.6	9.7
1/31/2015		119	85.8	6.9	7.4	66.7	410.6	10.8
2/28/2015		12.6	97.1	6.8	7.2	47	579.4	11.1
3/31/2015		47.2	93	6.4	7.13	180.6	2419.6	11.2
4/30/2015		28.8	93.4	6.7	7.2	12.4	66.3	10.6
5/31/2015		51.6	94.9	6.6	7.3	14.9	727	9
6/30/2015	19.8		97.8	6.9	7.5	3.9	78.9	9.1
7/31/2015	9.2		98.4	6.9	7.4	2	29.2	8.8
8/31/2015	6.4		99.4	7.1	7.4	1.1	3.1	8.3
9/30/2015	8.4		99	6.9	7.3	1.3	4.1	8.1
10/31/2015	8.8		98.1	6.8	7.2	1.7	12	8.4
11/30/2015		16.1	97.6	6.7	7	1.5	7.5	9
12/31/2015		11.2	98	6.9	7.5	1.4	5.2	9.7
1/31/2016		11.6	96.9	6.7	7.2	3	16.1	10.1
2/29/2016		43	96.8	6.7	7.2	2.3	10.9	8.9
3/31/2016		12.4	97.8	6.5	7.2	2.3	6.3	10.4
4/30/2016		7.2	98.6	6.8	7.5	3.3	2419.6	10
5/31/2016		14.3	98.7	6.8	7.3	1.7	80.5	9.2
6/30/2016	18		98.4	6.9	7.2	1.2	3.1	8.1
7/31/2016	8		98.9	7	7.4	1.4	5.2	7.9

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	TSS	TSS	TSS	pH	pH	E. coli	E. coli	DO
	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave Min	Minimum	Maximum	Monthly Geometric Mean	Daily Max	Minimum
Units	mg/L	mg/L	%	SU	SU	#/100mL	#/100mL	mg/L
Effluent Limit	30	35	85	6.5	8	126	406	6
8/31/2016	7.6		99.1	6.8	7.5	2.3	12	7.6
9/30/2016	6.8		99	6.9	7.5	1.1	5.2	7.6
10/31/2016	8.4		98.9	7	7.3	2.9	56.3	8.2
11/30/2016		10.4	98.2	6.8	7.2	9	290.9	8.8
12/31/2016		24	97.2	6.8	7.3	72.8	209.8	9.5
1/31/2017		9.2	97.1	6.5	7.4	29.2	111.9	9.8
2/28/2017		13.6	97	6.7	7.2	18.3	68.3	10.2
3/31/2017		26.7	96.8	6.8	7.1	12.7	37.3	10.4
4/30/2017		8.4	97.9	6.6	7.2	6.6	32.3	9.5
5/31/2017		6.8	98.1	6.7	7.1	6.1	17.3	9.2
6/30/2017	7.2		98.9	6.6	7.3	7	224.7	9
7/31/2017	5.4		98.9	6.9	7.2	4.7	77.6	8.5
8/31/2017	6.4		99	6.9	7.3	16.7	307.6	8.1
9/30/2017	26.8		95.7	7	7.6	21.8	866.4	7.4
10/31/2017	20.5		97	6.6	7.6	7.4	67	7.4
11/30/2017		13.3	98.2	6.6	7.1	15.7	201.4	8.7
12/31/2017		4.8	99.3	6.6	6.9	5.4	21.6	9.3
1/31/2018		9	98.5	6.7	7	8.3	159.7	10
2/28/2018		22	96.7	6.6	6.9	2.8	13.4	10.2
3/31/2018		5.6	98.3	6.7	6.9	4	28.8	10.5
4/30/2018		6.8	98.8	6.6	7	4.1	21.1	10.4
5/31/2018		4.8	99.3	6.6	7.1	2.6	58.1	9.9
6/30/2018	8		99.1	6.8	7.2	7.1	125.9	9.2
7/31/2018	7.6		98.6	6.7	7.3	8.8	51.2	9
8/31/2018	10.9		98.4	6.8	7.3	5.6	35	7.7
9/30/2018	10.8		98.8	6.8	7.3	3	73.3	8.5
10/31/2018	5.2		99.1	7	7.3	4.5	2419.6	9.1
11/30/2018		69	93.5	6.7	7.2	2.2	13.5	7.9
12/31/2018		5.6	98.7	6.8	7	1.1	2	9.2
1/31/2019		316	86.7	6.6	7.2	4.3	70.6	10
2/28/2019		4.8	98.9	6.8	7	2.7	29.8	10.2

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Cadmium	Cadmium
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Daily Max
Units	mg/L	mg/L	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	ug/L	ug/L
Effluent Limit	19.4	7.3	179	Report	10	Report	3	3.4
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	6.2	27.6	277.8	187.2	32.7	9.2	0	0
Average	0.846	1.98	43.3	44.5	4.63	2.53	0	0
No. of Violations	0	2	2	N/A	4	N/A	0	0
3/31/2014	1			163.6		5	0	0
4/30/2014	0.6			134.4		4.5	0	0
5/31/2014	0.1			7.2		0.6	0	0
6/30/2014		0.2	4.8		0.5		0	0
7/31/2014		0.1	1.8		0.2		0	0
8/31/2014		0.7	16.1		2		0	0
9/30/2014		0.2	9.6		1.2		0	0
10/31/2014		0.2	7.3		0.9		0	0
11/30/2014	0			6.1		0.6	0	0
12/31/2014	0.5			31		1.5	0	0
1/31/2015	2.3			74.2		5.8	0	0
2/28/2015	0.4			9.88		1	0	0
3/31/2015	0			3.7		0.3	0	0
4/30/2015	6.2			187.2		8.7	0	0
5/31/2015	2.6			108.7		9.2	0	0
6/30/2015		0	1.9		0.1		0	0
7/31/2015		0	0		0		0	0
8/31/2015		0	1.16		0.1		0	0
9/30/2015		0	2.4		0.3		0	0
10/31/2015		0	1.29		0.14		0	0
11/30/2015	0.4			12.6		1.3	0	0
12/31/2015	0			4.6		0.34	0	0
1/31/2016	1			37		2.4	0	0
2/29/2016	1.4			61.1		3.2	0	0
3/31/2016	0.7			27		1.9	0	0
4/30/2016	0.6			16.4		1.3	0	0
5/31/2016	0.9			63		5.4	0	0
6/30/2016		2.1	88.4		10.7		0	0
7/31/2016		1.8	112.9		13.8		0	0

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Ammonia	Cadmium	Cadmium
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Daily Max
Units	mg/L	mg/L	lb/d	lb/d	mg/L	mg/L	ug/L	ug/L
Effluent Limit	19.4	7.3	179	Report	10	Report	3	3.4
8/31/2016		1.1	59.6		7.2		0	0
9/30/2016		0	1.35		0.2		0	0
10/31/2016		0	0.65		0.1		0	0
11/30/2016	0			0		0	0	0
12/31/2016	1.3			31.81		3.5	0	0
1/31/2017	1.9			80.7		5.7	0	0
2/28/2017	0.4			15.8		1.1	0	0
3/31/2017	0.6			27.2		1.7	0	0
4/30/2017	1.1			96.9		3.3	0	0
5/31/2017	0.3			26.6		2	0	0
6/30/2017		0.4	44.4		2.4		0	0
7/31/2017		0	0		0		0	0
8/31/2017		0.5	29		3.5		0	0
9/30/2017		27.6	277.8		32		0	0
10/31/2017		13.4	251		32.7		0	0
11/30/2017	0.2			18.1		1.4	0	0
12/31/2017	0			4.4		0.4	0	0
1/31/2018	0.9			39		3	0	0
2/28/2018	0.6			9.6		1.4	0	0
3/31/2018	0.1			3.9		0.3	0	0
4/30/2018	0			1.36		0.1	0	0
5/31/2018	0			8		0.6	0	0
6/30/2018		0.2	8.7		0.9		0	0
7/31/2018		0.5	28.7		2.6		0	0
8/31/2018		0	4.4		0.2		0	0
9/30/2018		0.6	126.6		3.9		0	0
10/31/2018		0	1.7		0.1		0	0
11/30/2018	1.4			105.9		3.8	0	0
12/31/2018	0.2			13.6		1	0	0
1/31/2019	1.1			108.2		4.6	0	0
2/28/2019	0.8			19.8		1.6	0	0

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Copper	Copper	Copper	Copper	Lead	Lead
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Daily Max
Units	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L
Effluent Limit	10.1	20	13.5	20	5	51
Minimum	2.8	3.8	4	4.4	0	0
Maximum	18.1	29.2	22.8	45.1	0	0
Average	8.17	10.8	9.22	12.6	0	0
No. of Violations	9	1	4	1	0	0
3/31/2014		14.4		15.1	0	0
4/30/2014		11.2		11.6	0	0
5/31/2014		9.5		10.4	0	0
6/30/2014		11.1		11.6	0	0
7/31/2014		11.3		14	0	0
8/31/2014		9.8		10.2	0	0
9/30/2014		7.4		9.2	0	0
10/31/2014		12.3		15.4	0	0
11/30/2014		6.3		7.4	0	0
12/31/2014		6.6		6.8	0	0
1/31/2015		29.2		45.1	0	0
2/28/2015		10.9		14.6	0	0
3/31/2015		14.6		17.3	0	0
4/30/2015		16.3		17.4	0	0
5/31/2015		10.1		10.8	0	0
6/30/2015		8.5		8.8	0	0
7/31/2015		7.6		8.8	0	0
8/31/2015		3.8		4.4	0	0
9/30/2015		8.1		9	0	0
10/31/2015		9.3		10	0	0
11/30/2015		10.6		10.6	0	0
12/31/2015		9		9.5	0	0
1/31/2016		10.8		11	0	0
2/29/2016	8.6		9		0	0
3/31/2016	4.4		4.6		0	0
4/30/2016	11.7		12.2		0	0
5/31/2016	9.6		9.6		0	0
6/30/2016	12.1		14.2		0	0
7/31/2016	10.2		10.2		0	0

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Copper	Copper	Copper	Copper	Lead	Lead
	Monthly Ave	Monthly Ave	Daily Max	Daily Max	Monthly Ave	Daily Max
Units	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L
Effluent Limit	10.1	20	13.5	20	5	51
8/31/2016	8.5		9.1		0	0
9/30/2016	8.1		9		0	0
10/31/2016	2.8		5.6		0	0
11/30/2016	11.2		12		0	0
12/31/2016	8.7		9		0	0
1/31/2017	6.7		6.8		0	0
2/28/2017	6.8		7.1		0	0
3/31/2017	4.8		5.3		0	0
4/30/2017	4		4		0	0
5/31/2017	5.6		6		0	0
6/30/2017	3.8		4		0	0
7/31/2017	8.9		9.2		0	0
8/31/2017	10		11.4		0	0
9/30/2017	14.7		17.8		0	0
10/31/2017	7		8.9		0	0
11/30/2017	13.8		17.6		0	0
12/31/2017	7.6		7.9		0	0
1/31/2018	9.5		9.6		0	0
2/28/2018	18.1		22.8		0	0
3/31/2018	8.2		8.6		0	0
4/30/2018	8.3		10		0	0
5/31/2018	10.7		12.2		0	0
6/30/2018	8.9		9.2		0	0
7/31/2018	12.6		13		0	0
8/31/2018	7.3		7.6		0	0
9/30/2018	6.4		7		0	0
10/31/2018	3.9		7.2		0	0
11/30/2018	3.6		7.2		0	0
12/31/2018	4.5		4.8		0	0
1/31/2019	4.8		5.2		0	0
2/28/2019	5.8		6.2		0	0

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	LC50 Acute Ceriodaphnia	C-NOEC Chronic Ceriodaphnia	LC50 Static 48Hr Acute Pimephales	Noel Statre 7Day Chronic Pimephales	Hardness	pH	TRC
	Daily Min	Daily Min	Daily Min	Daily Min	Daily Max	Quarterly	Quarterly
Units	%	%	%	%	mg/L	SU	mg/L
Effluent Limit	100	28	100	28	Report	N/A	N/A
Minimum	100	6.25	100	100	120	7.1	Non-Detect
Maximum	100	100	100	100	200	7.7	Non-Detect
Average	100	85.3	100	100	153	7.3	Non-Detect
No. of Violations	0	1	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
3/31/2014	100	100	100	100	150	7.09	<.02
6/30/2014	100	100	100	100	140	7.36	<.02
9/30/2014	100	100	100	100	120	7.41	<.02
12/31/2014	100	6.25	100	100	140	7.42	<.02
3/31/2015	100	100	100	100	150	7.32	<.02
6/30/2015	100	50	100	100	150	7.29	<.02
9/30/2015	100	100	100	100	170	7.65	<.02
12/31/2015	100	100	100	100	180	7.4	<.02
3/31/2016	100	50	100	100	160	7.19	<.02
6/30/2016	100	100	100	100	200	7.28	<.02
9/30/2016	100	100	100	100	120	7.46	<.02
12/31/2016	100	100	100	100	120	7.29	<.02
3/31/2017	100	100	100	100	190	7.33	<.02
6/30/2017	100	100	100	100	140	7.13	<.02
9/30/2017	100	100	100	100	140	7.67	<.02
12/31/2017	100	100	100	100	160	7.29	<.02
3/31/2018	100	100	100	100	150	7.19	<.02
6/30/2018	100	100	100	100	190	7.12	<.02
9/30/2018	100	50	100	100	150	7.56	0
12/31/2018	100	50	100	100	130	7.39	<.02

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Alkalinity	Total Solids	Dissolved Solids	Ammonia	Aluminum	Cadmium	Calcium	Chromium
	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Units	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Effluent Limit	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum	80	180	300	Non-Detect	0.1	Non-Detect	12.0	Non-Detect
Maximum	240	530	520	0.71	0.5	0.0001	18.4	Non-Detect
Average	115	445	425	Non-Detect	0.3	Non-Detect	14.6	Non-Detect
No. of Violations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3/31/2014	87	500	440	0.53	0.27	<.0005	17	-
6/30/2014	150	410	380	0.2	0.23	<.0005	13	-
9/30/2014	120	410	380	0.17	0.25	<.0005	12	-
12/31/2014	130	510	300	<.1	0.31	<.0005	17	-
3/31/2015	130	500	402	0.43	0.24	<.0005	14	-
6/30/2015	110	390	380	0.34	0.39	<.0005	14	<.002
9/30/2015	240	470	470	<.1	0.24	<.0005	15	<.002
12/31/2015	99	440	390	<.1	0.31	<.0005	15	<.002
3/31/2016	100	440	390	0.71	0.35	<.0005	14	<.002
6/30/2016	120	440	520	<.1	0.26	<.0005	14	<.002
9/30/2016	110	440	400	0.17	0.30	<.0005	15.1	<.002
12/31/2016	97	450	450	<.1	0.5	<.0001	15.9	<.001
3/31/2017	130	480	500	0.18	0.45	0.0001	15.8	<.001
6/30/2017	80	460	460	<.01	0.5	<.0001	15	<.001
9/30/2017	150	430	440	<.1	0.45	<.0003	13.1	<.001
12/31/2017	97	500	440	<.1	0.28	<.0001	13.7	<.001
3/31/2018	91	400	410	0.28	0.23	<.0003	18.4	<.001
6/30/2018	99	530	510	<.1	0.4	<.0003	14.2	<.001
9/30/2018	130	450	500	<.1	0.14	<.0001	15.4	<.001
12/31/2018	120	180	390	<.1	0.15	<.0003	13.9	<.001

Monitoring Location - Outfall 001

Parameter	Copper	Lead	Magnesium	Nickel	Zinc
	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Units	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Effluent Limit	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum	Non-Detect	Non-Detect	0.9	Non-Detect	0.061
Maximum	0.010	0.0005	34.0	0.0036	0.200
Average	0.008	Non-Detect	23.0	0.002	0.100
No. of Violations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3/31/2014	0.01	<.0005	21	<.002	0.091
6/30/2014	0.008	<.0005	24	0.002	0.061
9/30/2014	0.005	<.0005	16	0.002	0.072
12/31/2014	0.007	<.0005	21	0.002	0.13
3/31/2015	0.01	<.0005	20	0.002	0.13
6/30/2015	<.002	<.0005	0.85	<.002	0.084
9/30/2015	0.003	<.0005	30	0.002	0.087
12/31/2015	0.01	<.0005	32	<.002	0.077
3/31/2016	0.008	<.0005	23	<.002	0.098
6/30/2016	0.009	<.0005	34	0.002	0.11
9/30/2016	0.0097	<.0005	18.7	0.003	0.10
12/31/2016	0.0098	0.0005	16.8	0.0029	0.2
3/31/2017	0.0067	0.0003	29.7	0.0024	0.11
6/30/2017	0.0054	0.0002	21.7	0.0021	0.11
9/30/2017	0.0097	0.0004	25.6	0.0027	0.1
12/31/2017	0.0063	<.0002	28.9	0.0019	0.11
3/31/2018	0.0072	<.0003	22.9	0.0021	0.1
6/30/2018	0.01	<.0003	27.6	0.0036	0.086
9/30/2018	0.0065	0.0002	23.9	0.0016	0.072
12/31/2018	0.0041	<.0003	18.6	0.0017	0.1

Monitoring Location - Receiving Water (WET Ambient)

Parameter	pH	Alkalinity	Hardness	Ammonia	Aluminum	Cadmium	Calcium	Chromium
	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Units	SU	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Limit	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient
Minimum	6.6	4.1	12.0	Non-Detect	0.0	Non-Detect	3.5	Non-Detect
Maximum	7.6	19.0	32.0	0.13	0.4	Non-Detect	6.8	Non-Detect
Median	7.0	9.4	16.0	Non-Detect	0.1	Non-Detect	4.6	Non-Detect
Mar-14	6.69	5.2	16	0.13	0.077	<.0005	4.6	-
May-14	7.27	4.1	12	<.1	0.11	<.0005	3.6	-
Sep-14	6.93	14	20	<.1	0.047	<.0005	6	-
Nov-14	6.72	19	32	<.1	0.082	<.0005	4.6	-
Feb-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
May-15	6.77	7.7	15	<.1	0.065	<.0005	4.1	<.002
Aug-15	6.95	14	24	<.1	0.033	<.0005	6.8	<.002
Nov-15	6.86	10	16	<.1	0.094	<.0005	4.6	<.002
Feb-16	6.90	10	13	<.1	0.013	<.0005	3.9	<.002
May-16	7.12	10	18	<.1	0.053	<.0005	5.1	<.002
Sep-16	7.19	8.8	19	<.1	0.41	<.0005	6.14	<.002
Nov-16	7.55	9.4	21	<.1	0.074	<.0001	5.41	<.001
Feb-17	7.07	6.4	17	<.1	0.077	<.0001	4.97	<.001
May-17	7.13	5.2	12	<.1	0.13	<.0001	3.54	<.001
Aug-17	7.07	14	22	<.1	0.044	<.0001	6.63	<.001
Nov-17	6.85	7.4	15	<.1	0.093	<.0001	4.22	<.001
Mar-18	7.01	6.9	15	<.1	0.073	<.0003	4.14	<.001
May-18	7.39	9.5	15	<.1	0.074	<.0003	4.38	<.001
Aug-18	6.87	11	16	<.1	0.099	<.0001	4.76	<.001
Oct-18	6.64	9.4	15	<.1	0.093	<.0001	4.46	<.001

Monitoring Location - Receiving Water (WET Ambient)

Parameter	Copper	Lead	Magnesium	Nickel	Zinc
	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Units	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
Limit	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient	Ambient
Minimum	Non-Detect	Non-Detect	0.8	Non-Detect	0.0030
Maximum	0.00410	0.0053	1.3	Non-Detect	0.0190
Median	0.00100	Non-Detect	1.0	Non-Detect	0.0100
Mar-14	<.002	<.0005	1	<.002	0.01
May-14	0.004	<.0005	0.76	<.002	0.01
Sep-14	<.002	0.0006	1.2	<.002	0.005
Nov-14	<.002	<.0005	1	<.002	0.011
Feb-15	-	-	-	-	-
May-15	<.002	<.0005	0.85	<.002	0.01
Aug-15	0.001	<.0005	1.3	<.002	0.011
Nov-15	<.002	<.0005	1	<.002	0.012
Feb-16	<.002	<.0005	0.86	<.002	0.003
May-16	<.002	<.0005	1.1	<.002	0.004
Sep-16	0.0041	0.0053	1.16	<.002	0.019
Nov-16	0.0009	0.0004	1.28	<.001	0.0074
Feb-17	0.0009	<.0002	1.04	<.001	0.015
May-17	0.0012	0.0003	0.75	<.001	0.011
Aug-17	0.0011	0.0005	1.3	<.001	0.0085
Nov-17	0.001	0.0003	0.98	<.001	0.012
Mar-18	0.001	<.0003	0.92	<.001	0.011
May-18	0.0024	0.0005	0.92	<.001	0.017
Aug-18	0.0013	0.0005	0.97	<.001	0.0094
Oct-18	0.0011	0.0003	0.98	<.001	0.01

APPENDIX B -
METALS REASONABLE POTENTIAL AND LIMITS

Metal	Q _e	C _e ¹		Q _s	C _s ²	Q _d	C _d		Criteria * 0.9		Acute Reasonable Potential	Chronic Reasonable Potential	Limits	
	cfs	Acute (µg/l)	Chronic (µg/l)	cfs	µg/l	cfs	Acute (µg/l)	Chronic (µg/l)	Acute (µg/l)	Chronic (µg/l)	C _e & C _d > Criteria	C _e & C _d > Criteria	Acute (µg/l)	Chronic (µg/l)
Aluminum	3.33	529.1	529.1	6.42	77.0	9.75	231.30	231.3	675	78.3	N	Y	N/A	87.0
Cadmium		3.4	3.0		0.0		1.16	1.02	1.07	0.48	N/A	N/A	3.1	1.4
Copper		13.5	10.1		1.0		5.27	4.11	8.00	5.56	N/A	N/A	16.2	14.4
Lead		51.0	2.0		0.0		17.40	0.68	39.76	1.55	N/A	N/A	51.0	2.0
Nickel		6.2	6.2		0.0		2.11	2.11	280.76	31.22	N	N	N/A	N/A
Zinc		149.3	149.3		10.0		57.52	57.5	71.66	71.66	N	N	N/A	N/A

¹Values represent the 95th percentile (for n ≥ 10) or maximum (for n < 10) concentrations from the DMR data and/or WET testing data during the review period (see Appendix A). If the metal already has a limit (for either acute or chronic conditions), the value represents the existing limit.

²Median concentration for the receiving water just upstream of the facility's discharge taken from the WET testing data during the review period (see Appendix A).

Appendix C

EPA REGION 1 NPDES PERMITTING APPROACH FOR PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS THAT INCLUDE MUNICIPAL SATELLITE SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS

This regional interpretative statement provides notice to the public of EPA Region 1's interpretation of the Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") and implementing regulations, and advises the public of relevant policy considerations, regarding the applicability of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") program to publicly owned treatment works ("POTWs") that include municipal satellite sewage collection systems ("regionally integrated POTWs"). When issuing NPDES permits to these types of sanitary sewer systems, it is EPA Region 1's practice to include and regulate the owners/operators of the municipal satellite collection systems through a co-permitting structure. This interpretative statement is intended to explain, generally, the basis for this practice. EPA Region 1's decision in any particular case will be made by applying the law and regulations on the basis of specific facts when permits are issued.

EPA has set out a national policy goal for the nation's sanitary sewer systems to adhere to strict design and operational standards:

"Proper [operation and maintenance] of the nation's sewers is integral to ensuring that wastewater is collected, transported, and treated at POTWs; and to reducing the volume and frequency of ...[sanitary sewer overflow] discharges. Municipal owners and operators of sewer systems and wastewater treatment facilities need to manage their assets effectively and implement new controls, where necessary, as this infrastructure continues to age. Innovative responses from all levels of government and consumers are needed to close the gap."¹

Because ownership/operation of a regionally integrated POTW is divided among multiple parties, the owner/operator of the treatment plant many times lacks the means to implement comprehensive, system-wide operation and maintenance ("O & M") procedures. Failure to properly implement O & M measures in a POTW can cause, among other things, excessive extraneous flow (*i.e.*, inflow and infiltration) to enter, strain and occasionally overload treatment system capacity. This failure not only impedes EPA's national policy goal concerning preservation of the nation's wastewater infrastructure assets, but also frustrates achievement of the water quality- and technology-based requirements of CWA § 301 to the extent it results in sanitary sewer overflows and degraded treatment plant performance, with adverse impacts on human health and the environment.

In light of these policy objectives and legal requirements, it is EPA Region 1's permitting practice to subject all portions of the POTW to NPDES requirements in order to ensure that the treatment system as a whole is properly operated and maintained and that human health and water quality impacts resulting from excessive extraneous flow are minimized. The approach of addressing O&M concerns in a regionally integrated treatment works by adding municipal

¹ See *Report to Congress: Impacts and Control of CSOs and SSOs* (EPA 833-R-04-001) (2004), at p. 10-2. See also "1989 National CSO Control Strategy," 54 Fed. Reg. 37371 (September 8, 1989).

satellite collection systems as co-permittees is consistent with the definition of “publicly owned treatment works,” which by definition includes sewage collection systems. Under this approach, the POTW in its entirety is subject to NPDES regulation as a point source discharger under the Act. This entails imposition of permitting requirements applicable to the POTW treatment plant along with a more limited set of conditions applicable to the connected municipal satellite collection systems.

The factual and legal basis for the Region’s position is set forth in greater detail in *Attachment A*.

Attachment A

ANALYSIS SUPPORTING EPA REGION 1 NPDES PERMITTING APPROACH FOR PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS THAT INCLUDE MUNICIPAL SATELLITE SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS

- Exhibit A* List of regional centralized POTW treatment plants and municipal satellite collection systems subject to the co-permittee policy
- Exhibit B* Analysis of extraneous flow trends for representative systems
- Exhibit C* List of municipal satellite collection systems that have had SSOs
- Exhibit D* Form of Regional Administrator's waiver of permit application requirements for municipal satellite collection systems

Introduction

On May 28, 2010, the U.S. EPA Environmental Appeals Board ("Board") issued a decision remanding to the Region certain NPDES permit provisions that included and regulated satellite collection systems as co-permittees. *See In re Upper Blackstone Water Pollution Abatement District*, NPDES Appeal Nos. 08-11 to 08-18 & 09-06, 14 E.A.D. __ (Order Denying Review in Part and Remanding in Part, EAB, May 28, 2010).² While the Board "did not pass judgment" on the Region's position that its NPDES jurisdiction encompassed the entire POTW and not only the treatment plant, it held that "where the Region has abandoned its historical practice of limiting the permit only to the legal entity owning and operating the wastewater treatment plant, the Region had not sufficiently articulated in the record of this proceeding the statutory, regulatory, and factual bases for expanding the scope of NPDES authority beyond the treatment plant owner/operator to separately owned/operated collection systems that do not discharge directly to waters of the United States, but instead that discharge to the treatment plant." *Id.*, slip op. at 2, 18. In the event the Region decided to include and regulate municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees in a future permit, the Board posed several questions for the Region to address in the analysis supporting its decision:

- (1) Is the scope of NPDES authority limited to owners/operators of the treatment plant, or does the authority extend to owners/operators of the municipal satellite collection systems that comprise the wider POTW?

² The decision is available on the Board's website via the following link:
http://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/EAB_Web_Docket.nsf/30b93f139d3788908525706c005185b4/34e841c87f346d94852577360068976f!OpenDocument.

- (2) If the latter, how far up the collection system does NPDES jurisdiction reach, *i.e.*, where does the “collection system” end and the “user” begin?
- (3) Do municipal satellite collection systems “discharge [] a pollutant” within the meaning of the statute and regulations?
- (4) Are municipal satellite collection systems “indirect dischargers” and thus excluded from NPDES permitting requirements?
- (5) Is the Region’s rationale for regulating municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees consistent with the references to “municipality” in the regulatory definition of POTW, and the definition’s statement that “[t]he term also means the municipality...which has jurisdiction over the Indirect Discharges to and the discharges from such a treatment works”?
- (6) Is the Region’s rationale consistent with the permit application and signatory requirements under NPDES regulations?

See *Blackstone, slip op.* at 18, 20, n. 17.

This regional interpretative statement is, in part, a response to the Board’s decision. It details the legal and policy bases for regulating as co-permittees publicly owned treatment works (“POTWs”) that include municipal satellite collection systems. Region 1’s analysis is divided into five sections. First, the Region provides context for the co-permitting approach by briefly describing the health and environmental impacts associated with poorly maintained sanitary sewer systems. Second, the Region outlines its evolving permitting practice regarding regionally integrated POTWs, particularly its attempts to ensure that such entity’s municipal satellite collection systems are properly maintained and operated. Third, the Region explains the legal authority to include municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees when permitting regionally integrated POTWs. In this section, the Region answers the questions posed by the Board in the order presented above. Fourth, the Region sets forth the basis for the specific conditions to which the municipal satellite collection systems are subject as co-permittees. Finally, the Region discusses other considerations informing its decision to employ a co-permittee structure when permitting regionally integrated POTWs.

I. Background

A sanitary sewer system (SSS) is a wastewater collection system owned by a state or municipality that is designed to collect and convey only sanitary wastewater (domestic sewage from homes as well as industrial and commercial wastewater).³ The purpose of these systems is

³ A combined sewer, on the other hand, is a type of sewer system that collects and conveys sanitary sewage and stormwater runoff in a single-pipe system to a POTW treatment plant. See *generally* Report to Congress: Impacts and Control of CSOs and SSOs (EPA 833-R-04-001) (2004), from which EPA Region 1 has drawn this background material.

to transport wastewater uninterrupted from its source to a treatment facility. Developed areas that are served by sanitary sewers often also have a separate storm sewer system (*e.g.*, storm drains) that collects and conveys runoff, street wash waters and drainage and discharges them directly to a receiving water (*i.e.*, without treatment at a POTW). While sanitary sewers are not designed to collect large amounts of runoff from precipitation events or provide widespread drainage, they typically are built with some allowance for higher flows that occur during periods of high groundwater and storm events. They are thus able to handle minor and controllable amounts of extraneous flow (*i.e.*, inflow and infiltration, or I/I) that enter the system. Inflow generally refers to water other than wastewater—typically precipitation like rain or snowmelt—that enters a sewer system through a direct connection to the sewer. Infiltration generally refers to other water that enters a sewer system from the ground, for example through defects in the sewer.

Municipal sanitary sewer collection systems can consist of a widespread network of pipes and associated components (*e.g.*, pump stations). These systems provide wastewater collection service to the community in which they are located. In some situations, the municipality that owns the collector sewers may not provide treatment of wastewater, but only conveys its wastewater to a collection system that is owned and operated by a different municipal entity (such as a regional sewer district). This is known as a satellite community. A “satellite” community is a sewage collection system owner/operator that does not have ownership of the treatment facility and a specific or identified point of discharge but rather the responsibility to collect and convey the community’s wastewater to a POTW treatment plant for treatment. *See* 75 Fed. Reg. 30395, 30400 (June 1, 2010).

Municipal sanitary sewer collection systems play a critical role in protecting human health and the environment. Proper operation and maintenance of sanitary sewer collection systems is integral to ensuring that wastewater is collected, transported, and treated at POTW treatment plants. Through effective operation and maintenance, collection system operators can maintain the capacity of the collection system; reduce the occurrence of temporary problem situations such as blockages; protect the structural integrity and capacity of the system; anticipate potential problems and take preventive measures; and indirectly improve treatment plant performance by minimizing deterioration due to I/I-related hydraulic overloading.

Despite their critical role in the nation’s infrastructure, many collection systems exhibit poor performance and are subjected to flows that exceed system capacity. Untreated or partially treated overflows from a sanitary sewer system are termed “sanitary sewer overflows” (SSOs). SSOs include releases from sanitary sewers that reach waters of the United States as well as those that back up into buildings and flow out of manholes into city streets.

There are many underlying reasons for the poor performance of collection systems. Much of the nation’s sanitary sewer infrastructure is old, and aging infrastructure has deteriorated with time. Communities also sometimes fail to provide capacity to accommodate increased sewage delivery and treatment demand from increasing populations. Furthermore, institutional arrangements relating to the operation of sewers can pose barriers to coordinated action, because many

municipal sanitary sewer collection systems are not entirely owned or operated by a single municipal entity.

The performance and efficiency of municipal collection systems influence the performance of sewage treatment plants. When the structural integrity of a sanitary sewer collection system deteriorates, large quantities of infiltration (including rainfall-induced infiltration) and inflow can enter the collection system, causing it to overflow. These extraneous flows are among the most serious and widespread operational challenges confronting treatment works.⁴

Infiltration can be long-term seepage of water into a sewer system from the water table. In some systems, however, the flow characteristics of infiltration can resemble those of inflow, *i.e.*, there is a rapid increase in flow during and immediately after a rainfall event, due, for example, to rapidly rising groundwater. This phenomenon is sometimes referred to as rainfall-induced infiltration.

Sanitary sewer systems can also overflow during periods of normal dry weather flows. Many sewer system failures are attributable to natural aging processes or poor operation and maintenance. Examples include years of wear and tear on system equipment such as pumps, lift stations, check valves, and other moveable parts that can lead to mechanical or electrical failure; freeze/thaw cycles, groundwater flow, and subsurface seismic activity that can result in pipe movement, warping, brittleness, misalignment, and breakage; and deterioration of pipes and joints due to root intrusion or other blockages.

Inflow and infiltration impacts are often regional in nature. Satellite collection systems in the communities farthest from the POTW treatment plant can cause sanitary sewer overflows (“SSOs”) in communities between them and the treatment plant by using up capacity in the interceptors. This can cause SSOs in the interceptors themselves or in the municipal sanitary sewers that lead to them. The implication of this is that corrective solutions often must also be regional in scope to be effective.

The health and environmental risks attributed to SSOs vary depending on a number of factors including location and season (potential for public exposure), frequency, volume, the amount and type of pollutants present in the discharge, and the uses, conditions, and characteristics of the receiving waters. The most immediate health risks associated with SSOs to waters and other areas with a potential for human contact are associated with exposure to bacteria, viruses, and other pathogens.

Human health impacts occur when people become ill due to contact with water or ingestion of water or shellfish that have been contaminated by SSO discharges. In addition, sanitary sewer systems can back up into buildings, including private residences. These discharges provide a

⁴ In a 1989 Water Pollution Control Federation survey, 1,003 POTWs identified facility performance problems. Infiltration and inflow was the most frequently cited problem, with 85 percent of the facilities reporting I/I as a problem. I/I was cited as a major problem by 41 percent of the facilities (32 percent as a periodic problem). [BP: Is there anything more recent?]

direct pathway for human contact with untreated wastewater. Exposure to land-based SSOs typically occurs through the skin via direct contact. The resulting diseases are often similar to those associated with exposure through drinking water and swimming (*e.g.*, gastroenteritis), but may also include illness caused by inhaling microbial pathogens. In addition to pathogens, raw sewage may contain metals, synthetic chemicals, nutrients, pesticides, and oils, which also can be detrimental to the health of humans and wildlife.

II. EPA Region 1 Past Practice of Permitting POTWs that Include Municipal Satellite Collection Systems

EPA Region 1's practice in permitting regionally integrated POTWs has developed in tandem with its increasing focus on addressing I/I in sewer collection systems, in response to the concerns outlined above. Up to the early 1990s, POTW permits issued by Region 1 generally did not include specific requirements for collection systems. When I/I and the related issue of SSOs became a focus of concern both nationally and within the region in the mid-1990s, Region 1 began adding general requirements to POTW permits that required the permittees to "eliminate excessive infiltration and inflow" and provide an annual "summary report" of activities to reduce I/I. As the Region gathered more information and gained more experience in assessing these reports and activities, it began to include more detailed requirements and reporting provisions in these permits.

MassDEP also engaged in a parallel effort to address I/I, culminating in 2001 with the issuance of MassDEP Policy No. BRP01-1, "Interim Infiltration and Inflow Policy." Among other provisions, this policy established a set of standard NPDES permit conditions for POTWs that included development of an I/I control plan (including funding sources, identification and prioritization of problem areas, and public education programs) and detailed annual reporting requirements (including mapping, reporting of expenditures and I/I flow calculations). Since September 2001, these requirements have been the basis for the standard operation and maintenance conditions related to I/I.

Regional treatment plants presented special issues as I/I requirements became more specific, as it is generally the member communities, rather than the regional sewer district, that own the collection systems that are the primary source of I/I. Before the focus on I/I, POTW permits did not contain specific requirements related to the collection system component of POTWs. Therefore, when issuing NPDES permits to authorize discharges from regionally integrated treatment POTWs, EPA Region 1 had generally only included the legal entity owning and/or operating the regionally centralized wastewater treatment plant. As the permit conditions were focused on the treatment plant itself, this was sufficient to ensure that EPA had authority to enforce the permit requirements.

In implementing the I/I conditions, Region 1 initially sought to maintain the same structure, placing the responsibility on the regional sewer district to require I/I activities by the contributing systems and to collect the necessary information from those systems for submittal to EPA. MassDEP's 2001 Interim I/I Policy reflected this approach, containing a condition for regional systems:

((FOR REGIONAL FACILITIES ONLY)) The permittee shall require, through appropriate agreements, that all member communities develop and implement infiltration and inflow control plans sufficient to ensure that high flows do not cause or contribute to a violation of the permittees effluent limitations, or cause overflows from the permittees collection system.

As existing NPDES permittees, the POTW treatment plants were an obvious locus of regulation. The Region assumed the plants would be in a position to leverage preexisting legal and/or contractual relationships with the satellite collection systems they serve to perform a coordinating function, and that utilizing this existing structure would be more efficient than establishing a new system of direct reporting to EPA by the collection system owners. The Region also believed that the owner/operator of the POTW treatment plant would have an incentive to reduce flow from contributing satellite systems because doing so would improve treatment plant performance and reduce operation costs. While relying on this cooperative approach, however, EPA Region 1 also asserted that it had the authority to require that POTW collection systems be included as NPDES permittees and that it would do so if it proved necessary. Indeed, in 2001 Region 1 acceded to Massachusetts Water Resources Authority's ("MWRA") request that the contributing systems to the MWRA Clinton wastewater treatment plant ("WWTP") be included as co-permittees, based on evidence provided by MWRA that its specific relationship with those communities would not permit it to run an effective I/I reduction program for these collection systems. EPA Region 1 also put satellite collection systems on notice that they would be directly regulated through legally enforceable permit requirements if I/I reductions were not pursued or achieved.

In time, the Region realized that its failure to assert direct jurisdiction over municipal satellite dischargers was becoming untenable in the face of mounting evidence that cooperative (or in some cases non-existent) efforts on the part of the POTW treatment plant and associated satellites were failing to comprehensively address the problem of extraneous flow entering the POTW. The ability and/or willingness of regional sewer districts to attain meaningful I/I efforts in their member communities varied widely. The indirect structure of the requirements also tended to make it difficult for EPA to enforce the implementation of meaningful I/I reduction programs.

It became evident to EPA Region 1 that a POTW's ability to comply with CWA requirements depended on successful operation and maintenance of not only the treatment plant but also the collection system. For example, the absence of effective I/I reduction and operation/maintenance programs was impeding the Region's ability to prevent or mitigate the human health and water quality impacts associated with SSOs. *See Exhibit B* (Municipal satellite collection systems with SSOs). Additionally, these excess flows stressed POTW treatment plants from a hydraulic capacity and performance standpoint, adversely impacting effluent quality. *See Exhibit C* (Analysis of extraneous flow trends for representative systems). Addressing these issues in regional systems was essential, as these include most of the largest systems in terms of flow, population served and area covered, and serve the largest population centers.

The Region's practice of imposing NPDES permit conditions on the municipal collection systems in addition to the treatment plant owner/operator represents a necessary and logical progression in its continuing effort to effectively address the serious problem of I/I in sewer collection systems.⁵ In light of its past permitting experience and the need to effectively address the problem of extraneous flow on a system-wide basis, Region 1 decided that it was necessary to refashion permits issued to regionally integrated POTWs to encompass all owners/operators of the treatment works (*i.e.*, the regional centralized POTW treatment plant and the municipal satellite collection systems).⁶ Specifically, Region 1 determined that the satellite systems should be subject as co-permittees to a limited set of O&M-related conditions on permits issued for discharges from regionally integrated treatment works. These conditions pertain only to the portions of the POTW collection system that the satellites own. This ensures maintenance and pollution control programs are implemented with respect to all portions of the POTW. Accordingly, since 2005, Region 1 has generally included municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees for limited purposes, in addition to the owner/operator of the treatment plant as the main permittee subject to the full array of NPDES requirements, including secondary treatment and water-quality based effluent limitations. The Region has identified 25 permits issued by the Region to POTWs in New Hampshire and Massachusetts that include municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees. *See Exhibit A.* The 25 permits include a total of 55 satellite collection systems as co-permittees.

III. Legal Authority

The Region's prior and now superseded practice of limiting the permit only to the legal entity owning and/or operating the wastewater treatment plant had never been announced as a regional policy or interpretation. Similarly, the Region's practice of imposing NPDES permit conditions on the municipal collection systems in addition to the treatment plant owner/operator has also never been expressly announced as a uniform, region-wide policy or interpretation. Upon consideration of the Board's decision, described above, EPA Region 1 has decided to supply a clearer, more detailed explanation regarding its use of a co-permittee structure when issuing NPDES permits to regionally integrated POTWs. In this section, the Region addresses the questions posed by the Board in the *Upper Blackstone* decision referenced above.

⁵ Although EPA Region 1 has in the past issued NPDES permits only to the legal entities owning and operating the wastewater treatment plant (*i.e.*, only a portion of the "treatment works"), the Region's reframing of permits to include municipal satellite collection systems does not represent a break or reversal from its historical legal position. EPA Region 1 has never taken the legal position that the satellite collection systems are beyond the reach of the CWA and the NPDES permitting program. Rather, the Region as a matter of discretion had merely never determined it necessary to exercise its statutory authority to directly reach these facilities in order to carry out its NPDES permitting obligations under the Act.

⁶ EPA has "considerable flexibility in framing the permit to achieve a desired reduction in pollutant discharges." *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Costle*, 568 F.2d 1369, 1380 (D.C.Cir.1977). ("[T]his ambitious statute is not hospitable to the concept that the appropriate response to a difficult pollution problem is not to try at all.")

(1) Is the scope of NPDES authority limited to owners/operators of the treatment plant, or does the authority extend to owners/operators of the municipal satellite collection systems that comprise the wider POTW?

The scope of NPDES authority extends beyond the owners/operators of the treatment plant to include to owners/operators of portions of the wider POTW, for the reasons discussed below.

The CWA prohibits the “discharge of any pollutant by any person” from any point source to waters of the United States, except, *inter alia*, in compliance with an NPDES permit issued by EPA or an authorized state pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. CWA § 301, 402(a)(1); 40 C.F.R. § 122.1(b). Where there is a discharge of pollutants, NPDES regulations require the “operator” of the discharging “facility or activity” to obtain a permit in circumstances where the operator is different from the owner. *Id.* § 122.21(b). “Owner or operator” is defined as “the owner or operator of any ‘facility or activity’ subject to regulation under the NPDES program,” and a “facility or activity” is “any NPDES ‘point source’ or any other facility or activity (including land or appurtenances thereto) that is subject to regulation under the NPDES program.” *Id.* § 122.2.

“Publicly owned treatment works” are facilities subject to the NPDES program. Statutorily, POTWs as a class must meet performance-based requirements based on available wastewater treatment technology. *See* CWA § 402(a)(1) (“[t]he Administrator may...issue a permit for the discharge of any pollutant...upon condition that such discharge will meet (A) all applicable requirements under [section 301]..”); § 301(b)(1)(B) (“In order to carry out the objective of this chapter there shall be achieved...for publicly owned treatment works in existence on July 1, 1977...effluent limitations based upon secondary treatment[.]”); *see also* 40 C.F.R. pt 133. In addition to secondary treatment requirements, POTWs are also subject to water quality-based effluent limits if necessary to achieve applicable state water quality standards. *See* CWA § 301(b)(1)(C). *See also* 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(a)(1) (“...each NPDES permit shall include...[t]echnology-based effluent limitations based on: effluent limitations and standards published under section 301 of the Act”) and (d)(1) (same for water quality standards and state requirements). NPDES regulations similarly identify the “POTW” as the entity subject to regulation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(a), (requiring “new and existing POTWs” to submit information required in 122.21(j),” which in turn requires “all POTWs,” among others, to provide permit application information).

A municipal satellite collection system is part of a POTW under applicable law. The CWA and its implementing regulations broadly define “POTW” to include not only wastewater treatment plants but also the sewer systems and associated equipment that collect wastewater and convey it to the plants. Under NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.2 and 403.3(q), the term “Publicly Owned Treatment Works” or “POTW” means “a treatment works as defined by section 212 of the Act, which is owned by a State or municipality (as defined by section 502(4) of the Act).” Under section 212 of the Act,

“(2)(A) The term ‘treatment works’ means any devices and systems used in the storage, treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid

nature to implement section 1281 of this title, or necessary to recycle or reuse water at the most economical cost over the estimated life of the works, including intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, *sewage collection systems* [emphasis added], pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances; extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof; elements essential to provide a reliable recycled supply such as standby treatment units and clear well facilities; and any works, including site acquisition of the land that will be an integral part of the treatment process (including land used for the storage of treated wastewater in land treatment systems prior to land application) or is used for ultimate disposal of residues resulting from such treatment.

(B) In addition to the definition contained in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, ‘treatment works’ means any other method or system for preventing, abating, reducing, storing, treating, separating, or disposing of municipal waste, including storm water runoff, or industrial waste, including waste in combined storm water and *sanitary sewer systems* [emphasis added]. Any application for construction grants which includes wholly or in part such methods or systems shall, in accordance with guidelines published by the Administrator pursuant to subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, contain adequate data and analysis demonstrating such proposal to be, over the life of such works, the most cost efficient alternative to comply with sections 1311 or 1312 of this title, or the requirements of section 1281 of this title.”

Under the NPDES program regulations, this definition has been interpreted as follows:

“The term *Publicly Owned Treatment Works* or *POTW* [emphasis in original]...includes any devices and systems used in the storage, treatment, recycling and reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature. It also includes sewers, pipes and other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW Treatment Plant. The term also means the municipality as defined in section 502(4) of the Act, which has jurisdiction over the Indirect Discharges to and the discharges from such a treatment works.”

See 40 C.F.R. § 122.2, cross-referencing 403.3(q).

The statutory and regulatory definitions plainly encompass both the POTW treatment plant and municipal satellite collection systems. Municipal satellite collection systems are part of a POTW by definition (*i.e.*, they are “sewage collection systems” under section 212(A) and “sanitary sewer systems” under section 212(B)). They are also conveyances that send wastewater to a POTW treatment plant for treatment under 40 C.F.R. 403.3(q)). The preamble to the rule that created the regulatory definition of POTW supports the reading that the treatment plant comprises only a portion of the POTW. See 44 Fed. Reg. 62260, 62261 (Oct. 29, 1979).⁷

⁷ “A new provision...defining the term ‘POTW Treatment Plant’ has been added to avoid an ambiguity that now exists whenever a reference is made to a POTW (publicly owned treatment works). ...[T]he existing regulation defines a POTW to include both the treatment plant and the sewer pipes and other conveyances leading to it. As a result, it is unclear whether a particular reference is to the pipes, the treatment plant, or both. The term “POTW

Consistent with EPA Region 1's interpretation, courts have similarly taken a broad reading of the terms treatment works and POTW.⁸

(2) *If the latter, how far up the collection system does NPDES jurisdiction reach, i.e., where does the "collection system" end and the "user" begin?*

NPDES jurisdiction extends beyond the treatment plant to the outer boundary of the municipally-owned sewage collection systems, which are defined as sewers whose purpose is to be a common carrier of wastewater for others to a POTW treatment plant for treatment, as explained below.

As discussed in response to Question 1 above, the term "treatment works" is defined to include "sewage collection systems." CWA § 212. In order to define the extent of the sewage collection system for purposes of co-permittee regulation—*i.e.*, to identify the boundary between the portions of the collection system that are subject to NPDES requirements and those that are not—Region 1 is relying on EPA's regulatory interpretation of the term "sewage collection system." In relevant part, EPA regulations define "sewage collection system" at 40 C.F.R. § 35.905 as:

"... each, and all, of the common lateral sewers, within a publicly owned treatment system, which are primarily installed to receive waste waters directly from facilities which convey waste water from individual structures or from private property and which include service connection "Y" fittings designed for connection with those facilities. The facilities which convey waste water from individual structures, from private property to the public lateral sewer, or its equivalent, are specifically excluded from the definition...."

Put otherwise, a municipal satellite collection system is subject to NPDES jurisdiction under the Region's approach insofar as its purpose is to be a common carrier of wastewater for others to a POTW treatment plant for treatment. The use of this primary purpose test (*i.e.*, common sewer installed as a recipient and carrier waste water from others) allows Region 1 to draw a principled, predictable and readily ascertainable boundary between the POTW's collection system and user. This test would exclude, for example, branch drainpipes that collect and transport wastewater from fixtures in a commercial building or public school to the common lateral sewer. This type

treatment plant" will be used to designate that portion of the municipal system which is actually designed to provide treatment to the wastes received by the municipal system."

⁸ See, e.g., *United States v. Borowski*, 977 F.2d 27, 30 n.5 (1st Cir. 1992) ("We read this language [POTW definition] to refer to such sewers, pipes and other conveyances that are publicly owned. Here, for example, the City of Burlington's sewer is included in the definition because it conveys waste water to the Massachusetts Water Resource Authority's treatment works."); *Shanty Town Assoc. v. Envtl. Prot. Agency*, 843 F.2d 782, 785 (4th Cir. 1988) ("As defined in the statute, a 'treatment work' need not be a building or facility, but can be any device, system, or other method for treating, recycling, reclaiming, preventing, or reducing liquid municipal sewage and industrial waste, including storm water runoff.") (citation omitted); *Comm. for Consideration Jones Fall Sewage System v. Train*, 375 F. Supp. 1148, 1150-51 (D. Md. 1974) (holding that NPDES wastewater discharge permit coverage for a wastewater treatment plant also encompasses the associated sanitary sewer system and pump stations under § 1292 definition of "treatment work").

of infrastructure would not be considered part of the collection system, because it is not designed to be a common recipient and carrier of wastewaters from other users. Rather, it is designed to transport its users' wastewater to such a common collection system at a point further down the sanitary sewer system.

EPA's reliance on the definition of "sewage collection system" from outside the NPDES regulations for interpretative guidance is reasonable as the construction grants regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 35, subpart E pertain to grants for POTWs, the entity that is the subject of this NPDES policy. Additionally, the term "sewage collection systems" expressly appears in the definition of treatment works under section 212 of the Act as noted above. Finally, this approach is also consistent with EPA's interpretation in other contexts, such as the SSO listening session notice, published in the Federal Register on June 1, 2010, which describes wastewater collection systems as those that "collect domestic sewage and other wastewater from homes and other buildings and convey it to wastewater sewage treatment plants for proper treatment and disposal." See "Municipal Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems, Municipal Satellite Collection Systems, Sanitary Sewer Overflows, and Peak Wet Weather Discharges From Publicly Owned Treatment Works Treatment Plants Serving Separate Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems," 75 Fed. Reg. 30395.⁹

(3) Do municipal satellite collection systems "discharge [] a pollutant" within the meaning of the statute and regulations?

Yes, because they are a part of the POTW, municipal satellite collection systems discharge pollutants to waters of the United States through one or more outfalls (point sources).

The "discharge of a pollutant," triggers the need for a facility to obtain an NPDES permit. A POTW "discharges [] pollutant[s]" if it adds pollutants from a point source to waters of the U.S. (See 40 C.F.R. § 122.2, section (a) of the definition of "discharge of a pollutant.") As explained above, municipal satellite collection systems are part of the POTW. The entire POTW is the entity that discharges pollutants to waters of the U.S. through point source outfalls typically located at the treatment plant but also occasionally through other outfalls within the overall system. The fact that a collection system may be located in the upstream portions of the POTW and not necessarily near the ultimate discharge point at the treatment plant is not material to the question of whether it "discharges" a pollutant and consequently may be subject to conditions of an NPDES permit issued for discharges from the POTW.¹⁰

⁹ That EPA has in the past looked for guidance from Part 35 when construing the NPDES permitting program, for instance, in the context of storm water permitting, provides further support to the Region that its practice in this regard is sound. See, e.g., "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for Storm Water Discharges," 55 Fed. Reg. 47990, 47955 (looking to the definition of "storm sewer" at 40 C.F.R. § 35.2005(b)(47) when defining "storm water" under the NDPEs program).

¹⁰ This position differs from that taken by the Region in the *Upper Blackstone* litigation. There, the Region argued that the treatment plant was the sole discharging entity for regulatory purposes. The Region has revised this view upon further consideration of the statute, regulations and case law and determined that the POTW as a whole is the discharging entity.

“Discharge of a pollutant” at 40 C.F.R. § 122.2 is also defined to include “... discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances owned by a State, municipality, or other person *which do not lead to a treatment works.*”(emphasis added). Some municipal collection systems have argued that this sentence means that only municipal discharges that do not lead to a “treatment plant” fall within the scope of “discharge of a pollutant.” They further argue that because discharges through satellite collection systems do lead to a treatment plant, such systems do not “discharge [] pollutant[s]” and therefore are not subject to the NPDES permit requirements. This argument is flawed in that it incorrectly equates “treatment works,” the term used in the definition above, with “treatment plant.” To interpret “treatment works” as it appears in the regulatory definition of “discharge of a pollutant” as consisting of only the POTW treatment plant would be inconsistent with the definition of “treatment works” at 40 C.F.R. § 403.3(q), which expressly includes the collection system. *See also* § 403.3(r) (defining “POTW Treatment Plant” as “*that portion* [emphasis added] of the POTW which is designed to provide treatment (including recycling and reclamation) of municipal sewage and industrial waste”).

(4) Are municipal satellite collection systems “indirect dischargers” and thus excluded from NPDES permitting requirements?

No, municipal satellite collection systems are part of the POTW, not “indirect dischargers” to the POTW.

Section 307(b) of the Act requires EPA to establish regulatory pretreatment requirements to prevent the “introduction of pollutants into treatment works” that interfere, pass through or are otherwise incompatible with such works. Section 307 is implemented through the General Pretreatment Regulations for Existing and New Sources of Pollution (40 C.F.R. Part 403) and categorical pretreatment standards (40 C.F.R. Parts 405-471). Section 403.3(i) defines “indirect discharger” as “any non-domestic” source that introduces pollutants into a POTW and is regulated under pretreatment standards pursuant to CWA § 307(b)-(d). The source of an indirect discharge is termed an “industrial user.” *Id.* at § 403.3(j). Under regulations governing the NPDES permitting program, the term “indirect discharger” is defined as “a non-domestic discharger introducing ‘pollutants’ to a ‘publicly owned treatment works.’” 40 C.F.R. § 122.2. Indirect dischargers are excluded from NPDES permit requirements by the indirect discharger rule at 40 C.F.R. § 122.3(c), which provides, “The following discharges do not require an NPDES permit: . . . The introduction of sewage, industrial wastes or other pollutants into publicly owned treatment works by indirect dischargers.”

Municipal satellite collection satellite systems are not indirect dischargers as that term is defined under part 122 or 403 regulations. Unlike indirect dischargers, municipal satellite collection systems are not “introducing pollutants” to POTWs under 40 C.F.R. § 122.2; they are, instead, part of the POTW by definition. Similarly, they are not a non-domestic *source* that introduces pollutants into a POTW within the meaning of § 403.3(j), but as part of the POTW collect and convey municipal sewage from industrial, commercial and domestic users of the POTW.

The Region’s determination that municipal satellite collection systems are not indirect dischargers is, additionally, consistent with the regulatory history of the term indirect discharger.

The 1979 revision of the part 122 regulations defined “indirect discharger” as “a non-municipal, non-domestic discharger introducing pollutants to a publicly owned treatment works, which introduction does not constitute a ‘discharge of pollutants’...” See National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, 44 Fed. Reg. 32854, 32901 (June 7, 1979). The term “non-municipal” was removed in the Consolidated Permit Regulations, 45 Fed. Reg. 33290, 33421 (May 19, 1980) (defining “indirect discharger” as “a nondomestic discharger...”). Although the change was not explained in detail, the substantive intent behind this provision remained the same. EPA characterized the revision as “minor wording changes.” 45 Fed. Reg. at 33346 (Table VII: “Relationship of June 7[, 1979] Part 122 to Today’s Regulations”). The central point again is that under any past or present regulatory incarnation, municipal satellite collection systems, as POTWs, are not within the definition of “indirect discharger,” which is limited to dischargers that introduce pollutants to POTWs.

The position that municipal satellite collection systems are part of, rather than discharge to, the POTW also is consistent with EPA guidance. EPA’s 1994 Multijurisdictional Pretreatment Programs Guidance Manual, (EPA 833-B94-005) (June 1994), at p. 19, asserts that EPA has the authority to require municipal satellite collection systems to develop pretreatment programs by virtue of their being part of the POTW.

(5) How is the Region’s rationale consistent with the references to “municipality” in the regulatory definition of POTW found at 40 C.F.R. § 403.3(q), and the definition’s statement that “[t]he term also means the municipality....which has jurisdiction over the Indirect Discharges to and the discharges from such a treatment works?”

There is no inconsistency between the Region’s view that municipally-owned satellite collection systems are part of a POTW, and the references to municipality in 40 C.F.R. § 403.3(q), including the final sentence of the regulatory definition of POTW in the pretreatment regulations.

The Region’s co-permitting rationale is consistent with the first part of the pretreatment program’s regulatory definition of POTW, because the Region is only asserting NPDES jurisdiction over satellite collection systems that are owned by a “State or municipality (as defined by section 502(4) of the Act).” The term “municipality” as defined in CWA § 502(4) “means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes...” Thus, in order to qualify under this definition, a wastewater collection system need only be “owned by a State or municipality.” There is no requirement that the constituent components of a regionally integrated POTW, *i.e.*, the collection system and regional centralized POTW treatment plant, be owned by the same State or municipal entity.

Furthermore, there is no inconsistency between the Region’s view that a satellite collection system is part of a POTW, and the final sentence of the regulatory definition of POTW in the pretreatment regulations. As noted above, the sentence provides that “POTW” may “also” mean a municipality which has jurisdiction over indirect discharges to and discharges from the treatment works. This is not a limitation because of the use of the word “also” (contrast this with the “only if” language in the preceding sentence of the regulatory definition).

(6) How does the Region's rationale comport with the permit application and signatory requirements under NPDES regulations?

EPA's authority to require municipal satellite collection systems to separately comply with the permit application requirements, or to provide waivers from these requirements where appropriate, is consistent with NPDES regulations, which provide that all POTWs must submit permit application information set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(j) unless otherwise directed, and municipal satellite collection systems are part of the POTW.

EPA has the authority to require municipal satellite collection systems to submit permit applications. These entities are operators of parts of the POTW. NPDES regulations characterize the operator "of the POTW" (which by definition includes the sewage collection system) as opposed to the operator "of the POTW treatment plant" as an appropriate applicant. *Id.* § 122.21(a), (requiring applicants for "new and existing POTWs" to submit information required in 122.21(j)," which in turn requires "all POTWs," among others, to provide permit application information). This reading of the regulation is in keeping with the statutory text, which subjects the POTW writ large to the secondary treatment and water quality-based requirements. *See* CWA § 301(b)(1)(B), (C). In fact, the NPDES permit application for POTWs solicits information concerning portions of the POTW beyond the treatment plant itself, including the collection system used by the treatment works. *See* 40 C.F.R. 122.21(j)(1).

Notwithstanding that EPA could require applications for all the municipal satellite collection systems, requiring such applications may result in duplicative or immaterial information. The Regional Administrator ("RA") may waive any requirement of this paragraph if he or she has access to substantially identical information. 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(j). *See generally*, 64 Fed. Reg. 42440 (August 4, 1999). The RA may also waive any application requirement that is not of material concern for a specific permit. Region 1 believes that it will typically receive information sufficient for NPDES permitting purposes from the POTW treatment plant operator's application.

In most cases, EPA Region 1 believes that having a single permit application from the POTW treatment plant operator will be more efficient in carrying out the regulation's intent than multiple applications from the satellite systems. (The treatment plant operator would of course be required to coordinate as necessary with the constituent components of the POTW to ensure that the information provided to EPA is accurate and complete). EPA Region 1 therefore intends to issue waivers to exempt municipal satellite collection systems from permit application and signatory requirements in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(j). To the extent the Region requires additional information, it intends to use its information collection authority under CWA § 308.

IV. Basis for the Specific Conditions to which the Municipal Satellite Collection Systems are Subject as Co-permittees

The legal authority for extending NPDES conditions to all portions of the municipally-owned treatment works to ensure proper operation and maintenance and to reduce the quantity of extraneous flow into the POTW is Section 402(a) of the CWA. This section of the Act authorizes EPA to issue a permit for the “discharge of pollutants” and to prescribe permit conditions as necessary to carry out the provisions of the CWA, including Section 301 of the Act. Among other things, Section 301 requires POTWs to meet performance-based requirements based on secondary treatment technology, as well as any more stringent requirements of State law or regulation, including water quality standards. *See* CWA § 301(b)(1)(B),(C).

The co-permittee requirements are required to assure continued achievement of secondary treatment requirements and water quality standards in accordance with sections 301 and 402 of the Act and to prevent unauthorized discharges of sewage from collection systems. With respect to secondary treatment, the inclusion of the satellite systems as co-permittees is necessary because high levels of I/I dilute the strength of influent wastewater and increase the hydraulic load on treatment plants, which can reduce treatment efficiency (*e.g.*, result in violations of technology-based percent removal limitations for BOD and TSS due to less concentrated influent, or violation of other technology effluent limitations due to reduction in treatment efficiency), lead to bypassing a portion of the treatment process, or in extreme situations make biological treatment facilities inoperable (*e.g.*, wash out the biological organisms that treat the waste).

As to water quality standards, the addition of the satellite systems as co-permittees is necessary to ensure collection system operation and maintenance, which will reduce extraneous flow entering the system and free up available capacity. This will facilitate compliance with water quality-based effluent limitations—made more difficult by reductions in treatment efficiency and also reduce water quality standard violations that result from the occurrence of SSOs. *See Exhibits B* (Municipal satellite collection systems with SSOs) and *C* (Analysis of extraneous flow trends for representative systems). SSOs that reach waters of the U.S. are discharges in violation of section 301(a) of the CWA to the extent not authorized by an NPDES permit.

Subjecting portions of an NPDES-regulated entity upstream of the ultimate discharge point is consistent with EPA’s interpretation of the CWA in other contexts. For example, it is well established that EPA has the ability to apply discharge limitations and monitoring requirements to internal process discharges, rather than to outfalls, on the grounds that compliance with permit limitations “may well involve controls applied at points other than the ultimate point of discharge.” *See Decision of the General Counsel No. 27 (In re Inland Steel Company)*, August 4, 1975 (“Limitations upon internal process discharges are proper, if such discharges would ultimately be discharged into waters of the United States, and if such limitations are necessary to carry out the principal regulatory provisions of the Act.”). In the case of regionally integrated POTWs, placing conditions on satellite collection systems—though located farther up the system than the point of discharge—is a logical implication of the regulations and serves to effectuate the statute.

Without imposing conditions on the satellite communities, standard permit conditions applicable to all NPDES permits by regulation cannot be given full effect. To illustrate, there is no dispute

that the operator of the POTW treatment plant and outfall is discharging pollutants within the meaning of the CWA and, accordingly, is subject to the NPDES permit program. NPDES permitting regulations require standard conditions that “apply to all NPDES permits,” pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.41, including a duty to mitigate and to properly operate and maintain “all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.” *Id.* at § 122.41(d), (e). EPA regulations also require additional conditions applicable to specified categories of NPDES permit, including “Publicly owned treatment works.” *See id.* at § 122.42(b). A municipal satellite collection system, as demonstrated above, falls within the regulatory definition of a POTW. In light of EPA’s authority to require appropriate operation and maintenance of collection systems necessary to achieve compliance with an NPDES permit, and because the operator of the POTW treatment plant may not own or operate a significant portion of the wider treatment works (*i.e.*, the collection systems that send flow to the POTW treatment plant), it is appropriate, and in some cases necessary, to extend pertinent, mandated standard conditions to all portions of the POTW, which is subject to regulation in its entirety. The alternative of allowing state and local jurisdictional boundaries to place significant portions of the POTW beyond the reach of the NPDES permitting program would not only be inconsistent with the broad statutory and regulatory definition of the term POTW but would impede Region 1 from carrying out the objectives of the CWA. It would also, illogically, preclude the Region from imposing on POTWs standard conditions EPA has by regulation mandated for those entities.

Other Considerations Informing EPA Region 1’s Decision to Use a Co-permittee Permitting Structure for Regionally Integrated POTWs

In addition to consulting the relevant statutes, regulations, and preambles, Region 1 also considered other EPA guidance in coming to its determination to employ a co-permittee structure for regionally integrated POTWs. EPA’s 1994 Multijurisdictional Pretreatment Programs Guidance Manual, p. 19, asserts that EPA has the authority to include municipal satellite collection systems as co-permittees by virtue of their being part of the POTW:

If the contributing jurisdiction owns or operates the collection system within its boundaries, then it is a co-owner or operator of the POTW. As such, it can be included on the POTW’s NPDES permit and be required to develop a pretreatment program. Contributing jurisdictions should be made co-permittees where circumstances or experience indicate that it is necessary to ensure adequate pretreatment program implementation.

The same logic that led EPA to conclude it had authority to require municipal satellite collection systems to develop a pretreatment program pursuant to an NPDES permit supports EPA Region 1’s decision to impose permit conditions on such facilities to undertake proper O & M and to reduce inflow and infiltration.

EPA Region 1 also took notice of federal listening session materials on the June 2010 proposed SSO rule and associated model permits and fact sheet. The position articulated by EPA in these

model documents—specifically the application of standard NPDES conditions to municipal satellite collection systems—generally conform to Region 1’s co-permitting approach.

Finally, in addition to federal requirements, EPA Region 1 considered the co-permittee approach in light of state regulations and policy pertaining to wastewater treatment works. The Region found its approach to be consistent with such requirements. Under Massachusetts law, “Any person operating treatment works shall maintain the facilities in a manner that will ensure proper operation of the facilities or any part thereof,” where “treatment works” is defined as “any and all devices, processes and properties, real or personal, used in the collection, pumping, transmission, storage, treatment, disposal, recycling, reclamation or reuse of waterborne pollutants, but not including any works receiving a hazardous waste from off the site of the works for the purpose of treatment, storage or disposal, or industrial wastewater holding tanks regulated under 314 CMR 18.00” *See* 314 CMR 12.00 (“Operation and Maintenance and Pretreatment Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works and Indirect Dischargers”). MassDEP has also prioritized this area, issuing detailed operation and maintenance guidelines entitled “Optimizing Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems.”

Exhibit A

Name	Issue Date
Massachusetts Water Resources Authority – Clinton (NPDES Permit No. MA0100404)	September 27, 2000
City of Brockton (NPDES Permit No. MA0101010)	May 11, 2005
City of Marlborough (NPDES Permit No. MA0100480)	May 26, 2005
Westborough Wastewater Treatment Plant (NPDES Permit No. MA0100412)	May 20, 2005
Lowell Regional Wastewater Utilities (NPDES Permit No. MA0100633)	September 1, 2005
Town of Webster Sewer Department (NPDES Permit No. MA0100439)	March 24, 2006
Town of South Hadley, Board of Selectmen (NPDES Permit No. MA0100455)	June 12, 2006
City of Leominster (NPDES Permit No. MA0100617)	September 28, 2006
Hoosac Water Quality District (NPDES Permit No. MA0100510)	September 28, 2006
Board of Public Works, North Attleborough (NPDES Permit No. MA0101036)	January 4, 2007
Town of Sunapee (NPDES Permit No. 0100544)	February 21, 2007
Lynn Water and Sewer Commission (NPDES Permit No. MA0100552)	March 3, 2007
City of Concord (NPDES Permit No. NH0100331)	June 29, 2007
City of Keene (NPDES Permit No. NH0100790)	August 24, 2007
Town of Hampton (NPDES No. NH0100625)	August 28, 2007
Town of Merrimack, NH (NPDES No. NH0100161)	September 25, 2007
City of Haverhill (NPDES Permit No. MA0101621)	December 5, 2007
Greater Lawrence Sanitary District (NPDES Permit No. MA0100447)	August 11, 2005

City of Pittsfield, Department of Public Works (NPDES No. MA0101681)	August 22, 2008
City of Manchester (NPDES No. NH0100447)	September 25, 2008
City of New Bedford (NPDES Permit No. MA0100781)	September 28, 2008
Winnepesaukee River Basin Program Wastewater Treatment Plant (NPDES Permit No. NH0100960)	June 19, 2009
City of Westfield (NPDES Permit No. MA0101800)	September 30, 2009
Hull Permanent Sewer Commission (NPDES Permit No. MA0101231)	September 1, 2009
Gardner Department of Public Works (NPDES Permit No. MA0100994)	September 30, 2009

Exhibit B

I/I Flow Analysis for Sample Regional Publicly Owned Treatment Works

I. Representative POTWS

The **South Essex Sewer District (SESD)** is a regional POTW with a treatment plant in Salem, Massachusetts. The SESD serves a total population of 174,931 in six communities: Beverly, Danvers, Marblehead, Middleton, Peabody and Salem. The **Charles River Pollution Control District (CRPCD)** is a regional POTW with a treatment plant in Medway, Massachusetts. The CRPCD serves a total population of approximately 28,000 in four communities: Bellingham, Franklin, Medway and Millis. Both of these facilities have been operating since 2001 under permits that place requirements on the treatment plant to implement I/I reduction programs with the satellite collection systems, in contrast to Region 1's current practice of including the satellite collection systems as co-permittees.

II. Comparison of flows to standards for nonexcessive infiltration and I/I

Flow data from the facilities' discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) are shown in comparison to the EPA standard for nonexcessive infiltration/inflow (I/I) of 275 gpcd wet weather flow and the EPA standard for nonexcessive infiltration of 120 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) dry weather flow; the standards are multiplied by population served for comparison with total flow from the facility. See *I/I Analysis and Project Certification*, EPA Ecol. Pub. 97-03 (1985); 40 CFR 35.2005(b)(28) and (29).

Figures 1 and 2 show the Daily Maximum Flows (the highest flow recorded in a particular month) for the CRPCD and SESD, respectively, along with monthly precipitation data from nearby weather stations. Both facilities experience wet weather flows far exceeding the standard for nonexcessive I/I, particularly in wet months, indicating that these facilities are receiving high levels of inflow and wet weather infiltration.

Figure 1. CRPCD Daily Maximum Flow Compared to Nonexcessive I/I Standard





Figure 2. SESD Daily Maximum Flow Compared to Nonexcessive I/I Standard



Figures 3 and 4 shows the Average Monthly Flows for the CRPCD and SESD, which exceed the nonexcessive infiltration standard for all but the driest months. This indicates that these systems experience high levels of groundwater infiltration into the system even during dry weather.

Figure 3. CRPCD Monthly Average Flow Compared to Nonexcessive Infiltration Standard





Figure 4. SESD Monthly Average Flow Compared to Nonexcessive Infiltration Standard



II. Flow Trends

Figures 5 and 6 show the trend in Maximum Daily Flows over the period during which these regional facilities have been responsible for implementing cooperative I/I reduction programs with the satellite collection systems. The Maximum Daily Flow reflects the highest wet weather flow for each month. The trend over this time period has been of increasing Maximum Daily Flow, indicating that I/I has not been reduced in either system despite the permit requirements.

Figure 5. CRPCD Daily Maximum Flow Trend





Figure 6. SESD Daily Maximum Flow Trend



III. Violations Associated with Wet Weather Flows

Both the CRPCD and SESD have experienced permit violations that appear to be related to I/I, based on their occurrence during wet weather months when excessive I/I standards are exceeded. Figure 7 shows violations of CRPCD’s effluent limits for CBOD (concentration) and TSS (concentration and percent removal). Twelve of the sixteen violations occurred during months when daily maximum flows exceeded the EPA standard.

Figure 7. CRPCD CBOD and TSS Effluent Limit Violations





Figure 8 shows SESD's results for removal of CBOD, in percentage, as compared to maximum daily flow. SESD had three permit violations where CBOD removal fell below 85%, all during months with high Maximum Daily Flows.

Figure 8. SESD CBOD Percent Removal



In addition, both of these regional POTWs have experienced SSOs within the municipal satellite collection systems. In the SESD system, Beverly, Danvers, Marblehead and Peabody have reported SSOs between 2006 and 2008, based on data provided by MassDEP. In the CRPCD system, both Franklin and Bellingham have reported SSOs between 2006 and 2009.

Exhibit C

List of municipal satellite collection systems that have had SSOs

Exhibit D

Form of Regional Administrator's waiver of permit application requirements for
municipal satellite collection systems



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 1
1 CONGRESS STREET, SUITE 1100
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114-2023

Re: Waiver of Permit Application and Signatory Requirements for [Municipal Satellite Sewage Collection System]

Dear _____:

Under NPDES regulations, all POTWs must submit permit application information set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(j) unless otherwise directed. Where the Region has “access to substantially identical information,” the Regional Administrator may waive permit application requirements for new and existing POTWs. *Id.* Pursuant to my authority under this regulation, I am waiving NPDES permit application and signatory requirements applicable to the above-named municipal satellite collection systems.

Although EPA has the authority to require municipal satellite collection systems to submit individual permit applications, in this case I find that requiring a single permit application executed by the regional POTW treatment plant owner/operator will deliver “substantially identical information,” and will be more efficient, than requiring separate applications from each municipal satellite collection system owner/operator. Municipal satellite collection system owners/operators are expected to consult and coordinate with the regional POTW treatment plant operators to ensure that any information provided to EPA about their respective entities is accurate and complete. In the event that EPA requires additional information, it may use its information collection authority under CWA § 308. 33 U.S.C. § 1318.

This notice reflects my determination based on the specific facts and circumstances in this case. It is not intended to bind the agency in future determinations where a separate permit for municipal satellites would not be duplicative or immaterial.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this decision, please contact [EPA Contact] at [Contact Info].

Sincerely,

Regional Administrator

NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
WATER DIVISION
P.O. BOX 95
CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03302-0095

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY-REGION 1
WATER DIVISION
5 POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109

JOINT PUBLIC NOTICE OF A DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE
ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE INTO THE WATERS OF
THE UNITED STATES UNDER SECTIONS 301 AND 402 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT
(THE "ACT"), AS AMENDED, AND REQUEST FOR STATE CERTIFICATION UNDER
SECTION 401 OF THE ACT, AND ISSUANCE OF A STATE SURFACE WATER PERMIT
UNDER NH RSA 485-A:13, I(a).

PUBLIC NOTICE PERIOD: May 20, 2020 – June 18, 2020

PERMIT NUMBER: **NH0100471**

PUBLIC NOTICE NUMBER: NH-10-20

NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

Town of Milford, NH
Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility
c/o Town Hall
1 Union Square
Milford, NH 03055

NAME AND LOCATION OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility
564 Nashua St
Milford, NH 03055

RECEIVING WATER: Souhegan River Class B

PREPRATION OF THE DRAFT PERMIT:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Water Division (NHDES-WD) have cooperated in the development of a draft permit for the Milford Wastewater Treatment Facility, which discharges treated domestic and commercial wastewater. Sludge from this facility is dried and then shipped off-site for disposal. The effluent limits and permit conditions imposed have been drafted to assure compliance with the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. sections 1251 et seq., Chapter 485-A of the New Hampshire Statutes: Water Pollution and Waste Disposal, and the New Hampshire Surface Water Quality Regulations, Env-Wq 1700 et seq. EPA has formally requested that the State

certify the draft permit pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and expects that the draft permit will be certified.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE DRAFT PERMIT:

The draft permit and explanatory fact sheet may be obtained at no cost at http://www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/draft_permits_listing_nh.html or by contacting:

Douglas MacLean
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100 (06-1)
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Telephone: (617) 918-1608
MacLean.Douglas@epa.gov

The administrative record containing all documents relating to this draft permit including all data submitted by the applicant may be inspected at the EPA Boston office mentioned above between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND REQUEST FOR PUBLIC HEARING:

All persons, including applicants, who believe any condition of the draft permit is inappropriate, must raise all issues and submit all available arguments and all supporting material for their arguments in full by **June 18, 2020**, to the address or email address listed above. Any person, prior to such date, may submit a request in writing to EPA and NHDES for a public hearing to consider this draft permit. Such requests shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. A public hearing may be held after at least thirty days public notice whenever the Regional Administrator finds that response to this notice indicates significant public interest. In reaching a final decision on the draft permit, the Regional Administrator will respond to all significant comments and make these responses available to the public at EPA's Boston office.

FINAL PERMIT DECISION:

Following the close of the comment period, and after a public hearing, if such hearing is held, the Regional Administrator will issue a final permit decision and notice of the final decision to the applicant and each person who has submitted written comments or requested notice.

THOMAS E. O'DONOVAN, P.E., DIRECTOR
WATER DIVISION
NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

KEN MORAFF, DIRECTOR
WATER DIVISION
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY - REGION I