

NPDES PQR Core Review Checklist

1. General Information

1. Name of facility [Enter text here.](#):
2. NPDES permit number: [Enter text here.](#)
3. Facility information:
 - a. Permit issuance status: New Reissued
 - b. Facility designation: Major Non-major
Indicate any concerns regarding the designation in the comment field
 - c. Facility type: POTW Non-POTW (including privately owned treatment works)
4. Permit writer or other state contact:
Email: [Enter text here.](#)
Phone: [Enter text here.](#)
5. Core permit reviewer(s):
Email: [Enter text here.](#)
Phone: [Enter text here.](#)
Date Reviewed: [Enter text here.](#)

Section 1. Comments: *(could include description of facility, design flow, industrial rating information, etc.):*
[Enter text here.](#)

2. Permit and Facility Information

2.1 Basic Permit Information

1. Did the permit identify the issuance, effective, and expiration dates? [Choose an item.](#)
 - a. What was the permit issuance date? [Enter text here.](#)
 - b. What was the permit effective date? [Enter text here.](#)
 - c. What was the permit expiration date? [Enter text here.](#)
 - i. Was the permit term 5 years or less? [Choose an item.](#)
2. Did the permit contain specific authorization-to-discharge information (from where, to where, by whom)? [Choose an item.](#)
3. Did the record indicate that the permit was issued by an appropriate official (e.g., signed permit cover page, transmittal letter)? [Choose an item.](#)
4. Note any other program areas applicable to the discharger (e.g., pretreatment, stormwater, CAFO, biosolids, 316):
[Enter text here.](#)

Section 2.1. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

2.2 Facility and Receiving Water Information

1. Did the permit or fact sheet describe the physical location of the facility (e.g., address, latitude/longitude)? [Choose an item.](#)
2. Did the fact sheet include a description of the type of activities and wastewater treatment processes at the facility? [Choose an item.](#)
3. Were all active outfalls identified in the record authorized in the permit (including stormwater and/or combined sewer overflow outfalls, if appropriate)? [Choose an item.](#)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| a. Did the permit or fact sheet identify the physical location of each outfall (e.g., address, latitude/longitude)? | Choose an item. |
| 4. Did the record clearly identify the name of the receiving water(s)? | Choose an item. |
| a. Did the record discuss the specific location within the receiving water (e.g., stream segment, HUC)? | Choose an item. |

Section 2.2. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

3. Permit Application

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Were the appropriate application forms submitted for the type of facility? | Choose an item. |
| a. If a state application form was used, did the form contain all required elements of 40 CFR 122.21?
<i>(Alternatively, a coordinated review of all the state permit application forms can be conducted separately, rather than individually by each reviewer for each permit.)</i>

If no, describe: Enter text here. | Choose an item. |
| 2. Was the most recent version of the application form submitted? | Choose an item. |
| 3. Was the permit application submitted at least 180 days prior to either: permit expiration (<i>for reissued permits</i>), or the date on which the discharge is to commence (<i>for new permits</i>)? | Choose an item. |
| a. If no, did the record contain documentation that the state granted permission for a later date? | Choose an item. |
| b. Date application submitted? | Enter text here. |
| c. (<i>For reissued permits</i>) Date of previous permit expiration? | Enter text here. |
| 4. Was the permit application signed by the appropriate official? | Choose an item. |
| 5. Was the permit application administratively complete (including all attachments, diagrams, etc.)? | Choose an item. |
| a. POTWs: | |
| i. Did the permit application include the results of at least 3 pollutant scans performed within the existing permit term? | Choose an item. |
| ii. Was the POTW required to provide the results of at least 4 quarterly whole effluent toxicity (WET) tests or 4 years of annual data?

If so, did the application provide this information? | Choose an item.
Choose an item. |
| iii. Was the POTW required to complete Form 2A Table F (or state application equivalent), which requires identification of industrial user discharges per 40 CFR 122.21(j)(6)(i) and (ii)?

If no, select why: | Choose an item. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> POTW does not receive discharges from SIUs or NSCIUs | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Permittee has an approved pretreatment program and submitted an annual report within one year of application that contains substantially identical information | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Permittee has submitted a pretreatment program for approval and the documentation contains substantially identical information | |
| If yes, did the permittee complete Table F (or state application equivalent)? | Choose an item. |
| Indicate any components of Table F (or state application equivalent) that were not complete:
Enter text here. | |
| b. Non-POTWs: | |
| i. (<i>New dischargers</i>) Based on the industrial category, were the correct Form 2D (or state application equivalent) analytical requirements met? | Choose an item. |
| ii. (<i>Existing dischargers</i>) Based on the industrial category, were the correct Form 2C (or state application equivalent) analytical requirements met? | Choose an item. |

iii. (New and existing nonprocess wastewater dischargers) Were the correct Form 2E (or state application equivalent) analytical requirements met?	Choose an item.
iv. For facilities subject to CWA 316(b) requirements, was the application information at 40 CFR 122.21(r) submitted?	Choose an item.
6. (New dischargers) If analytical data were not provided in the initial application, did the record indicate that the permittee submitted analytical data within 24 months of the discharge commencing?	Choose an item.
7. Did the permit record document that the permit application was complete?	Choose an item.
Section 3 Comments: Enter text here.	

4. Effluent Limitations

4.1 Technology-Based Effluent Limits (TBELs)

4.1.1 POTWs: (For non-POTWs, skip to section 4.1.2)

1. Did the permit contain numeric limits in accordance with secondary treatment (40 CFR 133.102) or equivalent to secondary treatment (40 CFR 133.105) for the following parameters:
 - a. BOD₅ (or CBOD₅) and TSS, expressed as both 30-day (monthly) average and 7-day (weekly) average limits? [Choose an item.](#)
 - b. Percent removal requirements for BOD₅ (or CBOD₅) and TSS? [Choose an item.](#)
 - c. pH? [Choose an item.](#)

If yes, select which standards were applied: (check all that apply)

Secondary Equivalent to secondary
2. If the permit contained equivalent to secondary treatment standards, did the fact sheet describe how the facility was eligible for those standards? [Choose an item.](#)
3. If secondary or equivalent to secondary treatment standards were not implemented in the permit, did the permit contain adjusted standards in accordance with 40 CFR 133.103? [Choose an item.](#)
 - a. If yes, which of the special considerations in 40 CFR 133.103 were the standards adjusted for? (check only one)
 - 133.103(a): Combined sewers
 - 133.103(b): Industrial flow
 - 133.103(c): Waste stabilization ponds
 - 133.103(d): Less concentrated waste and excess I/I
 - 133.103(e): Less concentrated waste due to combined sewers and during dry weather
 - b. If yes, did the fact sheet contain appropriate information and calculations as the basis for the adjustments? [Choose an item.](#)
4. If the permit does not reflect 40 CFR 133.102, 133.103, or 133.105, does the fact sheet identify the basis of the limits? [Choose an item.](#)
Describe: [Enter text here.](#)
5. Did the permit require influent monitoring for BOD₅ (or alternative) and TSS? [Choose an item.](#)
If yes, describe how the requirement is incorporated: [Enter text here.](#)

4.1.2 Non-POTWs: (For POTWs, skip to Section 4.2)

1. Was the facility subject to one or more ELGs? [Choose an item.](#)
 - a. If yes, what categories and subcategories applied (e.g. 40 CFR Part Number or Name of ELG)?

Enter text here.

- i. Indicate whether the facility is a New source or Existing source: New source Existing source
- ii. Did the fact sheet explain how the categorization and performance levels (BPT, BCT, BAT, NSPS) were determined? Choose an item.
- iii. Did the fact sheet adequately document the calculations used to develop ELG-based effluent limits? Choose an item.
- iv. Were all limits based on TBELs as stringent as required by applicable ELGs? Choose an item.
 If no, list parameters for which final limits were not as stringent: [Enter text here.](#)

Specify the basis in the record: [Enter text here.](#)

- b. If the facility was not subject to an ELG (or if it included processes or waste streams that were not subject to an ELG), did the permit include technology-based limitations based on BPJ for all conventional, nonconventional, and toxic pollutants in the discharge? Choose an item.

If yes, specify which were based on BPJ: [Enter text here.](#)

- i. For limits developed based on BPJ, did the fact sheet indicate that the limits were developed considering all the criteria established at 40 CFR 125.3(d)? Choose an item.
- ii. For limits developed based on BPJ, did the fact sheet adequately document the calculations used to develop BPJ technology-based effluent limits? Choose an item.

List and describe any technology-based limits that were not based on an ELG or BPJ:

[Enter text here.](#)

- 2. For all limits that were based on production or flow, did the fact sheet indicate that the calculations were based on a "reasonable measure of actual production" for the facility (not design)? Choose an item.
- 3. If the permit contained "tiered" limits that reflected projected increases in production or flow, did the permit require the facility to notify the permitting authority when alternate levels of production or flow were attained? Choose an item.

Section 4.1 Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

4.2 Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits (WQBELs)

4.2.1 Receiving Water Characterization

- 1. Did the fact sheet describe the designated uses of the receiving water(s) to which the facility discharges (e.g., contact recreation, aquatic life use)? Choose an item.
- 2. Was an EPA-approved water quality standards (WQS) variance applicable to this discharge? Choose an item.
 - a. If yes, did the fact sheet contain justification for the variance? Choose an item.
- 3. Did the fact sheet contain a description of the 303(d) status of the receiving water(s)? Choose an item.
 - a. If yes, was the receiving water(s) impaired for any uses? Choose an item.
 - b. If yes, complete the following table (if additional entries are necessary, continue on a separate sheet).

Impairing Pollutant	TMDL approved? (Y/N)	Facility Discharged Pollutant of Concern? (Y/N)	Permit included WQBELs consistent with TMDL? (Y/N)
Enter text here.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Enter text here.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Enter text here.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Enter text here.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

4. Were there any other concerns in the receiving waterbody or downstream of the discharge (e.g., downstream impairments with or without TMDLs, downstream WQS, other indicators of concerns such as fish kills)?			Choose an item.
If yes, please describe: Enter text here.			
4.2.2 Reasonable Potential (RP) Analysis and QBEL Development			
1. Did the fact sheet appropriately identify pollutants of concern for which RP analysis would be necessary?			Choose an item.
2. Did the permit writer assess whether the discharge would cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any applicable numeric or narrative WQS for each pollutant of concern (including WET and nutrients) at each outfall?			Choose an item.
a. If no, which pollutants of concern were not evaluated for RP? Enter text here.			
3. Where RP was assessed, did the fact sheet include sufficient documentation of the analysis (e.g., summary tables, calculations, spreadsheets)?			Choose an item.
a. If no, list all pollutants of concern for which the record did not include documentation: Enter text here.			
4. Did the permit contain QBELs for all pollutants that will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion of applicable WQS?			Choose an item.
a. If no, identify all pollutants for which there was RP but no final limit: Enter text here.			
5. Did the fact sheet indicate that dilution or a mixing zone was provided?			Choose an item.
<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution allowance <input type="checkbox"/> Mixing zone			
a. If yes, did the fact sheet record describe how the dilution allowance or mixing zone was determined?			Choose an item.
b. If yes, did the fact sheet indicate that actual background data for the receiving water was used in limit development calculations?			Choose an item.
i. If yes, for which parameters? Enter text here.			
ii. If default background data was used, what was the basis? Enter text here.			
6. Did the fact sheet indicate that the permit writer considered applicable narrative water quality criteria in developing QBELs?			Choose an item.
Section 4.2 Comments: Enter text here.			
4.3 Final Effluent Limitations			
1. Did the fact sheet include limit development calculations for each pollutant with a numeric pollutant limit or a rationale for each pollutant with a BMP or other non-numeric limit?			Choose an item.
a. If no, which pollutants did not have documentation of calculations or rationale? Enter text here.			
2. Were final effluent limitations protective of all applicable CWA standards, including both technology and water quality standards?			Choose an item.
a. Did the fact sheet correctly describe the basis (technology or water quality) for each of the final effluent limits? Choose an item.			
3. Were permit limitations expressed as both short-term (daily maximum or average weekly) and long-term (average monthly) limitations, consistent with 40 CFR 122.45(d)?			Choose an item.
a. If no, for which pollutants: Enter text here.			

- | | |
|--|--|
| b. If no, did the fact sheet provide justification for the alternate limit basis?
i. If yes, what was the rationale? Enter text here. | Choose an item. |
| 4. Were final permit limits expressed in appropriate units of measure (i.e., concentration, mass, standard units)? | Choose an item. |
| 5. <i>(For reissued permits)</i> Were all limits at least as stringent as those in the previous permit?
a. If no, which limits were not as stringent? Enter text here.
b. If no, did the fact sheet discuss whether “anti-backsliding” provisions were met?
i. If yes, was the discussion sufficient?
Describe: Enter text here. | Choose an item.
Choose an item. |
| 6. <i>(For reissued permits)</i> Did permit limits restrict pollutant loadings to levels at or below those in the previous permit?
a. If no, did the fact sheet indicate that an “antidegradation” review was performed in accordance with the state’s approved antidegradation policy?
Describe: Enter text here. | Choose an item.
Choose an item. |
| 7. Did the permit contain novel/innovative approaches or provisions to control pollution (e.g., water quality trading, watershed-based permitting, adaptive management, plant optimization)?
Describe: Enter text here. | Choose an item. |

Section 4.3 Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

5. Pretreatment Questions for POTWs (Non-POTWs skip to section 6)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Did the permit contain the requirement at 40 CFR 122.44(j)(1) to identify, in terms of character and volume of pollutants, any SIUs subject to pretreatment standards? | Choose an item. |
| 2. Did the fact sheet identify and characterize any existing industrial dischargers (including hauled industrial waste)?
a. If yes, specify: Enter text here. | Choose an item. |
| 3. Did the NPDES permit require the POTW to develop or implement an approved pretreatment program?
a. If yes, did the fact sheet describe the rationale for requiring a pretreatment program?
i. If yes, specify rationale: Enter text here.
b. If yes, did the NPDES permit require the POTW to submit an annual pretreatment report?
i. If yes, did the condition require the applicable data in Appendix A to 40 CFR part 127?
ii. If yes, did the condition require a summary of changes to the pretreatment program that have not been previously reported, and any other relevant information requested by the approval authority? | Choose an item.
Choose an item.
Choose an item.
Choose an item.
Choose an item. |
| 4. If developing a new program, was a due date of one year or less included? | Choose an item. |
| 5. If implementing an existing program:
a. Did the NPDES permit record identify the approval and most recent modification date(s) of the approved pretreatment program?
b. Did the NPDES permit require the POTW to prepare, maintain, and/or implement the following 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)-(6) requirements:
i. Legal authority for the POTW to apply and enforce pretreatment conditions of the CWA.
ii. Procedures to ensure compliance with the requirements of a Pretreatment Program.
iii. Sufficient resources and qualified personnel to carry out the authorities and procedures.
iv. Development of local limits. | Choose an item.
Choose an item.
Choose an item.
Choose an item. |

v. An enforcement response plan for IU noncompliance.	Choose an item.
vi. A list of its IUs meeting the criteria in 40 CFR 403.3(v)(1), which must be made available to the Pretreatment Approval Authority.	Choose an item.
c. Did the NPDES permit require a written technical evaluation of the need to revise previously adopted local limits, following permit reissuance/modification, in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(j)(2)(ii)?	Choose an item.
i. If yes, did the permit include a submission date for the evaluation and local limits revisions?	Choose an item.
ii. If yes, was the submission date within 1 year from the permit reissuance/modification date?	Choose an item.
6. If the POTW has chosen to receive electronic documents, does the NPDES permit require the POTW to satisfy the electronic reporting requirements of 40 CFR part 3?	Choose an item.
7. For POTWs without a pretreatment program: Did the record identify a history of interference and/or pass through due to industrial discharges?	Choose an item.
a. If yes, did the NPDES permit require development and submittal of local limits?	Choose an item.
b. If yes, did the permit include a submission date for local limits?	Choose an item.
c. If yes, was the submission date within 1 year from the permit reissuance/modification date?	Choose an item.
Section 5. Comments: Enter text here.	

6. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. Did the permit identify monitoring location(s)?	Choose an item.
2. Were any monitoring requirements (type, interval, frequency) insufficient to assess compliance with an effluent limitation?	Choose an item.
3. Did the permit require toxicity testing for WET?	Choose an item.
a. If yes, identify type of testing (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Acute <input type="checkbox"/> Chronic	
b. If yes, did the permit include specific toxicity testing requirements (e.g., test species, test endpoints)?	Choose an item.
c. If yes, did the fact sheet include information indicating the consideration of species sensitivity when selecting the WET test to be conducted?	Choose an item.
d. If yes, did the permit include necessary follow up actions to take if WET tests do show toxicity (e.g., accelerated monitoring, TIE/TRE)?	Choose an item.
4. Did the permit require use of sufficiently sensitive 40 CFR Part 136 methods capable of quantifying pollutants at concentrations equal to or less than the permit limits?	Choose an item.
5. Did the permit specify the method, frequency, and timing of submission of discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) and other required reports to the permitting authority?	Choose an item.
a. Did the permit require at least annual reporting for all limited parameters?	Choose an item.
b. Did the permit require the permittee to submit DMRs electronically?	Choose an item.
c. If any of the following reports were required by the permit, did the permit require the permittee to submit the reports electronically, no later than December 21, 2025, regardless of whether a tool for electronic submission is currently available?	Choose an item.
i. Sewage Sludge/Biosolids Annual Program Reports	Choose an item.
ii. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Annual Program Reports	Choose an item.
iii. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Program Reports	Choose an item.
iv. Pretreatment Program Reports	Choose an item.
v. Sewer Overflow/Bypass Event Reports	Choose an item.
vi. CWA section 316(b) Annual Reports	Choose an item.

6. **POTWs:** Did the permit require monitoring and/or reporting specifically for combined sewer overflows (CSOs), sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), or blending? Choose an item.

If yes, specify: [Enter text here.](#)

7. **Non-POTWs:** If the monitoring frequency was less than annual for ELG-based limits, did the record indicate that the facility applied for and was granted a monitoring waiver? Choose an item.

a. If yes, did the permit specifically incorporate this waiver? Choose an item.

Section 6. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

7. Standard and Special Conditions

1. Did the permit contain all 40 CFR 122.41 standard conditions? Choose an item.
(If a separate attachment is used to incorporate standard conditions into permits, a full review of the separate attachment can be conducted once and the findings can be deemed applicable to all of the permits reviewed).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) Duty to comply | <input type="checkbox"/> (l) Reporting requirements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) Duty to reapply | <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Planned change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) Anticipated noncompliance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (d) Duty to mitigate | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) Transfers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (e) Proper operation & maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) Monitoring reports |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (f) Permit actions | <input type="checkbox"/> (5) Compliance schedules |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (g) Property rights | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) Twenty-four-hour reporting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (h) Duty to provide information | <input type="checkbox"/> (7) Other non-compliance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (i) Inspections and entry | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) Other information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (j) Monitoring and records | <input type="checkbox"/> (9) Identification of the initial recipient for NPDES electronic reporting data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (k) Signatory requirement | <input type="checkbox"/> (m) Bypass |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> (n) Upset |

2. Was the standard condition language at least as stringent as 40 CFR 122.41? Choose an item.
(If a separate attachment is used to incorporate standard conditions into permits, a full review of the separate attachment can be conducted once and the findings can be deemed applicable to all of the permits reviewed).

a. If no, specify: [Enter text here.](#)

3. **POTWs:** Did the permit contain the additional standard conditions at 40 CFR 122.42(b)(1)-(3) regarding notification of changes in pollutants discharged to the POTW? Choose an item.

4. **Non-POTWs:** Did the permit contain the additional standard conditions at 40 CFR 122.42(a)(1)-(2) regarding notification levels? Choose an item.

5. Did the permit require specific best management practices (BMPs) and/or development of a BMP plan? Check all that apply: Choose an item.

- Specific BMPs BMP Plan

6. Did the permit include a compliance schedule? Choose an item.

a. If yes, did the permit include the final compliance date? Choose an item.

b. If yes, was the schedule otherwise consistent with 40 CFR 122.47 (explanation of need for compliance schedule, interim milestones, compliance as soon as possible)? Choose an item.

Section 7. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

8. Administrative Process

8.1 Revisions and Modifications

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Was the permit revised between the draft and final permit? | Choose an item. |
| a. If yes, did the record contain documentation of the changes and rationale? | Choose an item. |
| 2. After issuance, was the permit modified? | Choose an item. |
| a. If yes, identify the type of modification: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Major Modification | |
| b. If it was a major modification, was the modified permit public noticed? | Choose an item. |

Section 8.1. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

8.2 Public Notice and Hearings

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Did the record include documentation of public notice? | Choose an item. |
| 2. Did the public notice include the content required by 40 CFR 124.10(d)? | Choose an item. |
| a. The name and address of the office processing the permit action. | Choose an item. |
| b. The name and address of the permittee or applicant and, if different, of the facility or activity regulated by the permit. | Choose an item. |
| c. A brief description of the business conducted at the facility or activity described in the permit or application. | Choose an item. |
| d. The name, address, and telephone number of a contact from whom interested persons can obtain additional information. | Choose an item. |
| e. A brief description of the comment procedures required and the time and place of any hearing to be held including procedures to request a hearing. | Choose an item. |
| f. For EPA-issued permits, the location and availability of the administrative record and the times at which the record will be open for public inspection. | Choose an item. |
| g. A statement that all data submitted by the applicant is available as part of the administrative record. | Choose an item. |
| h. A description of the location of each existing or proposed discharge point and the name of the receiving water and the sludge use and disposal practice(s) and the location of each sludge treatment works treating domestic sewage and use or disposal sites known at the time of permit application. | Choose an item. |
| i. Requirements applicable to cooling water intake structures under CWA section 316(b). | Choose an item. |
| 3. If a 316(a) variance was requested, did the public notice include contents required at 40 CFR 124.57? | Choose an item. |
| 4. Was the public notice period at least 30 days? | Choose an item. |
| 5. Did the record indicate whether comments were received? | Choose an item. |
| a. If yes, did the record identify or include all comments received? | Choose an item. |
| b. If yes, did the record include a written response to all significant comments? | Choose an item. |
| 6. Did the record indicate if a public hearing was held? | Choose an item. |
| a. If yes, was the recording or transcript part of the record? | Choose an item. |

Section 8.2. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

8.3 Administrative Record

1. Note whether any supporting documentation was not available in the record for review (list documents).
[Enter text here.](#)

9. Selected EPA Priorities

9.1 Climate Impacts and Resilience

1. Did the fact sheet indicate that the permit writer considered climate impacts and resilience in developing permit conditions? [Choose an item.](#)
- a. If yes, describe whether (and if so, how) climate considerations impacted permit conditions.
[Enter text here.](#)

Section 9.1. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

9.2 Environmental Justice

1. Did the permit writer evaluate the potential for adverse and disproportionate impacts to the community from the permit decision? [Choose an item.](#)
- a. If yes, describe how the analysis was conducted.
[Enter text here.](#)
2. Did the evaluation find the potential for adverse and disproportionate impacts to the community? [Choose an item.](#)
- a. If yes, describe the results (e.g., how the community was impacted).
[Enter text here.](#)
- b. If yes, describe if/how any permit conditions were affected by the evaluation (e.g., if the permitting authority mitigated identified water quality impacts or other impacts, as appropriate)
[Enter text here.](#)
3. Was there enhanced outreach to, and involvement of, any population adversely and disproportionately affected by the permitting action? [Choose an item.](#)
- a. If yes, describe.
[Enter text here.](#)

Section 9.2. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

9.3 PFAS

9.3.1 POTWs (Non-POTWs skip to section 9.3.2)

1. Did the permit require monitoring for PFAS for any of the following (check all that apply)? [Choose an item.](#)
- Influent Effluent Biosolids None
2. Did the permit require the POTW to update the industrial user (IU) inventory with industry categories expected or suspected of PFAS discharges? [Choose an item.](#)
3. If the POTW receives industrial discharges expected or suspected of PFAS, did the permit utilize BMPs and/or pollution prevention to reduce PFAS discharges to the POTW? [Choose an item.](#)
- If yes, specify: [Enter text here.](#)

9.3.2 Non-POTWs (POTWs skip to section 9.3.3)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Is the permit issued to an industry sector known or suspected to discharge PFAS?
<i>(Examples include: organic chemicals, plastics & synthetic fibers (OCPSF); metal finishing; electroplating; electric and electronic components; landfills; pulp, paper & paperboard; leather tanning & finishing; plastics molding & forming; textile mills; paint formulating, and airports. The state may have identified additional industries for which it regulates PFAS discharges.)</i> | Choose an item. |
| a. If yes, did the permit require monitoring for PFAS? | Choose an item. |
| b. If yes, did the permit include BMPs to reduce discharges of PFAS (e.g., BMP conditions based on pollution prevention/source reduction opportunities, or BMP permit special conditions)?
If yes, specify: Enter text here. | Choose an item. |
| c. If yes, did the permit contain numeric or narrative effluent limitations, where applicable? | Choose an item. |

9.3.3 All Permits

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. If the permit included monitoring for PFAS: | |
| a. Did the permit require use of CWA wastewater analytical methods? (check all that apply) | Choose an item. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Method 1633 <input type="checkbox"/> Method 1621 <input type="checkbox"/> Other methods <input type="checkbox"/> Method not specified | |
| i. If other methods, describe: Enter text here. | |
| b. Did the permit require monitoring for each of the 40 PFAS parameters detectable by method 1633? | Choose an item. |
| i. If monitoring was not required for all 40 PFAS parameters, specify which were included.
Enter text here. | |
| c. Did the permit require that all PFAS monitoring be conducted at least quarterly? | Choose an item. |
| 2. If the permit contained PFAS conditions, was the public notice of the draft permit provided to potentially affected public water systems (PWS)? | Choose an item. |

Section 9.3. Comments: [Enter text here.](#)

Permit Strengths: [Enter text here.](#)

Permit Areas for Improvement: [Enter text here.](#)

Clarifications Needed: [Enter text here.](#)