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INTRODUCTION

The City of Coos Bay owns two domestic wastewater treatment facilities located in Coos Bay, Oregon. Treatment facility #2 serves portions of the City of Coos Bay and the Charleston Sanitary District. Operation of this facility is by Operations Management International, Inc. (OMI).

Municipal wastewater is treated and discharged to Coos Bay in accordance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit number 100771. The NPDES Permit for the facility was issued on May 30, 1991 and expired on April 30, 1996.

The Department received a renewal application on September 5, 1995. The permit shall not be deemed to expire until final action has been taken on the renewal application as per Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 340-045-0040. A renewal permit is necessary to discharge to state waters pursuant to provisions of Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 468B.050 and the Federal Clean Water Act. The Department proposes to renew the permit. This permit evaluation report describes the basis and methodology used in developing the permit.

This permit is a joint federal and state permit and subject to federal and state regulations. The Clean Water Act, the Code of Federal Regulations, and numerous guidelines of the Environmental Protection Agency provide the federal permit requirements. The Oregon Revised Statutes, Oregon Administrative Rules, and policies and guidelines of the Department of Environmental Quality provide the state permitting requirements.

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The City developed a combined sanitary-storm water sewer system starting in 1949. A primary treatment plant was first constructed at this location (see Attachment #1) in 1964. Secondary treatment (complete mix activated sludge with surface aerators) was added in 1973 under an EPA Construction Grant. Until separation began in 1971, the entire system operated as a combined storm-sanitary system. In 1991, the facility was extensively refurbished and upgraded to provide Class I mechanical and electrical reliability up to an instantaneous peak hydraulic flow of 4.84 MGD.

By the end of 1991, the city had completed a major rehabilitation of the sewers, pump stations and wastewater treatment facility. These improvements have enabled the entire wet weather flow to be conveyed without bypass at the treatment plant and have also reduced salt water intrusion into the collection system. Overflows from pump stations and the collection system into the bay have occurred due to large storms. The treatment facility receives primarily domestic wastewater from residential and commercial sources from a population of approximately 10,000.

The basic treatment process is activated sludge with effluent chlorination and anaerobic digestion of biosolids (see Attachment #2). The facility's approved design average dry weather flow (ADWF) is 2.02 million gallons per day (MGD) but is capable of treating a peak hydraulic flow of 4.84 MGD. The facility is unmanned at night, but has 24 hour manned telemetry of alarms through the city Police Department and also has a standby power generator.

The treatment plant upgrade did not allow for organic loadings associated with septage, and the plant has no facilities for the unloading, screening, holding, and blending of septage into the flowstream in a controlled manner. The proposed permit prohibits acceptance of septage.
The collection system for the Empire area contains four pump stations. Eleven (11) stations are located in Charleston and are operated and maintained by the Charleston Sanitary District. All pump stations are built to Class I reliability Standards, all are manned by 24 hour telemetry at this time and have standby power capability through installed generators.

Biosolids Management and Utilization

The permittee’s biosolids management plan was approved April 3, 1989. All waste sludge must be managed in accordance with the Department approved Biosolids Management Plan to ensure compliance with the federal biosolids regulations (40 CFR Part 503). The Department is proposing to approve an updated Biosolids Management Plan as a part of this NPDES Permit renewal action (see Attachment 3).

After treatment necessary to comply with vector attraction and pathogen reduction requirements, the Class B biosolids can be beneficially land applied on sites in Coos County. The permittee may continue to utilize all previously authorized land application sites. Any future land application sites must conform to the site selection criteria in the Biosolids Management Plan and must be located in Coos County.

Primary and secondary sludges are co-settled in the primary clarifier and pumped to the anaerobic digesters. The primary digester is heated and mixed. Digested sludge is trucked across the bay to the Facultative Sludge Lagoon in Eastside. Digested sludge from Plant #1 is pumped directly to the sewage lagoon. The size of the lagoon is adequate to accommodate sludge from both plants.

The lagoon is approximately four surface acres by eleven feet deep and contains two inlet points, this enables sludge to be discharged into one end of the lagoon at a time. The other is then dedicated to curing and storage for pathogen reduction. The floor and sides of the lagoon were sealed with bentonite clay. Groundwater monitoring wells have not been installed since any leakage would be into the Bay and not groundwater. A leak test was performed when it was constructed and there is no visual evidence that leakage is occurring. The lagoon yields a weak supernatant which is aerated and pumped into the Eastside collection system for eventual treatment at Plant #1. Sludge is harvested by a floating dredge after storage for a year or more and land applied to private farmlands and forest sites as a beneficial supplement. The city has approximately 250 acres approved for land application of digested sludge as biosolids. Biosolids applications generally occur between June 1 and October 1 each year.

The City conducts chemical testing of sludge removed from the lagoon. Testing includes analyses for nutrients and eleven metals. Based on the past analyses, there are no known potential impacts from the current land application program.

Table 1 – Biosolids Metals Results for 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mg/dry Kg</th>
<th>§503.13 Table 3 Limit</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mg/dry Kg</th>
<th>§503.13 Table 3 Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>41 mg/kg</td>
<td>Molybdenum</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>39 mg/kg</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>420 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>100 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1500 mg/kg</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>300 mg/kg</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>2800 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflow and Infiltration (I/I)

During the 2001 and 2002 dry weather periods (May 1 through October 31), the plant's average flow was 1.55 MGD with a daily maximum flow of 0.96 MGD in May 2002. During the 2001/02 wet weather period
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(November 1 through April 30), the average flow to the facility was 1.20 MGD with maximum daily flow as high as 3.02 MGD in January 2002. (The 2000/01 wet weather period occurred during a severe drought and the plant only had an average flow of 0.86 MGD.)

There have been system overflows due to stormwater, pump station malfunction or line plugging, which the City is addressing with a major revamping of the collection system. There is strong indication that the collection system has significant Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) since peak flows are nearly ten times the average dry weather flows.

**Industrial Pretreatment**

The City of Coos Bay has conducted an approved industrial pretreatment program since 1988. The only significant industrial user was the Bay Area Hospital which contributes its wastewater to Plant #1. Annual reports including updated surveys are submitted yearly. The Department, in a letter dated April 18, 1995, issued a Notice of Noncompliance for failure to submit the 1994 annual pretreatment report as required by Schedule E, condition 1.e. of the current permit.

The City has requested that the Department delete the pretreatment program requirements from the City's NPDES permit. The Department has put this request on hold until information has been supplied that details the City's legal authority for implementing pretreatment requirements with the various Sanitary Districts utilizing the City's collection system.

A formal permit modification will be necessary if the pretreatment program can be delisted at some future date. The Department’s determination will be based on the City’s documentation demonstrating that all federal requirements have been met for delisting. The permit modification would delete all of Schedule E and adjust monitoring requirements in Schedule B.

**Groundwater Issues**

The treatment plant is constructed entirely of impervious structures. It is not anticipated that the treatment process and discharge to surface waters will cause groundwater impacts. Schedule A of the proposed permit prohibits adverse impacts to groundwater. Schedule D of the proposed permit states that no groundwater evaluations will be required during this permit cycle.

**Stormwater Issues**

Stormwater is not addressed in this permit. General NPDES permits are required for wastewater treatment facilities with stormwater discharges if the design flow is 1 MGD or more. All stormwater at this facility flows through the treatment processes and is not discharged as stormwater.

**Outfalls**

The current NPDES Permit allows the treatment facility to discharge treated effluent into Coos Bay just west of the plant at River Mile 4.5. However, the Department’s GIS tool identifies the discharge location as River Mile 3.8. The renewal permit will include a river mile of 3.8.

The outfall consists of a 27 inch lined and coated concrete pipe approximately 1,826 feet long and discharges directly west of the plant site near the dredged channel. The end of the outfall is marked with a timber pylon. There are five port diffusers spaced 7.5 feet apart.

Four emergency overflow points are identified in the permit. Their use is restricted to storm events as allowed under OAR 340-041-0120(13) and (14) and instances of upset as defined in the General Conditions.
During the current permit period, the collection system has overflowed several times at manholes due to blockage and high storm flows through inflow and infiltration.

Mixing Zone Analysis

The Clean Water Act allows for the use of mixing zones, also known as “allocated impact zones”, as long as acute toxicity to drifting organisms is prevented and the integrity of the waterbody as a whole is not impaired. Mixing zones allow the initial mixing of waste and receiving water, but are not designed to allow for treatment. The EPA does not have specific regulations pertaining to mixing zones. Each state must adopt its own mixing zone regulations.

The Department has adopted the two-number aquatic life criteria and developed mixing zone regulations with respect to that. The regulations are primarily narrative and essentially require the permit writer to use best professional judgment in establishing the size of the mixing zone. There are essentially two allowable mixing zones for each discharge: 1) The acute mixing zone, also known as the zone of initial dilution (ZID), and 2) the chronic mixing zone, referred to as the mixing zone. The acute mixing zone is designed to prevent lethality to organisms passing through the ZID. The chronic mixing zone is designed to protect the integrity of the entire water body as a whole. The allowable size of the mixing zone should be based upon the relative size of the discharge to the receiving stream, the beneficial uses of the receiving stream, location of other discharges to the same water body, location of drinking water intakes, and other considerations. More specific guidance is available from the EPA regarding criteria used in appropriately sizing a ZID.

The Department’s mixing zone regulations state the mixing zone must be less than the total stream width as necessary to allow passage of fish and other aquatic organisms. Early recommendations regarding the size of the zone of passage originated from the Department of Interior (1968). They recommended a zone of passage of 75 percent of the cross-sectional area and/or volume of flow of the receiving stream. Based on this recommendation, the Department’s standard practice is to allow no more than 25 percent of the stream flow for mixing zones.

The current permit provides for a mixing zone of a 50 foot radius around the point of discharge. There is no ZID defined in the permit. In accordance with the existing permit, a mixing zone study was completed in August, 1991, by CH2M Hill and recommends that the ZID and mixing zone be expanded in order to meet the acute and chronic criteria for total residual chlorine at the ZID and mixing zone boundaries, respectively. The Department is proposing to retain the existing mixing zone. However, a ZID of 5 feet is proposed in this permit renewal.

Recreational shellfishing regularly occurs within the mixing zone boundaries. Therefore, the fecal coliform criteria applicable to shellfishing waters will be applied as an end of pipe limitation.

Receiving Stream Water Quality

The City’s discharge from STP #2 is to Coos Bay at River Mile 3.8. The basin name is South Coast. The sub-basin name is Coos. The designated beneficial uses of the receiving stream are: industrial water supply, anadromous fish passage, salmonid spawning and rearing, resident fish and aquatic life, wildlife and hunting, fishing, boating, water contact recreation, aesthetic quality and commercial navigation and transportation. The water quality standards for the South Coast Basin (OAR 340-041-0325) were developed to protect the beneficial uses for the basin.

Upper Coos Bay is water quality limited from Jordan Cove to Marshfield Channel for violating the fecal coliform criteria for marine and shellfish growing areas. Therefore, the discharge of bacteria needs to be considered in this permit renewal.
Stream temperatures are generally rising throughout the State of Oregon and many streams violate the applicable temperature standard in the summer. The Department's 1998 List of Water Quality Limited Water Bodies (303(d) List) does not include Coos Bay as Water Quality Limited for temperature. However, the temperature standard also includes a requirement of no measurable temperature increase outside the mixing zone in stream segments containing federally listed Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species if the increase would impair the biological integrity of the T&E population.

According to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) fish distribution maps and discussions with ODF&W staff, Coho salmon are found in Coos Bay between March and June and between September and December each year. The National Marine Fisheries Service has listed Coho salmon as Threatened in the Oregon Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU).

An evaluation of potential temperature impacts was performed for the months that Coho salmon are present (see Attachment #4). The evaluation was based on DEQ's ambient temperature data taken in the bay, effluent temperature data taken by the facility staff and the dilution available within the mixing zone at critical case conditions.

The evaluation showed that the discharge will not cause a measurable increase in stream temperature. A "measurable increase" is defined as greater than a 0.25°F increase at the edge of the mixing zone (OAR 340-041-0006(55)). October was the month with the highest theoretical temperature increase (0.16°F increase). Based on the evaluation, a Temperature Management Plan has not been required from this source.

No information is available concerning the concentration of metals in the receiving stream. The permit includes a requirement that the permittee monitor eleven metals and cyanide in Coos Bay semi-annually for one year. Monitoring is to be performed on one day the effluent is also being monitored for metals. Mercury monitoring must be conducted in accordance with EPA Method 1631. Silver must be monitored using a "clean" sampling method, an "ultra-clean" sampling method, EPA method 1669 or any other test method approved by the Department with a detection limit of 0.1 µg/L or less.

PERMIT HISTORY

Previous Permit Actions
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit number 100771 was issued on May 30, 1991 and expired on April 30, 1996. The Department received a renewal application on September 11, 1995. The permit shall not be deemed to expire until final action has been taken on the renewal application.

An Antidegradation Review was completed with a recommendation to proceed with this permit action (see Attachment #5).

Current Permit Limits
The current permit limits are as follows:

Outfall 001 – Treated Effluent

(1) May 1 - October 31:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD₃</td>
<td>20 mg/L 30 mg/L</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>20 mg/L 30 mg/L</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal coliform</td>
<td>200 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **November 1 - April 30:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD₃</td>
<td>30 mg/L 45 mg/L</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>30 mg/L 45 mg/L</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal coliform</td>
<td>200 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Other parameters (year-round)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>Shall be within the range of 6.0 - 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD₃ and TSS Removal Efficiency</td>
<td>Shall not be less than 85% monthly average for BOD₃ and 85% monthly for TSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a daily median value of 0.5 mg/l and no single sample shall exceed 1.0 mg/l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance History**

This facility was last inspected September 10, 2002 and was found to be operating in compliance with the permit. The following Notices of Noncompliance (NON) have been issued for violations documented at this facility since 1994:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of NON</th>
<th>NON Class</th>
<th>Description of Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/19/99</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Raw sewage overflows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a NON was issued to the Coos Bay #1 facility on January 5, 1996 for violations of a General NPDES stormwater permit. Subsequent to the violation, all stormwater at this plant site was directed to the wet well and receives full treatment in the plant.

NON's are informal enforcement actions. Formal enforcement actions include Notice of Permit Violation (NPV), Civil Penalties (CP) and Department Orders (DO). The following formal enforcement actions have been taken against the City by the Department since 1993:

All penalties have been paid. The other violations are either considered to be minor and/or have been corrected. Therefore, the Department considers this facility to be in substantial compliance with the terms of the current permit. There is no record of any complaints about this facility.

PERMIT LIMITATIONS

Two categories of effluent limitations exist for NPDES permits: 1) Technology based effluent limits, and 2) Water quality based effluent limits. Technology based effluent limits have been established by EPA rules. Technology based effluent limits were established to require a minimum level of treatment for industrial or municipal sources using available technology. Water quality based effluent limits are designed to be protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water and are independent of the available treatment technology.

In addition, when performing a permit renewal, there are existing permit limits (discussed above). These may be technology-based limits, water quality-based limits, or limits based on best professional judgment. When renewing a permit, the most stringent of technology-based, water quality-based, and existing effluent limits must be applied.

Technology-Based Effluent Limits

EPA has established secondary treatment standards for domestic wastewater treatment facilities. The standards are found in 40 CFR Part 133. This facility must achieve a biochemical oxygen demand (BOD$_5$) and suspended solids (TSS) monthly average of 30 mg/L and a weekly average of 45 mg/L. The pH must be between 6.0 and 9.0. In addition, the facility must remove at least 85% of the influent BOD$_5$ and TSS.

Oregon Administrative Rules establish minimum design criteria for domestic treatment facilities. In the South Coast Basin the BOD$_5$ and TSS minimum design criteria is 20 mg/L as a monthly average in the summer period and secondary treatment in the winter period. In addition, there are requirements for disinfection and dilution of oxygen demanding pollutants.

Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits

Pollutant parameters should be limited if there is a reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality criteria or standard. A reasonable potential analysis (RPA) was performed by inserting the data accumulated during 2001 into DEQ spreadsheets.

The RPA (see Attachment #6) for chlorine and ammonia was conducted based on acute and chronic water quality criteria and the available dilution. Since the ammonia criteria is dependent upon temperature and pH, the evaluation was performed on a seasonal basis. The evaluation indicated that the chlorine concentrations in the effluent have a reasonable potential to cause an excursion above the state water quality criteria. There is a reasonable potential for ammonia to cause an excursion above the state water quality criteria in the summer but not the winter. The proposed permit includes limitations on total residual chlorine year-round and ammonia in the summer (see discussion below under Schedule A).

The second sheet of the RPA evaluates the potential for toxicity from metals and cyanide. When sampling of a particular parameter resulted in the parameter not being detected in the effluent, the Department used ½ of the detection level in the spreadsheet calculations. No information was available concerning the background ambient concentrations. Silver was generally not detected in the effluent but during one 3 consecutive day sampling event, silver was found each day at concentrations nearing 10 µg/L. The evaluation indicated such levels had a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the water quality criteria. The proposed permit does not include a limitation on silver due to the anomalous nature of the results. Additional monitoring using low detection level testing for one year is required in the
renewal permit. The Department will evaluate the results of the additional testing to determine whether or not a silver limit is necessary.

The spreadsheet indicated none of the other metals or cyanide had a reasonable potential to cause any excursion above state water quality criteria. Depending upon the background concentrations, it is possible that the spreadsheet could indicate mercury also has reasonable potential to cause an excursion. Mercury has not been detected at measurable concentrations in the effluent with the test methods used.

The Department does not have enough information to determine whether or not these metals in the discharge have an actual potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the state water quality criteria. Therefore, the proposed permit requires the permittee to monitor metals and cyanide in the receiving stream semi-annually for a period of one year.

PERMIT DRAFT DISCUSSION

The proposed permit limits and conditions are described below. Refer to the proposed permit and the discussion above when reviewing this section.

Face Page

The face page provides information about the permittee, description of the wastewater, outfall locations, receiving stream information, permit approval authority, and a description of permitted activities. The permittee is authorized to construct, install, modify, or operate a wastewater collection, treatment, control and disposal system. Permits discharge of treated effluent to Coos Bay within limits set by Schedule A and the following schedules. All other discharges are prohibited.

Schedule A, Waste Discharge Limitations

Schedule A contains two tiers of effluent limitations for this discharge. Upon issuance, the winter BOD5 and TSS mass load limits will be based on the average dry weather flow. Once the City obtains the legal authority to implement the provisions of OAR 340-041-0120(9)(a)(G)(iv) in tributary collection systems, the winter mass load limits in Schedule A, Condition 2 will automatically become effective. The proposed limits are:

1. Waste Discharge Limitations not to be exceeded after permit issuance
   a. Treated Effluent Outfall 001

   (1) May 1 - October 31:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>20 mg/L</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>20 mg/L</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (2) November 1 - April 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>45 mg/L</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>45 mg/L</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Waste Discharge Limitations not to be exceeded after submitting documentation that the authority to implement OAR 340-041-0120(9)(a)(G)(iv) in tributary collection systems has been obtained.

a. Treated Effluent Outfall 001

(1) May 1 - October 31:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations Monthly</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD$_5$</td>
<td>20 mg/L</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>20 mg/L</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) November 1 - April 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations Monthly</th>
<th>Average Effluent Concentrations Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Weekly Average lb/day</th>
<th>Daily Maximum lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD$_5$</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>45 mg/L</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>30 mg/L</td>
<td>45 mg/L</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Other waste Discharge Limitations not to be exceeded after permit issuance.

a. Treated Effluent Outfall 001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other parameters (year-round except as noted)</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform Bacteria</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a monthly median of 14 organisms per 100 mL. Not more than 10 percent of the samples shall exceed 43 organisms per 100 mL. (See Note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>Shall be within the range of 6.0 - 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD$_5$ and TSS Removal Efficiency</td>
<td>Shall not be less than 85% monthly average for BOD$_5$ and TSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a monthly average concentration of 0.02 mg/l and a daily maximum concentration of 0.05 mg/l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia-N (May 1 - October 31)</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a monthly average concentration of 20 mg/L and a daily maximum concentration of 30 mg/L (See Note 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Thermal Load (May 1 - October 31)</td>
<td>Shall not exceed 37 Million kcals/day as a weekly average. (See Note 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOD and TSS Concentration and Mass Limits
Based on the South Coast Basin minimum design criteria, wastewater treatment resulting in a monthly average effluent concentration of 20 mg/L for BOD$_5$ and TSS must be provided from May 1 - October 31. From November 1 - April 30, a minimum of secondary treatment or equivalent control is required. Secondary treatment for this facility is defined as monthly average concentration limit of 30 mg/L for BOD$_5$ and TSS.
The Department is proposing concentration limits at least as stringent as the basin minimum design criteria. The proposed monthly average summer BOD₅ and TSS concentration limits are 20 mg/L with a weekly average limit of 30 mg/L. The proposed monthly average winter BOD₅ and TSS concentration limits are 30 mg/L with a weekly average limit of 45 mg/L.

The facility's summer mass limits for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the design average dry weather flow (ADWF) of 2.02 MGD and the monthly average BOD₅ and TSS concentration limit of 20 mg/L. The current winter mass load limits are based on the design ADWF and the monthly average BOD₅ and TSS concentration limit of 30 mg/L. The proposed permit retains the current winter mass load limits as limits that must be met upon issuance.

However, the Department's rules (OAR 340-41-120(9)(a)) allow the winter mass load limitations to be based on design wet weather flow (AWWF). Calculations determined the AWWF to be 2.8 MGD. Therefore, the winter mass load limits for the facility proposed in this permit may be based on the design AWWF of 2.8 MGD and the monthly average BOD₅ and TSS concentration limit of 30 mg/L. On any day that the daily flow exceeds 4.04 MGD (twice the design ADWF), the daily mass load limits shall not apply. By basing the winter mass limits on AWWF, the permittee is required to remove all inflow sources from the collection system. Once the permittee obtains the legal authority to require implementation of the inflow removal program in tributary collection systems, the higher AWWF based limits will automatically become effective. The proposed permit includes a Schedule C condition requiring submittal of a program and time schedule for identifying and removing inflow.

The calculations for the limits upon issuance are:

1. Summer BOD₅ and TSS
   a. 2.02 MGD x 8.34 #/gal x 20 mg/L monthly avg. = 337 lbs/day
   b. 337 lbs/day monthly avg. x 1.5 = 506 lbs/day weekly avg.
   c. 337 lbs/day monthly avg. x 2.0 = 674 lbs/day daily max.

2. Winter BOD₅ and TSS
   a. 2.02 MGD x 8.34 #/gal x 30 mg/L monthly avg. = 505 lbs/day
   b. 505 lbs/day monthly avg. x 1.5 = 758 lbs/day weekly avg.
   c. 505 lbs/day monthly avg. x 2.0 = 1010 lbs/day daily max.

The calculations for the limits upon compliance with 340-041-0120(9)(a)(G)(iv) are:

1. Summer BOD₅ and TSS
   a. 2.02 MGD x 8.34 #/gal x 20 mg/L monthly avg. = 337 lbs/day
   b. 337 lbs/day monthly avg. x 1.5 = 506 lbs/day weekly avg.
   c. 337 lbs/day monthly avg. x 2.0 = 674 lbs/day daily max.

2. Winter BOD₅ and TSS
   a. 2.8 MGD x 8.34 lbs/gal x 30 mg/L monthly avg. = 700.6 lbs/day
   b. 700.6 lbs/day monthly avg. x 1.5 = 1050.8 lbs/day weekly avg.
   c. 700.6 lbs/day monthly avg. x 2.0 = 1401.1 lbs/day daily max.
All mass load limitations are rounded to two significant figures. A review of monitoring data (see Attachment #7) from 1995 to the present indicates the City should generally be able to comply with the permit limits.

**BOD and TSS Percent Removal Efficiency**

A minimum level of percent removal for BOD₃ and TSS for municipal dischargers is required by the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) secondary treatment standards (40 CFR, Part 133). An 85 percent removal efficiency limit is included in the proposed permit to comply with federal requirements.

**pH**

The South Coast Basin Water Quality Standard for pH in estuarine waters is found in OAR 340-041-0325(2)(d). The allowed range is 6.5 to 8.5. The proposed permit limits pH to the range 6.0 to 9.0. This limit is based on Federal wastewater treatment guidelines for sewage treatment facilities, and is applied to the majority of NPDES permittees in the state. Within the permittee's mixing zone, the water quality standard for pH does not have to be met. According to the Reasonable Potential Analysis (see Attachment #6), mixing with ambient water within the mixing zone will ensure that the pH at the edge of the mixing zone meets the standard. The Department considers the proposed permit limits to be protective of the water quality standard.

**Fecal Coliform bacteria**

The shellfishing standard is a median concentration of 14 organisms per 100 mL. Recreational shellfishing regularly occurs within the mixing zone boundaries. The proposed permit includes end-of-pipe effluent limits on discharges of fecal coliform equal to the fecal coliform criteria applicable to shellfishing waters. The limits are adequate to comply with the basin water quality standard for marine waters and estuarine shellfish growing waters at the point of discharge.

The contact recreation standard is 126 \( E. coli \) per 100 mL, with no sample to exceed 406 \( E. coli \) per 100 mL. Since \( E. coli \) is a subset of fecal coliform, compliance with the proposed fecal coliform limit will ensure compliance with the contact recreation standard.

Compliance with the permit limits will not cause or contribute to the existing violation of the bacterial water quality standard. However, when the bacterial Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is issued, the TMDL could include Waste Load Allocations (WLA) or best management practices for point source dischargers. Therefore, the proposed permit includes a reopener clause allowing the Department to reopen the permit upon issuance of the TMDL and include limits or conditions as needed.

In accordance with OAR 340-041-0026(3)(a)(I), this NPDES permit constitutes the City’s bacterial management plan.

**Total Chlorine Residual**

Chlorine is added at the discharge from the secondary clarifiers to disinfect the plant effluent and comply with the waste discharge limitations for bacteria. The South Coast Basin minimum design criteria (OAR 340-041-0335) requires the City to provide disinfection facilities capable of achieving 1.0 mg/L total chlorine residual. This level could be considered a technology based minimum concentration.

Chlorine is a known toxic substance and as such is subject to limitation under Oregon Administrative Rules. The rule (OAR 340-041-0325(2)(p)) states in part that toxic substances shall not be discharged to waters of the state at levels that adversely affect public health, aquatic life or other designated beneficial uses. In addition, levels of toxic substances shall not exceed the criteria listed in Table 20 which were based on criteria established by the EPA and published in Quality Criteria for Water (1986), unless otherwise noted.
However, OAR 340-041-0325(4) states that the Department may allow a designated portion of a receiving water to serve as a zone of dilution for wastewaters and receiving waters to mix thoroughly and this zone will be defined as a mixing zone. The Department may suspend all or part of the water quality standards, or set less restrictive standards, in the defined mixing zone, provided the water within the mixing zone is free of materials in concentrations that will cause acute toxicity to aquatic life as measured by the acute Whole Effluent Toxicity method, and outside the boundary of the mixing zone is free of materials in concentrations that will cause chronic toxicity.

Furthermore, 40 CFR §122.44(d) states that permit limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality. The salt water criteria for chlorine were used to calculate permit limitations. According to OAR 340-041, Table 20, chlorine concentrations of 7.5 μg/L can result in chronic toxicity in salt waters while 13 μg/L can result in acute chlorine toxicity in salt waters.

Compliance with acute toxicity criteria is required at the edge of the Zone of Immediate Dilution (ZID) and compliance with chronic toxicity criteria is required at the edge of the mixing zone. For the facility, outfall, and mixing zone as presently configured, the estimated dilution factor at the edge of the ZID is 4:1 during critical low stream flow conditions. The mixing zone study determined that the dilution factor at the edge of the mixing zone is 41:1 during critical low flow conditions.

The available dilutions at critical case conditions were used to perform a reasonable potential analysis for chlorine (see Attachment #6). The analysis indicated there was a reasonable potential for chlorine to cause toxicity within the receiving stream.

Therefore, permit limits based on the acute and chronic criteria were calculated. Since the acute and chronic criteria are based on different durations, the durations have to be equalized using a DEQ spreadsheet program to determine the more restrictive criteria (see Attachment #8).

In this case, the acute criterion is the more stringent of the two. Thus, end-of-pipe limits based on that criteria were calculated. The calculated limits are 0.02 mg/L monthly average and a daily maximum of 0.05 mg/L.

The current permit contains the following total residual chlorine limit:

Shall not exceed a daily median value of 0.5 mg/L and no single sample shall exceed 1.0 mg/L.

The water quality based limit is more restrictive than the technology based minimum and the existing permit limit. Therefore, the Department is proposing to include the following water quality based limits in the permit:

Shall not exceed a monthly average concentration of 0.02 mg/L and a daily maximum concentration of 0.05 mg/L.

A file review of recent effluent monitoring data shows that the chlorine residual regularly exceeds these limits. The permittee does not currently have the ability to dechlorinate the discharge to reduce potential toxic effects on the receiving stream. Therefore, the Department is proposing to enter into a Mutual Agreement and Order (MAO) with the permittee. The MAO includes a compliance schedule for addressing chlorine toxicity requirements. The MAO also contains interim limits of 0.50 mg/L monthly average and 1.0 mg/L daily maximum for this parameter. This interim limit is based on the estimated ability of the treatment plant to achieve compliance with disinfection requirements for the effluent.
Ammonia
Ammonia is a substance normally found in wastewater. The wastewater treatment processes, particularly aeration and biological treatment, can convert a large portion to nitrate and nitrite but the treated effluent still contains some ammonia. After discharge, the continued process of oxidizing the ammonia removes dissolved oxygen from the ambient water.

Unionized ammonia is also a toxic agent and may have to be limited to prevent toxicity. As with chlorine residual, the water outside the boundary of the mixing zone shall be free of materials in concentrations that will cause chronic (sublethal) toxicity while the water outside the ZID must be free of pollutants that will cause acute toxicity.

If ammonia may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard (dissolved oxygen or toxicity), it must be limited by the permit. The ambient water conditions in Coos Bay consistently comply with the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen. No permit limit for ammonia based on dissolved oxygen is necessary. In order to determine if a permit limit for ammonia is needed based on toxicity, a more detailed evaluation was performed.

According to EPA's 1986 Quality Criteria for Water and OAR 340-41, Table 20, toxic concentrations of total ammonia are pH and temperature dependent. The pH at this location in Coos Bay ranges up to 8.2 with temperature levels as high as 16°C in late summer. Salmonids were assumed to be present. Using a DEQ spreadsheet program (see Attachment #6), an analysis was performed to determine if the discharge will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to any excursion above state water quality standard for ammonia in the summer.

Forty effluent ammonia concentration results from the summer period were reviewed. The highest concentration found was 33.4 mg/L. Using the CORMIX dilution within the mixing zone and the estimated dilution within the ZID and, the spreadsheet calculated that there was a reasonable potential for chronic toxicity due to ammonia. The Department proposes ammonia limits be included in the permit for the summer period.

Forty-three effluent ammonia concentration results from the winter period were reviewed. The highest concentration found was 28.4 mg/L. Using pH and temperatures appropriate for the season, the spreadsheet calculated that there was no reasonable potential for chronic toxicity due to ammonia. No ammonia limits are included in the permit for the winter period.

Using the critical case conditions (listed above), the critical case effluent conditions (7.6 for pH and 20°C) and dilution factors, the expected pH and temperature conditions at the edge of the mixing zone and ZID were calculated using a DEQ spreadsheet (see Attachments #6 and #8). Instream background levels of ammonia can be as high as 0.24 mg/L.

Using these values, new end-of-pipe limits based on the criteria were calculated. The proposed summer period limits are 20 mg/L monthly average and 30 mg/L daily maximum.

In this case, the acute criterion is the more stringent of the two. Thus, end-of-pipe limits based on that criterion were calculated. The calculated limits are 20 mg/L monthly average and a daily maximum of 30 mg/L. The current permit does not contain a limit on ammonia. The water quality based limit is the most restrictive permit limit. Therefore, the Department is proposing to include the following water quality based limits in the permit for the period of May 1 through October 31 each year:
Shall not exceed a monthly average concentration of 20 mg/L and a daily maximum concentration of 30 mg/L.

A file review of effluent monitoring data shows that the ammonia concentrations regularly exceed these limits. The permittee may not currently have the ability to reduce ammonia levels in the discharge to reduce potential toxic effects on the receiving stream. Therefore, the Department is proposing to enter into a Mutual Agreement and Order (MAO) with the permittee. The MAO includes a compliance schedule for addressing ammonia toxicity requirements. The MAO also contains interim limits of 30 mg/L monthly average and 40 mg/L daily maximum for this parameter. This interim limit is based on the estimated ability of the treatment plant to achieve compliance in the effluent.

Excess Thermal Load
Point source dischargers are required to help stop and reverse the warming trend. In order to prevent further warming, most discharge permits will identify the maximum allowable temperature or thermal load that can be discharged. The permit must also prohibit further increases.

The Department is proposing to include a limit on Excess Thermal Load in this permit. This is defined as the amount of heat in the discharge above 64°F. It is based on the maximum thermal discharge that is expected to occur during the summer with the existing design flow and effluent temperatures. The thermal load limit was calculated using the weekly average dry weather design (monthly average dry weather design flow times 1.5) and the degrees Fahrenheit that the maximum expected weekly average of daily maximum effluent temperature exceeds the applicable stream temperature standard, as follows:

\[2.02 \text{DADWF (MGD)} \times 1.5 \times 8.34 \text{#/gallon} \times (69.8 \text{maximum effluent temperature in °F} - 64 \text{applicable standard in °F}) \times 1 \text{BTU/lb °F} \\
\times 0.252 \text{kcals/BTU} = 37 \text{million kcals/day}.
\]

The limit applies during the period May 1 through October 31 each year. The permit may be reopened and the maximum allowable thermal load modified (up or down), when more accurate effluent temperature data becomes available. If the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for temperature for this sub-basin assigns a Waste Load Allocation (WLA) to this source, this permit may be re-opened to establish new thermal load limits and/or new temperature conditions or requirements.

Mixing Zone
The current permit provides for a mixing zone of a 50 foot radius around the point of discharge. There is no ZID defined in the current permit. The Department is proposing to retain the existing mixing zone but include a ZID of 5 feet in this permit renewal.

The Department believes that the beneficial uses of the receiving stream will not be affected by the discharge and this mixing zone and that the defined mixing zone meets the criteria in the rule.

Outfall 002 – 005
No waste may be discharged from these outfalls unless it is due to a storm event as allowed under OAR 340-41-120(13) and (14). In the summer, raw sewage overflows are prohibited except during a storm event greater than the one-in-ten-year, 24-hour duration storm. In the winter, overflows are prohibited except during a storm event greater than the one-in-five-year, 24-hour duration storm.

Schedule B - Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements
Schedule B describes the minimum monitoring and reporting necessary to demonstrate compliance with the conditions of this permit. The authority to require periodic reporting by permittees is included in ORS 468.065(5). Self-monitoring requirements are the primary means of ensuring that permit limitations are
being met. However, other parameters need to be monitored to collect information when insufficient information exists to set a limit, but where there is a potential for a water quality concern.

In 1988, the Department developed a monitoring matrix for commonly monitored parameters. Proposed monitoring frequencies for all parameters are based on this matrix and, in some cases, may have changed from the current permit. The proposed monitoring frequencies for all parameters correspond to those of facilities of similar size and complexity in the state.

The permittee is required to have a laboratory Quality Assurance/Quality Control program. The Department recognizes that some tests do not accurately reflect the performance of a treatment facility due to quality assurance/quality control problems. These tests should not be considered when evaluating the compliance of the facility with the permit limitations. Thus, the Department is also proposing to include in the opening paragraph of Schedule B a statement recognizing that some test results may be inaccurate, invalid, do not adequately represent the facility's performance and should not be used in calculations required by the permit.

Below is a discussion of some of the minimum monitoring requirements contained in the proposed permit:

**Influent and Outfall 001 (Treated Effluent)**

Daily monitoring of the influent flow, the chlorine used for disinfection and the total residual chlorine concentration in the effluent is required in this permit. In addition, calibration of the flow meter is required every six months. Bacteria monitoring for fecal coliform must be performed on the discharge twice per week. There is no change in the frequency of analysis for these parameters.

Monitoring of the influent and effluent for BOD$_5$ and TSS will be required twice per week. Monitoring of the influent and effluent for pH will be required three times per week. There is no change in the frequency of analysis for these parameters.

Temperature monitoring of the effluent is required year round. In addition, the permittee will be required to calculate the weekly average of the daily maximum effluent temperatures and the weekly average thermal load discharged. These are new requirements.

Because this Permittee implements a Department approved pretreatment program, the Department has required whole effluent toxicity (WET) tests using two species in the proposed permit. Generally, facilities with pretreatment programs are required to perform WET testing on a quarterly basis. However, since no categorical industrial users discharge to the treatment plant, the Department is proposing to require WET testing on a semi-annual basis. Whole Effluent Toxicity tests are to be conducted in accordance with EPA test methods and procedural requirements as defined in Schedule D.

The Department recognizes that the Whole Effluent Toxicity tests are quite expensive to conduct. If the results of the first year's Whole Effluent Toxicity tests show that the effluent samples are not toxic at the dilutions determined to occur at the Zone of Immediate Dilution and the Mixing Zone, no further Whole Effluent Toxicity testing will be required during this permit cycle.

Silver must be monitored during the first year after permit issuance using a “clean” sampling method, an “ultra-clean” sampling method, EPA method 1669 or any other test method approved by the Department with a detection limit of 0.1 μg/L or less. In addition, the permittee must monitor for specific toxic pollutants (metals including silver and cyanide) in the plant influent and effluent for three consecutive days every six months. Except for silver, there is no change in the frequency of analysis for these parameters. Two additional metals (arsenic and selenium) have been added and monitoring for total phenols has been...
deleted. During the first year after permit issuance, monitoring for mercury must be conducted in accordance with EPA Method 1631.

Since the silver and mercury tests will likely be more costly, silver and mercury monitoring may be conducted according to any test procedures approved by 40 CFR Part 136 after the first year of monitoring unless otherwise notified in writing by the Department. The Department will base its determination upon the ability of the permittee to consistently comply with the water quality criteria. This monitoring will allow the Department to ensure all of the parameters continue to have no reasonable potential for causing or contributing to water quality standard violations.

Biosolids
Volatile solids reduction in the biosolids is the process used to demonstrate compliance with vector attraction reduction requirements. Monitoring of volatile solids reduction is proposed in the renewal permit at the same frequency as the existing permit.

Digestion of the biosolids is the process used to demonstrate compliance with pathogen reduction requirements. Monitoring the duration and temperature of biosolids digestion is proposed in the renewal permit. This is a new requirement.

Monitoring of the Biosolids for solids and nutrient content is reduced to annually. Monitoring of the Biosolids for metals and cyanide is still required semi-annually. Two additional metals (arsenic and selenium) have been added.

Outfalls 002 to 005 (Emergency Overflows)
The estimated duration and volume of each overflow from the emergency outfalls must be recorded. This is a new requirement.

Receiving Stream
The Department does not have information on the background concentration of metals and cyanide in Coos Bay and cannot perform a complete reasonable potential analysis. Therefore, the proposed permit requires the permittee to monitor 11 metals and cyanide in Coos Bay semi-annually for one year. Monitoring is to be performed on one day the effluent is also being monitored for metals.

Silver must be monitored using a "clean" sampling method, an "ultra-clean" sampling method, EPA method 1669 or any other test method approved by the Department with a detection limit of 0.1 µg/L or less. Monitoring for mercury must be conducted in accordance with EPA Method 1631. The ambient stream monitoring requirement will be discontinued after the first year unless otherwise notified in writing by the Department. The Department will base its determination upon the ability of the permittee to consistently comply with the water quality criteria.

Reporting
The reporting period is the calendar month. Discharge monitoring reports must be submitted to the Department monthly by the 15th day of the following month. The monitoring reports need to identify the principal operators designated by the Permittee to supervise the treatment and collection systems. The reports must also include records concerning application of biosolids and all applicable equipment breakdowns and bypassing.

Schedule B of the permit includes the requirement for the submittal of annual reports. The conditions are standard language requirements concerning:

Annual report on inflow and infiltration removal
Annual report on land application of biosolids

Schedule C, Compliance Schedules and Conditions

The permit contains two compliance conditions with deadlines:

1. The permittee is required to submit a proposed program and time schedule for identifying and reducing inflow within 180 days of submitting documentation that the City of Coos Bay has acquired the necessary legal authority to implement the provisions of OAR 340-041-0120(9)(a)(G)(iv) in tributary collection systems.

2. Within 90 days after permit issuance, the permittee must submit a report concerning sewage overflow locations. The report shall also provide a schedule to eliminate any overflows.

The final condition requires the permittee to meet the compliance dates established in this schedule or notify the Department within 14 days following any lapsed compliance date.

Schedule D - Special Conditions

The permit contains nine special conditions. The requirements include:

1. The Department has included a limit on thermal load in Schedule A that identifies the currently permitted amount of thermal energy over and above the temperature standard that may be discharged. The Department is proposing to include a prohibition against increasing thermal discharges beyond the currently permitted amount. That prohibition can be found in Schedule D.

2. Schedule D of this permit includes conditions requiring the permittee to manage the land application of biosolids in accordance with the approved biosolids management plan.

3. The permit may be modified to incorporate changes in federal biosolids standards.

4. The requirements for Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing are specified.

5. All facilities with industrial pretreatment programs must include the results of a priority pollutant scan with their application for permit renewal. Schedule D of this permit includes a condition requiring such submittal and specifying the necessary procedures.

6. The permittee must have the facilities supervised by personnel certified by the Department in the operation of treatment and/or collection systems.

7. The permittee must notify the Department of malfunctions.

8. The wastewater treatment plant may not accept septage without proper facilities.

9. The permittee shall not be required to perform a hydrogeologic characterization or groundwater monitoring due during the term of this permit.

Schedule E – Pretreatment Activities

The proposed permit includes Schedule E conditions that require implementation of the industrial pretreatment program.
Schedule F, NPDES General Conditions

All NPDES permits issued in the State of Oregon contain certain conditions that remain the same regardless of the type of discharge and the activity causing the discharge. These conditions are called General Conditions. These conditions can be changed or modified only on a statewide basis. The latest edition of the NPDES General Conditions is December 1, 1995 and this edition is included as Schedule F of the draft permit.

Section A contains standard conditions which include compliance with the permit, assessment of penalties, mitigation of noncompliance, permit renewal application, enforcement actions, toxic discharges, property rights and referenced rules and statutes. Section B contains requirements for operation and maintenance of the pollution control facilities. This section includes conditions for proper operation and maintenance, duty to halt or reduce activity in order to maintain compliance, bypass of treatment facilities, upset conditions, treatment of single operational events, overflows from wastewater conveyance systems and associated pump stations, public notification of effluent violation or overflow, and disposal of removed substances. Section C contains requirements for monitoring and reporting. This section includes conditions for representative sampling, flow measurement, monitoring procedures, penalties of tampering, reporting of monitoring results, additional monitoring by the permittee, averaging of measurements, retention of records, contents of records, and inspection and entry. Section D contains reporting requirements and includes conditions for reporting planned changes, anticipated noncompliance, permit transfers, progress on compliance schedules, noncompliance which may endanger public health or the environment, other noncompliances, and other information. Section D also contains signatory requirements and the consequences of falsifying reports. Section E contains the definitions used throughout the permit.

PERMIT PROCESSING/PUBLIC COMMENT/APPEAL PROCESS

The beginning and end date of the public comment period to receive written comments regarding this permit, and the contact name and telephone number are included in the public notice. The permittee is the only party having standing to file a permit appeal. If the Permittee is dissatisfied with the conditions of the permit when issued, they may request a hearing before the EQC or its designated hearing officer, within 20 days of the final permit being mailed. The request for hearing must be sent to the Director of the Department. Any hearing held shall be conducted pursuant to regulations of the Department.