

STATE OF MISSOURI  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION



## MISSOURI STATE OPERATING PERMIT

In compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law (Chapter 644 RSMo, hereinafter, the Law), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 92-500, 92<sup>nd</sup> Congress) as amended,

Permit No.: MO-0111902

Owner: Quad Property Group LLC  
Address: 355 West Springfield, Sullivan, MO 63080

Continuing Authority: Same as above  
Address: Same as above

Facility Name: Westview Mobile Home Park  
Facility Address: 712 Star Circle, Union, MO 63084

Legal Description: Sec. 30, T43N, R1W, Franklin County  
UTM Coordinates: X = 667829, Y = 4257510

Receiving Stream: Tributary to Audrain Branch  
First Classified Stream and ID: 100K Extent-Remaining Streams (C) (3960)  
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10300200-0502)

is authorized to discharge from the facility described herein, in accordance with the effluent limitations and monitoring requirements as set forth herein:

### FACILITY DESCRIPTION

#### Outfall #001 – Non-POTW

Septic tanks / MicroFAST / Bioclere / ultraviolet disinfection / septage disposal by contract hauler  
Design population equivalent is 90.  
Design flow is 10,000 gallons per day.  
Actual flow is 13,592 gallons per day.  
Design sludge production is 1.5 dry tons/year.

This permit authorizes only wastewater discharges under the Missouri Clean Water Law and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; it does not apply to other regulated areas.

August 1, 2022  
Effective Date

July 31, 2027  
Expiration Date

Chris Wieberg, Director, Water Protection Program

OUTFALL #001	TABLE A-1. FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
The permittee is authorized to discharge from outfall number(s) as specified in the application for this permit. The final effluent limitations in <b>Table A-1</b> shall become effective on <u>August 1, 2022</u> and remain in effect until the expiration of the permit. Such discharges shall be controlled, limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:						
EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
		DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
<b>Limit Set: Q</b>						
Flow	MGD	*		*	once/quarter****	24 hr. estimate
Biochemical Oxygen Demand <sub>5</sub>	mg/L		15	10	once/quarter****	composite**
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L		15	10	once/quarter****	composite**
<i>E. coli</i> ( <b>Note 1</b> )	#/100mL	1,030		206	once/quarter****	grab
Ammonia as N (Jan 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	5.6		2.1	once/quarter****	composite**
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Jun 30)	mg/L	1.7		0.6	once/quarter****	composite**
Ammonia as N (Jul 1 – Sep 30)	mg/L	1.7		0.6	once/quarter****	composite**
Ammonia as N (Oct 1 – Dec 31)	mg/L	5.6		2.1	once/quarter****	composite**
EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	MINIMUM		MAXIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
pH – Units***	SU	6.5		9.0	once/quarter****	grab
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED <b>QUARTERLY</b> ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE <u>OCTOBER 28, 2022</u> . THERE SHALL BE NO DISCHARGE OF FLOATING SOLIDS OR VISIBLE FOAM IN OTHER THAN TRACE AMOUNTS.						

\* Monitoring requirement only.

\*\* A composite sample made up from a minimum of four grab samples collected within a 24 hour period with a minimum of two hours between each grab sample.

\*\*\* pH is measured in pH units and is not to be averaged.

\*\*\*\* See table below for quarterly sampling.

Quarterly Minimum Sampling Requirements				
Quarter	Months	<i>E. coli</i>	All Other Parameters	Report is Due
First	January, February, March	Not required to sample.	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	April 28 <sup>th</sup>
Second	April, May, June	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	July 28 <sup>th</sup>
Third	July, August, September	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	October 28 <sup>th</sup>
Fourth	October	<b>Sample once during <u>October</u></b>	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	January 28 <sup>th</sup>
	November & December	Not required to sample.		

**Note 1** – Effluent limitations and monitoring requirements for *E. coli* are applicable only during the recreational season from April 1 through October 31. The Monthly Average Limit for *E. coli* is expressed as a geometric mean.

## **B. STANDARD CONDITIONS**

In addition to specified conditions stated herein, this permit is subject to the attached **Parts I & III** standard conditions dated **August 1, 2014, and August 1, 2019**, and hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein. Annual reports required per Standard Conditions Part III Section K shall be submitted online to the Department via the Department's eDMR system as an attachment. This supersedes Standard Conditions Part III Section K #4. EPA reports shall continue to be submitted online via the Central Data Exchange system.

### C. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Electronic Discharge Monitoring Report (eDMR) Submission System. Per 40 CFR Part 127 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Electronic Reporting Rule, reporting of effluent monitoring data and any report required by the permit (unless specifically directed otherwise by the permit) shall be submitted by the permittee via an electronic system to ensure timely, complete, accurate, and nationally consistent set of data about the NPDES program. All reports uploaded into the system shall be reasonably named so they are easily identifiable, such as “WET Test Chronic Outfall 002 Jan 2023,” or “Outfall 004 Daily Data Mar 2025.”
  - (a) eDMR Registration Requirements. The permittee must register with the Department’s eDMR system through the Missouri Gateway for Environmental Management (MoGEM) before the first report is due. Registration and other information regarding MoGEM can be found at <https://dnr.mo.gov/data-e-services/missouri-gateway-environmental-management-mogem>. Information about the eDMR system can be found at <https://dnr.mo.gov/water/business-industry-other-entities/reporting/electronic-discharge-monitoring-reporting-system-edmr>. The first user shall register as an Organization Official and the association to the facility must be approved by the Department. Regarding Standard Conditions Part I, Section B, #7, the eDMR system is currently the only Department approved reporting method for this permit unless a waiver is granted by the Department. See paragraph (c) below.
  - (b) Electronic Submissions. To access the eDMR system, use the following link in your web browser: <https://apps5.mo.gov/mogems/welcome.action>. If you experience difficulties with using the eDMR system you may contact [edmr@dnr.mo.gov](mailto:edmr@dnr.mo.gov) or call 855-789-3889 or 573-526-2082 for assistance.
  - (c) Waivers from Electronic Reporting. The permittee must electronically submit compliance monitoring data and reports unless a waiver is granted by the Department in compliance with 40 CFR Part 127. The permittee may obtain an electronic reporting waiver by first submitting an eDMR Waiver Request Form: <https://dnr.mo.gov/document-search/electronic-discharge-monitoring-report-waiver-request-form-mo-780-2692>. The Department will either approve or deny this electronic reporting waiver request within 120 calendar days.
2. The full implementation of this operating permit, which includes implementation of any applicable schedules of compliance, shall constitute compliance with all applicable federal and state statutes and regulations in accordance with §644.051.16, RSMo, and the Clean Water Act (CWA) section 402(k); however, this permit may be reopened and modified, or alternatively revoked and reissued:
  - (a) To comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under Sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
    - (1) contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the permit; or
    - (2) controls any pollutant not limited in the permit.
3. All outfalls must be clearly marked in the field.
4. Report as no-discharge when a discharge does not occur during the report period.
5. Reporting of Non-Detects:
  - (a) An analysis conducted by the permittee or their contracted laboratory shall be conducted in such a way that the precision and accuracy of the analyzed result can be enumerated.
  - (b) See sufficiently sensitive test method requirements in Standard Conditions Part I, Section A, No. 4 regarding proper testing and method minimum levels used for sample analysis.
  - (c) The permittee shall not report a sample result as “Non-Detect” without also reporting the method minimum level of the test. Reporting as “Non Detect” without also including the method minimum level, will be considered failure to report, which is a violation of this permit.
  - (d) The permittee shall provide the “Non-Detect” sample result using the less than symbol and the method minimum level (e.g., <50 µg/L, if the method minimum level for the parameter is 50 µg/L).
  - (e) Where the permit contains a Department determined Minimum Quantification Level (ML) and the permittee is granted authority in the permit to report zero in lieu of the < ML for a specified parameter (conventional, priority pollutants, metals, etc.), then zero (0) is to be reported for that parameter.
  - (f) For the daily maximum, the facility shall report the highest value. If the highest value was a non-detect, use the less than “<” symbol and the laboratory’s highest method minimum level.
  - (g) For reporting an average based on all non-detected values, remove the “<” sign from the values, average the values, and then add the “<” symbol back to the resulting average.
  - (h) For reporting an average based on a mix of detected and non-detected values (not including *E. coli*), assign a value of “0” for all non-detects for that reporting period and report the average of all the results.
  - (i) When *E. coli* is not detected above the method minimum level, the permittee must report the data qualifier signifying less than detection limit for that parameter (e.g., <1 #/100mL, if the method minimum level is 1 #/100mL). For reporting a geometric mean based on a mix of detected and non-detected values, use one-half of the detection limit (instead of zero) for non-detects when calculating geometric means.
  - (j) See the Fact Sheet Appendix - Non-Detect Example Calculations for further guidance.

### **C. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)**

6. It is a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law to fail to pay fees associated with this permit (644.055 RSMo).
7. Bypasses are not authorized at this facility unless they meet the criteria in 40 CFR 122.41(m). If a bypass occurs, the permittee shall report in accordance to 40 CFR 122.41(m)(3), and with Standard Condition Part I, Section B, subsection 2. Bypasses are to be reported to the St. Louis Regional Office during normal business hours or by using the online Sanitary Sewer Overflow/Facility Bypass Application located at: <https://dnr.mo.gov/data-e-services/missouri-gateway-environmental-management-mogem> or the Environmental Emergency Response spill-line at 573-634-2436 outside of normal business hours. Once an electronic reporting system compliant with 40 CFR Part 127, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Electronic Reporting Rule, is available all bypasses must be reported electronically via the new system. Blending, which is the practice of combining a partially-treated wastewater process stream with a fully-treated wastewater process stream prior to discharge, is not considered a form of bypass. If the permittee wishes to utilize blending, the permittee shall file an application to modify this permit to facilitate the inclusion of appropriate monitoring conditions.
8. The facility must be sufficiently secured to restrict entry by children, livestock and unauthorized persons as well as to protect the facility from vandalism.
9. An Operation and Maintenance (O & M) manual shall be maintained by the permittee and made available to the operator. The O & M manual shall include key operating procedures and a brief summary of the operation of the facility.
10. An all-weather access road to the treatment facility shall be maintained.
11. The outfall sewer shall be protected and maintained against the effects of floodwater, ice, or other hazards as to reasonably insure its structural stability, freedom from stoppage, and that a sample of the effluent can be obtained at a point after the final treatment process and before the discharge mixes with the receiving waters.

### **D. NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

If you were adversely affected by this decision, you may be entitled to pursue an appeal before the administrative hearing commission (AHC) pursuant to Sections 621.250 and 644.051.6 RSMo. To appeal, you must file a petition with the AHC within thirty days after the date this decision was mailed or the date it was delivered, whichever date was earlier. If any such petition is sent by registered mail or certified mail, it will be deemed filed on the date it is mailed; if it is sent by any method other than registered mail or certified mail, it will be deemed filed on the date it is received by the AHC. Any appeal should be directed to:

Administrative Hearing Commission  
U.S. Post Office Building, Third Floor  
131 West High Street, P.O. Box 1557  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-1557  
Phone: 573-751-2422  
Fax: 573-751-5018  
Website: <https://ahc.mo.gov>

**MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**  
**FACT SHEET**  
**FOR THE PURPOSE OF RENEWAL**  
**OF**  
**MO-0111902**  
**WESTVIEW MOBILE HOME PARK**

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act" Section 402 Public Law 92-500 as amended) established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. This program regulates the discharge of pollutants from point sources into the waters of the United States, and the release of stormwater from certain point sources. All such discharges are unlawful without a permit (Section 301 of the "Clean Water Act"). After a permit is obtained, a discharge not in compliance with all permit terms and conditions is unlawful. Missouri State Operating Permits (MSOPs) are issued by the Director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Department) under an approved program, operating in accordance with federal and state laws (Federal "Clean Water Act" and "Missouri Clean Water Law" Section 644 as amended). MSOPs are issued for a period of five (5) years unless otherwise specified.

As per [40 CFR Part 124.8(a)] and [10 CSR 20-6.020(1)(A)2.], a Factsheet shall be prepared to give pertinent information regarding the applicable regulations, rationale for the development of effluent limitations and conditions, and the public participation process for the Missouri State Operating Permit (operating permit) listed below.

A Factsheet is not an enforceable part of an operating permit.

### **Part I – Facility Information**

Application Date: Operating Permit Renewal: 03/18/2021 & 04/13/2022; Transfer of Ownership: 10/29/2021 (updated 03/16/2022)  
 Expiration Date: 06/30/2021

Facility Type and Description: Non - POTW

#### **OUTFALL(S) TABLE:**

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	EFFLUENT TYPE
#001	0.01547	Secondary	Domestic

#### **Comments:**

This facility is currently under Department-initiated enforcement action. In addition, the Department approved a Water Quality and Antidegradation Review in November 2018. Permit limits have been set by preferred alternative effluent limits or federal/state regulation. Therefore, effluent limits were not recalculated as part of this renewal. See Part II of the Fact Sheet for further information. Minor changes were made in wording of permit special conditions, based on the current permit template used by the Department. The effluent flow was reported as 0.014 MGD for several months. Only recently was the flow reported differently. Water records submitted by the permittee show an average of approximately 13,592 gpd from January 2019 to July 2021. The permittee should work to improve accuracy in flow monitoring. The permittee could consider long-term tracking of water usage and attempt to monitor the flow rate more frequently than the minimum quarterly requirement.

### **Part II – Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements**

#### **OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL**

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

#### **OUTFALL #001 - RECEIVING STREAM INFORMATION**

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

WATER-BODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	DESIGNATED USES*	12-DIGIT HUC	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
Tributary to Audrain Branch	--	--	General Criteria	10300200-0502	< 0.1
100K Extent-Remaining Streams	C	3960	AQL(WWH), IRR, LWW, HHP, WBC-B, SCR		1.13

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

Uses found in the receiving streams table, above:

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

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

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

**WBC** = Whole Body Contact recreation where the entire body is capable of being submerged;

**WBC-A** = Whole body contact recreation that supports swimming uses and has public access;

**WBC-B** = Whole body contact recreation that supports swimming;

**SCR** = Secondary Contact Recreation (like fishing, wading, and boating).

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

**HHP** (formerly HHH) = Human Health Protection as it relates to the consumption of fish;

**IRR** = Irrigation for use on crops utilized for human or livestock consumption;

**LWW** = Livestock and wildlife watering (Current narrative use is defined as **LWP** = Livestock and Wildlife Protection);

**DWS** = Drinking Water Supply;

**IND** = Industrial water supply

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

**WSA** = Storm- and flood-water storage and attenuation; **WHP** = Habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species;

**WRC** = Recreational, cultural, educational, scientific, and natural aesthetic values and uses; **WHC** = Hydrologic cycle maintenance.

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

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

RECEIVING STREAM	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)		
	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
100K Extent-Remaining Streams	0	0	0

#### MIXING CONSIDERATIONS

Mixing Zone: Not Allowed [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(A)4.B.(I)(a)].

Zone of Initial Dilution: Not Allowed [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(A)4.B.(I)(b)].

#### Receiving Water Body's Water Quality

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

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

- ✓ This facility discharges upstream of a stream with an EPA approved TMDL. The TMDL for the Missouri River was approved by the EPA on November 3, 2006. The pollutants of concern were Chlordane and Polychlorinated Biphenyls. The TMDL discusses that there are no Missouri facilities which discharge either directly to the Missouri River, or a tributary to, that have a potential to discharge detectable amounts of PCBs or chlordane. Therefore, the Westgate Mobile Home Park is not considered a source of the pollutants of concern.

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

- **Flow.** In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(1)(ii)] the volume of effluent discharged from each outfall is needed to assure compliance with permitted effluent limitations. If the permittee is unable to obtain effluent flow, then it is the responsibility of the

permittee to inform the Department, which may require the submittal of an operating permit modification. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.

- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>).** Operating permit retains 10 mg/L as a Weekly Average and 15 mg/L as a Monthly Average. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.
- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** Operating permit retains 10 mg/L as a Weekly Average and 15 mg/L as a Monthly Average. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.
- ***Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*).** Operating permit retains monthly average of 206 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Daily Maximum of 1,030 per 100 mL as a geometric mean during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), for discharges within two miles upstream of segments or lakes with Whole Body Contact Recreation (B) designated use of the receiving stream, as per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(B). Effluent limits for both monthly average and daily maximum are required by 40 CFR 122.45(d). The Geometric Mean is calculated by multiplying all of the data points and then taking the  $n$ th root of this product, where  $n = \#$  of samples collected. For example: Five *E. coli* samples were collected with results of 1, 4, 6, 10, and 5 (#/100mL). Geometric Mean =  $5^{\text{th}}$  root of  $(1)(4)(6)(10)(5) = 5^{\text{th}}$  root of 1,200 = 4.1 #/100mL. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Operating permit retains the “alternative analysis”-based technology limits of 0.6 mg/L monthly average and 1.7 mg/L daily maximum in summer and 2.1 mg/L monthly average and 5.6 mg/L daily maximum in winter. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.
- **pH.** Operating permit retains 6.5-9.0 standard pH units, based on federal/state regulation as set out in the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet. The pH limitations of 6.0-9.0 SU [10 CSR 20-7.015] are not protective of the in-stream Water Quality Standard, which states that water contaminants shall not cause pH to be outside the range of 6.5-9.0 SU.

**Sampling Frequency Justification:** The Department has determined that previously established sampling and reporting frequency is sufficient to characterize the facility’s effluent and be protective of water quality. Sampling for *E. coli* is set at quarterly per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)7.C. However, due to the potential for inaccurate flow monitoring in the past, the permittee should consider tracking long-term water usage and attempt to monitor the flow rate more frequently than the minimum required quarterly requirement.

**Sampling Type Justification:** As per 10 CSR 20-7.015, samples collected for mechanical plants shall be a composite sample, and may be a modified composite. Grab samples, however, must be collected for pH and *E. coli* in accordance with recommended analytical methods. For further information on sampling and testing methods please review 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D) 2.

#### **OUTFALL #001 – GENERAL CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS:**

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

- (A) **Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause the formation of putrescent, unsightly or harmful bottom deposits or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses.** The discharge from this facility is made up of treated domestic wastewater. Based upon review of the reports of compliance inspection for the inspections conducted on September 16, 2015, and on July 13, 2016, the facility’s effluent exceeded the permitted effluent limits and discharged sludge to the receiving stream. The permittee was referred for enforcement action (on September 27, 2016), has since constructed upgrades, and is currently working with the Compliance and Enforcement Section of the Department’s Water Pollution Control Branch – Water Protection Program. The facility’s recent upgrades were supposed to be secondary treatment technology; however, the discharge still does not fully comply with permitted effluent limits. The current permitted effluent limits were established by a Water Quality and Antidegradation Review approved in November 2018. The effluent limits are being retained in this permit renewal, and the permittee will continue to work with the Compliance and Enforcement Section to address noncompliance. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, the final effluent limitations being proposed for this permit, if met, should protect against the excursion of this criterion. It is assumed that discharges meeting the proposed limits will not have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.
- (B) **Waters shall be free from oil, scum and floating debris in sufficient amounts to be unsightly or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses.** Please see (A) above as justification is the same.

- (C) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause unsightly color or turbidity, offensive odor or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (D) Waters shall be free from substances or conditions in sufficient amounts to result in toxicity to human, animal or aquatic life. This permit contains final effluent limitations which are protective of both acute and chronic toxicity for various pollutants that are either expected to be discharged by domestic wastewater facilities or that were disclosed by this facility on the application for permit coverage. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, it has been determined that, if the facility meets final effluent limitations established in this permit, there is no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause an excursion of this criterion.
- (E) Waters shall provide for the attainment and maintenance of water quality standards downstream including waters of another state. Please see (D) above as justification is the same.
- (F) There shall be no significant human health hazard from incidental contact with the water. Please see (D) above as justification is the same.
- (G) There shall be no acute toxicity to livestock or wildlife watering. Please see (D) above as justification is the same.
- (H) Waters shall be free from physical, chemical or hydrologic changes that would impair the natural biological community. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (I) Waters shall be free from used tires, car bodies, appliances, demolition debris, used vehicles or equipment and solid waste as defined in Missouri's Solid Waste Law, section 260.200, RSMo, except as the use of such materials is specifically permitted pursuant to section 260.200-260.247. The discharge from this facility is to consist of treated domestic wastewater. Based upon review of the reports of compliance inspection for the inspections conducted on September 16, 2015, and on July 13, 2016, the facility discharged sludge to the receiving stream. The permittee was referred for enforcement action (on September 27, 2016), has since constructed upgrades, and is currently working with the Compliance and Enforcement Section of the department's Water Pollution Control Branch – Water Protection Program to address noncompliance. The Department has not conducted a recent compliance inspection; however, the permittee has not disclosed any other information, related to the characteristics of the discharge on their permit application, which has the potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this narrative criterion. Solid wastes received or produced at this facility are to be wholly contained in appropriate storage facilities, are not to be discharged, and are to be disposed of offsite (as allowed by the permit's conditions). This discharge is subject to Standard Conditions Part III, which contains requirements for the management and disposal of sludge to prevent its discharge. Therefore, if the facility is operated properly so as to meet permitted effluent limits, this discharge should not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.

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

#### **ANTI-BACKSLIDING:**

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

- ✓ All limits in this operating permit are at least as protective as those previously established; therefore, backsliding does not apply.

#### **ANTIDEGRADATION:**

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

- ✓ No additional degradation proposed, and no further review necessary. In conjunction with the application to renew this permit, the facility did not apply for authorization to increase pollutant loading or to add additional pollutants to their discharge. See Appendix D for a copy of the Water Quality and Antidegradation Review previously approved in November 2018, on which the effluent limits in this permit are based.

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

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(2)(C)], an applicant may utilize a lower preference continuing authority when a higher level authority is available by submitting information as part of the application to the Department for review and approval, provided it does not conflict with any area-wide management plan approved under section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act or any other regional sewage service and treatment plan approved for higher preference authority by the Department.

#### **BIOSOLIDS & SEWAGE SLUDGE:**

Biosolids are solid materials resulting from domestic wastewater treatment that meet federal and state criteria for beneficial uses (i.e. fertilizer). Sewage sludge includes solids, semi-solids, or liquid residue generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works; including, but not limited to, domestic septage; scum or solids removed in primary, secondary, or advanced



wastewater treatment process; and a material derived from sewage sludge. Sewage sludge does not include ash generated during the firing of sewage sludge in a sewage sludge incinerator or grit and screening generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works.

- ✓ Permittee is not authorized to land apply biosolids. Sludge/biosolids are removed by contract hauler.

#### **COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT:**

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

#### **Facility Performance History:**

- ✓ The facility is currently under enforcement action. The enforcement action is due to discharging sludge to the receiving stream and routine exceedances of permit limits. The permittee is continuing to work with the Compliance and Enforcement Section of the Department's Water Pollution Control Branch – Water Protection Program. Since enforcement action was initiated, the facility has been upgraded but still fails to meet permitted effluent limits. However, the previous limits have been retained based on a Water Quality and Antidegradation Review approved by the Department in November 2018.

#### **CONTINUING AUTHORITY:**

Each application for an operating permit shall identify the person, as that term is defined in section 644.016(15), RSMo, that is the owner of, operator of, or area-wide management authority for a water contaminant source, point source, wastewater treatment facility, or sewer collection system. This person shall be designated as the continuing authority and shall sign the application. By doing so, the person designated as the continuing authority acknowledges responsibility for compliance with all permit conditions.

10 CSR 20-6.010(2) establishes preferential levels for continuing authorities: Levels 1 through 5 (with Level 1 as the highest level), and requires a higher preference continuing authority be utilized if available. A Level 3, 4, or 5 applicant may constitute a continuing authority by showing that the authorities listed under paragraphs (B)1.–2. of 10 CSR 20-6.010(2) are not available; do not have jurisdiction; are forbidden by state statute or local ordinance from providing service to the person; or that it has met one of the requirements listed in paragraphs (2)(C)1.–7. of 10 CSR 20-6.010(2). The seven options in paragraphs (2)(C)1.–7. for a lower-level authority to demonstrate that it is the valid continuing authority are:

1. A waiver from the existing higher authority declining the offer to accept management of the additional wastewater or stormwater;
2. A written statement or a demonstration of non-response from the higher authority;
3. A to-scale map showing all parts of the legal boundary of the facility's property are beyond 2000 feet from the collection (sewer) system operated by the higher preference authority;
4. A proposed connection or adoption charge by the higher authority that would equal or exceed what is economically feasible for the applicant, which may be in the range of one hundred twenty percent (120%) of the applicant's cost for constructing or operating a wastewater treatment system;
5. A proposed service fee on the users of the system by the higher authority that is above what is affordable for existing homeowners in that area;
6. Terms for connection or adoption by the higher authority that would require more than two (2) years to achieve full sewer service; or
7. A demonstration that the terms for connection or adoption by the higher authority are not viable or feasible to homeowners in the area.

Permit applicants that are Levels 3, 4, and 5 must, as part of their application, identify their method of compliance with this regulation. The following are the methods to comply.

- No higher level authorities are available to the facility;
- No higher level authorities have jurisdiction;
- Higher level authorities are forbidden by state statute or local ordinance from providing service to the person;
- The existing higher level authority is available to the facility, however the facility has proposed the use of a lower preference continuing authority and has submitted one of the following as part of their application (See Fact Sheet Appendix - Continuing Authority for more information on these options):
  - A waiver from the existing higher authority;
  - A written statement or a demonstration of non-response from the higher authority;
  - A to-scale map showing all parts of the legal boundary of the facility's property are beyond 2000 feet from the collection (sewer) system operated by the higher preference authority;

- Documentation that the proposed connection or adoption charge by the higher authority would equal or exceed what is economically feasible for the applicant, which may be in the range of one hundred twenty percent (120%) of the applicant's cost for constructing or operating a wastewater treatment system;
  - Documentation that the proposed service fee on the users of the system by the higher authority is above what is affordable for existing homeowners in that area;
  - Documentation that the terms for connection or adoption by the higher authority would require more than two (2) years to achieve full sewer service;
  - A demonstration that the terms for connection or adoption by the higher authority are not viable or feasible to homeowners in the area;
- ✓ The continuing authority listed on the application form is for a business entity which is incorporated under the laws of Missouri. The business entity is registered with the Missouri Secretary of State's office and is assigned Charter Number [LC001592356](#) per the Secretary of State's webpage. The corporation name with that charter number was verified by the permit writer to match the corporation name on the application form. The corporation has a status of "Active" on the Secretary of State's webpage at the time of the drafting of this permit. The continuing authority is a Level 4 Authority. The applicant has shown that:
- A higher level authority is not available to the facility;

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

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

Per 40 CFR 127.15 and 127.24, permitted facilities may request a temporary waiver for up to 5 years or a permanent waiver from electronic reporting from the Department. To obtain an electronic reporting waiver, a permittee must first submit an eDMR Waiver Request Form: <https://dnr.mo.gov/document-search/electronic-discharge-monitoring-report-waiver-request-form-mo-780-2692>. Each facility must make a request. If a single entity owns or operates more than one facility, then the entity must submit a separate request for each facility based on its specific circumstances. An approved waiver is non-transferable.

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

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

#### **NUMERIC LAKE NUTRIENT CRITERIA**

- ✓ This facility does not discharge into a lake watershed where numeric lake nutrient criteria are applicable.

#### **OPERATOR CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(8) Terms and Conditions of a Permit], the permittee shall operate and maintain facilities to comply with the Missouri Clean Water Law and applicable permit conditions and regulations. Operators at regulated wastewater treatment facilities shall be certified in accordance with [10 CSR 20-9.020(2)] and any other applicable state law or regulation. As per [10 CSR 20-9.020(2)(A)], requirements for operation by certified personnel shall apply to all wastewater treatment systems with population equivalents greater than 200 and are owned or operated by or for municipalities, public sewer districts, counties, public water supply districts, private sewer companies regulated by the Public Service Commission and state or federal agencies.

- ✓ This facility is not required to have a certified operator as it doesn't have a PE greater than 200 and is not owned or operated by or for a municipality, public sewer district, county, public water supply district, private sewer company regulated by the PSC, state or federal agency

#### **OPERATIONAL CONTROL TESTING**

Missouri Clean Water Commission regulation 10 CSR 20-9.010 requires certain publicly owned treatment works and privately owned facilities regulated by the Public Service Commission to conduct internal operational control monitoring to further ensure proper operation of the facility and to be a safeguard or early warning for potential plant upsets that could affect effluent quality. This

requirement is only applicable if the publicly owned treatment works and privately owned facilities regulated by the Public Service Commission has a Population Equivalent greater than two hundred (200).

10 CSR 20-9.010(3) allows the Department to modify the monitoring frequency required in the rule based upon the Department's judgement of monitoring needs for process control at the specified facility.

- ✓ As per [10 CSR 20-9.010(4)], the facility is not required by this permit to conduct operational monitoring.

#### **PFAS VOLUNTARY SAMPLING:**

The Department is implementing voluntary sampling of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS. PFAS are a family of compounds common in industrial processes that degrade slowly in the environment and have suspected health effects such as cancer, decreased immune response, hepatotoxicity, and low infant birth rate at levels as low as parts per trillion. EPA plans to require additional testing for facilities most at risk of discharging PFAS, promulgate Effluent Limitation Guidelines for these facilities, and designate PFAS as CERCLA hazardous substances prior to 2024, per their PFAS Strategic Roadmap. Removal technologies for PFAS remain both traditionally expensive and resource-intensive. As such, understanding this facility's reasonable potential to violate future effluent limitations prior to their implementation will inform required process improvements in the future.

- ✓ This facility has no known PFAS sources, as they are a non-POTW (a mobile home park). However, CDC has been collecting data regarding PFAS exposure in humans since 1999. Nearly every person surveyed had measurable amounts of PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, and PFNA in their blood serum, indicating widespread exposure. Despite this facility having no known PFAS sources, the permittee should determine if any non-domestic wastewater is being discharged to the system. If so, voluntary testing may be prudent to ensure that these sources (especially if an industrial process wastewater) are not discharging to the WWTF. If the facility wishes to test for PFAS, the Department recommends sampling using a modified Test Method 537.1, found here: [https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si\\_public\\_record\\_report.cfm?dirEntryId=348508&Lab=CESER&simpleSearch=0&showCriteria=2&searchAll=537.1&TIMSType=&dateBeginPublishedPresented=03%2F24%2F2018](https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?dirEntryId=348508&Lab=CESER&simpleSearch=0&showCriteria=2&searchAll=537.1&TIMSType=&dateBeginPublishedPresented=03%2F24%2F2018). It is advisable to test for all 40 analytes described in CWA Test Method 1633. Sample results may be submitted with this permit's renewal application.

#### **PRETREATMENT PROGRAM:**

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

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

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

#### **REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS (RPA):**

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

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

- ✓ An RPA was not conducted for this facility, .

#### **REMOVAL EFFICIENCY:**

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

- ✓ Influent monitoring is not being required to determine percent removal.

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

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are defined as untreated sewage releases and are considered bypassing under state regulation [10 CSR 20-2.010(12)] and should not be confused with the federal definition of bypass. SSOs result from a variety of causes including blockages, line breaks, and sewer defects that can either allow wastewater to backup within the collection system during dry weather conditions or allow excess stormwater and groundwater to enter and overload the collection system during wet weather conditions. SSOs can also result from lapses in sewer system operation and maintenance, inadequate sewer design and construction, power

failures, and vandalism. SSOs include overflows out of manholes, cleanouts, broken pipes, and other into waters of the state and onto city streets, sidewalks, and other terrestrial locations.

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

Missouri RSMo §644.026.1.(13) mandates that the Department issue permits for discharges of water contaminants into the waters of this state, and also for the operation of sewer systems. Such permit conditions shall ensure compliance with all requirements as established by sections 644.006 to 644.141. Standard Conditions Part I, referenced in the permit, contains provisions requiring proper operation and maintenance of all facilities and systems of treatment and control. Missouri RSMo §644.026.1.(15) instructs the Department to require proper maintenance and operation of treatment facilities and sewer systems and proper disposal of residual waste from all such facilities. To ensure that public health and the environment are protected, any noncompliance which may endanger public health or the environment must be reported to the Department within 24 hours of the time the permittee becomes aware of the noncompliance. Standard Conditions Part I, referenced in the permit, contains the reporting requirements for the permittee when bypasses and upsets occur.

- ✓ This facility is not required to develop or implement a program for maintenance and repair of the collection system; however, it is a violation of Missouri State Environmental Laws and Regulations to allow untreated wastewater to discharge to waters of the state.

#### **SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE (SOC):**

Per 644.051.4 RSMo, a permit may be issued with a Schedule of Compliance (SOC) to provide time for a facility to come into compliance with new state or federal effluent regulations, water quality standards, or other requirements. Such a schedule is not allowed if the facility is already in compliance with the new requirement, or if prohibited by other statute or regulation. A SOC includes an enforceable sequence of interim requirements (actions, operations, or milestone events) leading to compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law, its implementing regulations, and/or the terms and conditions of an operating permit. *See also* Section 502(17) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR §122.2. For new effluent limitations, the permit may include interim monitoring for the specific parameter to demonstrate the facility is not already in compliance with the new requirement. Per 40 CFR § 122.47(a)(1), 10 CSR 20-7.031(11), and 10 CSR 20-7.015(9), compliance must occur as soon as possible. If the permit provides a schedule for meeting new water quality based effluent limits, a SOC must include an enforceable, final effluent limitation in the permit even if the SOC extends beyond the life of the permit.

A SOC is not allowed:

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

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

- ✓ This permit does not contain an SOC.

#### **VARIANCE:**

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

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

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

As per [10 CSR 20-2.010(86)], the amount of pollutant each discharger is allowed by the Department to release into a given stream after the Department has determined total amount of pollutant that may be discharged into that stream without endangering its water quality.

- ✓ Wasteload allocations were not calculated for this permit renewal, as permit limits were set by the Water Quality and Antidegradation Review previous approved in November 2018. See Appendix D.

#### **WLA MODELING:**

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

- ✓ A WLA study was either not submitted with the application for permit renewal or determined not applicable by Department staff.

#### **WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET) TEST:**

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

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

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

- ✓ At this time, the permittee is not required to conduct WET test for this facility. It is noted the actual flow was reported as about 13,592 gpd, based on water records. This is not dissimilar to the average of submitted effluent flows. However, flow was reported as 0.014 MGD for several months in a row and do not appear to be accurate. The design average flow is 10,000 gpd. The operator should review their procedures for measuring flow, investigate and attempt to eliminate inflow and infiltration (I/I), and consider installing an automated flow meter on the effluent. At this time, considering the relatively low effluent limits being required and the facility being domestic only, no WET testing appears to be needed at this time. However, if this facility continues to exceed the design flow, WET testing may be required in the future.

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

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

- ✓ This facility does not anticipate bypassing.

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

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

- ✓ The Department is not required to complete a cost analysis for compliance, because the facility is not a combined or separate sanitary sewer system for a publicly-owned treatment works.

## **Part V – Administrative Requirements**

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

### **WATER QUALITY STANDARD REVISION:**

In accordance with section 644.058, RSMo, the Department is required to utilize an evaluation of the environmental and economic impacts of modifications to water quality standards of twenty-five percent or more when making individual site-specific permit decisions.

- ✓ This operating permit does not contain requirements for a water quality standard that has changed twenty-five percent or more since the previous operating permit.

### **PERMIT SYNCHRONIZATION:**

The Department of Natural Resources is currently undergoing a synchronization process for operating permits. Permits are normally issued on a five-year term, but to achieve synchronization many permits will need to be issued for less than the full five years allowed by regulation. The intent is that all permits within a watershed will move through the Watershed Based Management (WBM) cycle together will all expire in the same fiscal year. This will allow further streamlining by placing multiple permits within a smaller geographic area on public notice simultaneously, thereby reducing repeated administrative efforts. This will also allow the Department to explore a watershed based permitting effort at some point in the future. Renewal applications must continue to be submitted within 180 days of expiration, however, in instances where effluent data from the previous renewal is less than 4 years old, that data may be re-submitted to meet the requirements of the renewal application. If the permit provides a schedule of compliance for meeting new water quality based effluent limits beyond the expiration date of the permit, the time remaining in the schedule of compliance will be allotted in the renewed permit. This permit will expire in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of calendar year 2026.

### **PUBLIC NOTICE:**

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

- ✓ The Public Notice period for this operating permit was from May 27, 2022, to June 27, 2022. No responses received.

**DATE OF FACT SHEET:** AUGUST 4, 2021; APRIL 12, 2022; JUNE 30, 2022

### **COMPLETED BY:**

**SCOTT ADAMS, P.E.**

**MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

**WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM**

**CONSTRUCTION PERMITS UNIT**

**on behalf of the OPERATING PERMITS SECTION - DOMESTIC WASTEWATER UNIT**


**(573) 751-9122**

**scott.adams@dnr.mo.gov**




Appendices

APPENDIX A – FACILITY LOCATION




APPENDIX B – FACILITY FLOW DIAGRAM



From the application received on October 4, 2018.



APPENDIX B – FACILITY FLOW DIAGRAM  
(CONTINUED)



From 2020 as-built engineering plans.

#### APPENDIX C – Non-Detect Example Calculations:

**Example:** Permittee has four samples for Pollutant X which has a method minimum level of 5 mg/L and is to report a Daily Maximum and Monthly Average.

Week 1 = 11.4 mg/L

Week 2 = Non-Detect or <5.0 mg/L

Week 3 = 7.1 mg/L

Week 4 = Non-Detect or <5.0 mg/L

For this example, use subpart (h) - For reporting an average based on a mix of detected and non-detected values (not including *E. coli*), assign a value of “0” for all non-detects for that reporting period and report the average of all the results.

$$11.4 + 0 + 7.1 + 0 = 18.5 \div 4 \text{ (number of samples)} = 4.63 \text{ mg/L.}$$

The Permittee reports a Monthly Average of 4.63 mg/L and a Daily maximum of 11.4 mg/L (Note the < symbol was dropped in the answers).

**Example:** Permittee has five samples for Pollutant Y that has a method minimum level of 9 µg/L and is to report a Daily Maximum and Monthly Average.

Day 1 = Non-Detect or <9.0 µg/L

Day 2 = Non-Detect or <9.0 µg/L

Day 3 = Non-Detect or <9.0 µg/L

Day 4 = Non-Detect or <9.0 µg/L

Day 5 = Non-Detect or <9.0 µg/L

For this example, use subpart (g) - For reporting an average based on all non-detected values, remove the “<” sign from the values, average the values, and then add the “<” symbol back to the resulting average.

$$(9 + 9 + 9 + 9 + 9) \div 5 \text{ (number of samples)} = <9 \text{ µg/L.}$$

The Permittee reports a Monthly Average of <9.0 µg/L (retain the ‘less than’ symbol) and a Daily Maximum of <9.0 µg/L.

**Example:** Permittee has four samples for Pollutant Z where the first two tests were conducted using a method with a method minimum level of 4 µg/L and the remaining two tests were conducted using a different method that has a method minimum level of <6 µg/L and is to report a Monthly Average and a Weekly Average.

Week 1 = Non-Detect or <4.0 µg/L

Week 2 = Non-Detect or <4.0 µg/L

Week 3 = Non-Detect or <6.0 µg/L

Week 4 = Non-Detect or <6.0 µg/L

For this example, use subpart (g) - For reporting an average based on all non-detected values, remove the “<” sign from the values, average the values, and then add the “<” symbol back to the resulting average.

$$(4 + 4 + 6 + 6) \div 4 \text{ (number of samples)} = <5 \text{ µg/L. (Monthly)}$$

The facility reports a Monthly Average of <5.0 µg/L and a Weekly Average of <6.0 µg/L.

## APPENDIX C – Non-Detect Example Calculations (Continued):

**Example:** Permittee has five samples for Pollutant Z where the first two tests were conducted using a method with a method minimum level of 4 µg/L and the remaining three tests were conducted using a different method that has a method minimum level of <6 µg/L and is to report a Monthly Average and a Weekly Average.

Week 1 = Non-Detect or <4.0 µg/L

Week 2 = Non-Detect or <4.0 µg/L

Week 2 = Non-Detect or <6.0 µg/L

Week 3 = Non-Detect or <6.0 µg/L

Week 4 = Non-Detect or <6.0 µg/L

For this example, use subpart (g) - For reporting an average based on all non-detected values, remove the "<" sign from the values, average the values, and then add the "<" symbol back to the resulting average.

$(4 + 4 + 6 + 6 + 6) \div 5$  (number of samples) = <5.2 µg/L. (Monthly)

$(4 + 6) \div 2$  (number of samples) = <5 µg/L. (Week 2)

The facility reports a Monthly Average of <5.2 µg/L and a Weekly Average of <6.0 µg/L (report highest Weekly Average value)

**Example:** Permittee has four samples for Pollutant Z where the tests were conducted using a method with a method minimum level of 10 µg/L and is to report a Monthly Average and Daily Maximum. The permit lists that Pollutant Z has a Department determined Minimum Quantification Level (ML) of 130 µg/L.

Week 1 = 12 µg/L

Week 2 = 52 µg/L

Week 3 = Non-Detect or <10 µg/L

Week 4 = 133 µg/L

For this example, use subpart (h) - For reporting an average based on a mix of detected and non-detected values (not including *E. coli*), assign a value of "0" for all non-detects for that reporting period and report the average of all the results.

For this example,  $(12 + 52 + 0 + 133) \div 4$  (number of samples) =  $197 \div 4 = 49.3$  µg/L.

The facility reports a Monthly Average of 49.3 µg/L and a Daily Maximum of 133 µg/L.

**Example:** Permittee has five samples for *E. coli* which has a method minimum level of 1 #/100mL and is to report a Weekly Average (seven (7) day geometric mean) and a Monthly Average (thirty (30) day geometric mean).

Week 1 = 102 #/100mL

Week 2 (Monday) = 400 #/100mL

Week 2 (Friday) = Non-Detect or <1 #/100mL

Week 3 = 15 #/100mL

Week 4 = Non-Detect or <1 #/100mL

For this example, use subpart (i) - When *E. coli* is not detected above the method minimum level, the permittee must report the data qualifier signifying less than detection limit for that parameter (e.g., <1 #/100mL, if the method minimum level is 1 #/100mL). For reporting a geometric mean based on a mix of detected and non-detected values, use one-half of the detection limit (instead of zero) for non-detects when calculating geometric means. The Geometric Mean is calculated by multiplying all of the data points and then taking the nth root of this product, where n = # of samples collected.

The Monthly Average (30 day Geometric Mean) = 5th root of  $(102)(400)(0.5)(15)(0.5)$  = 5th root of 153,000 = 10.9 #/100mL.

The 7 day Geometric Mean = 2nd root of  $(400)(0.5)$  = 2nd root of 200 = 14.1 #/100mL. (Week 2)

The Permittee reports a Monthly Average (30 day Geometric Mean) of 10.9 #/100mL and a Weekly Average (7 day geometric mean) of 102 #/100mL (report highest Weekly Average value)

**APPENDIX D – WATER QUALITY AND ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW**

*[Dated November 2018 and attached to construction permit #CP0002033 (March 20, 2019, to March 19, 2021) and to the August 1, 2020, modification of the operating permit (MO-0111902, September 1, 2016, to June 30, 2021)].*

**Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
Water Protection Program  
Water Pollution Control Branch  
Engineering Section**

# **Water Quality and Antidegradation Review**

## **Department's Alternatives Analysis for Domestic Wastewater Facilities with Design Flow Less Than 10,000 Gallons per Day**

*For Protection of Water Quality  
and Determination of Effluent Limits*

November, 2018



Department's Alternatives Analysis

**Table of Contents**

1. WATER QUALITY INFORMATION .....	18
2. APPLICABILITY .....	18
3. TIER DETERMINATION .....	18
TABLE 1. POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN AND TIER DETERMINATION .....	18
4. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE.....	19
4.1. NO DISCHARGE EVALUATION .....	19
4.2. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY .....	19
FIGURE 1. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST VS. AMMONIA LIMITS.....	21
FIGURE 2. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST VS. BOD & TSS LIMITS .....	22
TABLE 2. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST .....	23
4.3. DESIGN FLOW DETERMINATION .....	25
4.4. REGIONALIZATION ALTERNATIVE.....	25
4.5. LOSING STREAM ALTERNATIVE DISCHARGE LOCATION .....	25
4.6. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION.....	25
5. GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WATER QUALITY AND ANTIDegradation REVIEW .....	26
6. PERMIT LIMITS AND MONITORING INFORMATION.....	26
TABLE 3. EFFLUENT LIMITS – ALL OUTFALLS .....	26
7. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS .....	27
8. DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS .....	27
8.1. LIMIT DERIVATION .....	27
9. ANTIDegradation REVIEW PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION .....	31
APPENDIX A: MAP OF DISCHARGE LOCATION .....	32
APPENDIX B: ANTIDegradation REVIEW SUMMARY ATTACHMENTS.....	33

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

**1. WATER QUALITY INFORMATION**

In accordance with Missouri's Water Quality Standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)] and federal antidegradation policy at Title 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Section 131.12 (a), the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Department) developed a statewide antidegradation policy and corresponding procedures to implement the policy. A proposed discharge to a water body will be required to undergo a level of Antidegradation Review which documents that the use of a water body's available assimilative capacity is justified. Effective August 30, 2008, and revised July 13, 2016, a facility is required to use *Missouri's Antidegradation Implementation Procedure (AIP)* for new and expanded wastewater discharges.

**2. APPLICABILITY**

This Water Quality and Antidegradation Review is for facilities which produce primarily domestic wastewater and discharge less than 10,000 gallons per day. It is not applicable to facilities where the receiving waterbody, or downstream waterbodies, have a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) or are 303(d) or 305(b) listed for the pollutants of concern addressed in this alternatives analysis, with an exception for waterbodies that are listed for *E. coli* since disinfection will be required. Facilities that are currently under enforcement will need to coordinate with the Water Protection Program's compliance and enforcement section to determine applicability for the Department's Alternatives Analysis. No mixing will be included in this review for receiving waterbodies. If the applicant would like to have effluent limitation derivation include mixing considerations, a site specific alternatives analysis will need to be completed.

**3. TIER DETERMINATION**

Below is a list of pollutants of concern reasonably expected to be in the discharge for a domestic wastewater treatment facility. Pollutants of concern are defined as those pollutants "proposed for discharge that affects beneficial use(s) in waters of the state. POCs include pollutants that create conditions unfavorable to beneficial uses in the water body receiving the discharge or proposed to receive the discharge" (AIP, Page 7). No existing water quality data is required because all POCs were considered to be Tier 2 and significantly degrading in the absence of existing water quality. Assumed uses for the receiving waterbody are General Criteria, Protection of Warm Water Aquatic Life (AQL), Human Health Protection (HHP), Irrigation (IRR), and Livestock & Wildlife Protection (LWP). If any Tier 1 Pollutants of Concern not addressed in this alternatives analysis will be discharged, the applicant must submit *Attachment D: Tier 1 Review* (<http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2024-f.pdf>) for those pollutants.

Table 1. Pollutants of Concern and Tier Determination

POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN	TIER*	DEGRADATION	COMMENT*****
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )/DO	2	Significant	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	**	Significant	
Ammonia	2	Significant	
pH	***	Significant	Permit limits applied
<i>Escherichia coli</i> ( <i>E. coli</i> )	2	Significant	

\* Tier assumed.

\*\* Tier determination not possible: No in-stream standard for this parameter.

\*\*\* The standard for this parameter is a range.

\*\*\*\*\* Permit limits for other parameters including Oil & Grease, Total Residual Chlorine, Nitrates, and Total Phosphorus will be applied based on water quality standards and criteria as applicable.

Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) effluent limits of 0.017 mg/L daily maximum, 0.008 mg/L monthly average are recommended if chlorine is used as a disinfectant. Standard compliance language for TRC, including the minimum level (ML), may be included in the operating permit.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### **4. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE**

Missouri's Antidegradation Implementation Procedures (AIP) specify that if the proposed activity results in significant degradation then a demonstration of necessity (i.e., alternatives analysis) and a determination of social and economic importance are required. The applicant must submit *Attachment E: Tier 2 – Significant Degradation Using Department's Alternatives Analysis for Domestic Wastewater Facilities with Design Flow Less Than 10,000 Gallons per Day* form. This analysis will serve as the applicant's alternatives analysis to fulfill the requirements of the AIP.

A Geohydrologic Evaluation must be submitted with the Antidegradation Review Request.

A Missouri Department of Conservation Natural Heritage Review Report must be obtained by the applicant. The applicant should review the Natural Heritage Review and contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Missouri Department of Conservation for further coordination if necessary.

#### **4.1. NO DISCHARGE EVALUATION**

According to 10 CSR 20-6.010(4)(D), reports for the purpose of constructing a wastewater treatment facility shall consider the feasibility of constructing and operating a no discharge facility. Per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.1, for discharges likely to cause significant degradation, applicants must provide an analysis of non-degrading alternatives. No-discharge alternatives may include surface land application, subsurface land application, and connection to a regional treatment facility.

The applicant must submit a *No Discharge Evaluation* form to demonstrate that a no-discharge facility is not feasible for this site. If the information provided on the form is not sufficient to demonstrate that a no-discharge facility is not feasible, a more detailed evaluation of no discharge options will be required before the Department can complete its determination.

#### **4.2. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY**

The Department has used available data to complete an alternatives analysis of previously evaluated treatment technologies and expected performance. Data from forty-five Water Quality and Antidegradation Reviews (WQARs) completed between March 2011 and March 2016 was evaluated and results are presented in Figure 1, Figure 2, and Table 2 below.

The data include five facilities designed to provide a high level of treatment to meet the expected future ammonia as N effluent limits based on the 2013 EPA Ammonia criteria for the protection of mussels and gill-breathing snails (See Notice to Permittee in DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS section). The data available to date indicates that the cost of facilities of this size range designed to meet 2013 EPA ammonia criteria is not substantively higher than other facilities designed to meet the current ammonia criteria.

The data include fourteen facilities designed to meet BOD and TSS effluent limits of 10 mg/L monthly average and 15 mg/L daily maximum or weekly average. The data available to date indicates that the cost of facilities designed to meet BOD and TSS effluent limits of 10 mg/L monthly average and 15 mg/L daily maximum or weekly average is not substantively higher than other facilities of this size range designed to meet less stringent BOD and TSS effluent limits.

Facilities which were designed to meet limits based on the 2013 EPA ammonia criteria included a membrane bioreactor, extended aeration package plant, recirculating sand filter with moving bed biofilm reactor, sequencing batch reactor, and an integrated fixed film activated sludge system.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

Membrane bioreactor (MBR) systems combine a suspended growth biological reactor with solids removal via filtration across a membrane. The membranes can be designed for and operated in small spaces and with high removal efficiency of contaminants such as nitrogen, phosphorus, bacteria, biochemical oxygen demand, and total suspended solids. Membrane filtration allows a higher biomass concentration to be maintained in the treatment tank, thereby allowing smaller bioreactors to be used for a smaller footprint. MBR systems provide operational flexibility with respect to flow rates, as well as the ability to readily add or subtract units as needed, but that flexibility has limits. Membranes typically require that the water surface be maintained above a minimum elevation so that the membranes remain wet during operation. Throughput limitations are dictated by the physical properties of the membrane, and the result is that peak design flows generally should be no more than 1.5 to 2 times the average design flow. If peak flows exceed that limit, additional membranes may be needed to process the peak flow, or equalization may need to be included in the design. MBR systems typically have higher capital and operating costs than conventional systems.

The extended aeration process is a modification of the activated sludge process which provides biological treatment for the removal of biodegradable organic wastes under aerobic conditions. Wastewater in the aeration tank is mixed and oxygen is provided to the microorganisms. The mixed liquor then flows to a clarifier or settling chamber where most microorganisms settle to the bottom of the clarifier and a portion are pumped back to the beginning of the plant. The clarified wastewater flows over a weir and into a collection channel before being disinfected and discharged. Extended aeration is often used in smaller prefabricated package-type plants where lower operating efficiency is offset by mechanical simplicity and minimized design costs. In comparison to traditional activated sludge, longer mixing time with aged sludge and light loading (low F:M) offers a stable biological ecosystem better adapted for effectively treating waste load fluctuations from variable occupancy situations. Although the process is stable and easier to operate, extended aeration systems may discharge higher effluent suspended solids than found under conventional loadings.

Moving Bed Bioreactor (MBBR) systems may be a single aerated reactor, or several in series, with a buoyant free-moving plastic biofilm carrier media. MBBR systems can be designed to be capable of meeting more stringent total nitrogen limits. They produce a significantly reduced solids loading to the liquid-solids separation unit, the biofilm improves process stability, they offer flexibility to meet specific treatment objectives, and they are well suited for retrofit into existing treatment systems. MBBR systems require a smaller tank volume than a conventional activated sludge system and therefore have a smaller footprint. Adequate mixing must be provided to ensure that free floating media remains uniformly distributed and screens must be provided to retain the media within the reactors.

Integrated fixed film activated sludge (IFAS) systems add fixed or free floating media to an activated sludge basin. The process gets its name from combining a conventional activated sludge process with a fixed film system. This treatment system is similar to an MBBR; however MBBR systems do not recycle sludge. IFAS systems are often installed as a retrofit solution to conventional activated sludge systems. They require a smaller tank volume than a conventional activated sludge system and therefore have a smaller footprint. The biofilm combines aerobic, anaerobic, and anoxic zones promoting better nitrification compared to conventional activated sludge systems and the biofilm improves process stability. Adequate mixing must be provided to ensure that free floating media remains uniformly distributed and to slough biomass from the media. Higher dissolved oxygen concentrations may be required as compared to conventional activated sludge. Screens must be provided to retain the media within the reactors.



## Department's Alternatives Analysis


In addition to the treatment technologies listed above, all of which had previous WQARs that established advanced ammonia limits, there are other technology alternatives that can meet the advanced ammonia limits including recirculating sand filter, recirculating textile filter, conventional activated sludge, oxidation ditch, and lagoon retrofits. To obtain this level of performance, all technologies must be properly designed to accommodate nitrification and de-nitrification and they must be properly and actively operated.

Recirculating sand filters (RSF) remove contaminants in wastewater through physical, chemical, and, most importantly, biological processes. The three common components are a pretreatment unit (generally a septic tank), a recirculation tank, and a sand filter. In the recirculation tank, raw effluent from the septic tank and the sand filter filtrate are mixed and pumped back to the sand filter bed. RSFs are effective in applications with high levels of BOD and can provide a good effluent quality with 85 - 95% removal of BOD and TSS. They can be designed to provide nitrification, but this requires increased surface area. Treatment is affected by extremely cold weather. Treatment capacity can be expanded through modular design. RSFs require routine maintenance, although the complexity of maintenance is generally minimal.

Recirculating textile filters systems are configured similar to an RSF except the filter media is an engineered fabric textile. They can be configured to provide nitrification, but this may require additional treatment units. They have a small operating footprint, are more aesthetically pleasing than some other treatment options, produce minimal noise, have the ability to handle variable flows, and have simple maintenance.

The above treatment system descriptions were adapted from EPA technology fact sheets and *Design of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants: WEF Manual of Practice No. 8 ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 76; Fifth Edition*, as well as other readily available sources and previous Water Quality and Antidegradation Reviews.


FIGURE 1. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST VS. AMMONIA LIMITS



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

LEGEND		Summer Ammonia (mg/L)		Winter Ammonia (mg/L)	
		Daily Max	Monthly Avg.	Daily Max	Monthly Avg.
2013 EPA Criteria	■	≤1.7	≤0.6	≤5.6	≤2.1
Existing Aquatic Life Criteria (no mixing)	◆	approx. 3.7	approx. 1.4	approx. 7.5	approx. 2.9
Less Stringent (mixing)	●	>3.7	>1.4	>7.5	>2.9

FIGURE 2. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST VS. BOD & TSS LIMITS



LEGEND	BOD (mg/L)		TSS (mg/L)	
	Daily Max	Monthly Avg.	Daily Max	Monthly Avg.
■	15	10	15	10
◆	15	10	>15	>10
●	>15	>10	>15	>10

TABLE 2. DESIGN FLOW VS. PRESENT WORTH COST

DATE	Design Flow (MGD)	Technology	BOD (mg/L)		TSS (mg/L)		Summer Ammonia (mg/L)		Winter Ammonia (mg/L)		Present Worth Cost (\$)	\$ PW/gpd
			Daily Max or Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Daily Max or Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Daily Maximum	Monthly Average	Daily Maximum	Monthly Average		
5/2/2012	0.000555	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	20	15	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	62,506	113
4/2/2013	0.000555	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	20	15	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	62,506	113
10/1/2014	0.000555	Extended Aeration Package Plant	15	10	22.5	15	7.8	3	7.8	3	62,506	113
4/4/2012	0.000800	Recirculating Fabric Filter	30	15	30	15	4	1.5	7.7	2.9	127,427	159
12/1/2013	0.000821	Membrane Bioreactor	30	20	30	20	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	61,240	75
9/2/2012	0.001000	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	162,007	162
7/6/2011	0.001240	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	22	15	6	3	6	3	91,000	73
1/1/2015	0.001400	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	23	15	3.7	1.4	7.6	2.9	102,174	73
5/5/2011	0.002500	Extended Aeration	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	198,000	79
9/1/2011	0.003000	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	15	10	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	220,915	74
3/1/2012	0.003000	Extended Aeration Package Plant	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	92,604	31
2/22/2016	0.003700	Recirculating Rock Filter	30	20	30	20	7.3	2.8	7.3	2.8	115,688	31
7/4/2011	0.003750	Recirculating Fabric Filter	15	10	20	15	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	283,000	75
4/1/2014	0.003885	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	132,185	34
12/1/2012	0.004500	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	23	15	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	133,676	30
6/3/2013	0.004718	Recirculating Sand Filter	30	20	30	20	12.1	4.6	12.1	4.6	203,060	43
11/2/2011	0.004950	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	20	15	3.5	1.4	7.5	2.9	114,058	23
6/4/2011	0.005000	Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor	45	30	45	30	5.7	2.2	8.2	3.2	127,000	25
9/6/2012	0.005600	Extended Aeration with Filtration and Aerated Holding Tanks	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	130,000	23
6/1/2011	0.006000	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	176,239	29
3/1/2011	0.007875	Modular Fixed Film Activated Sludge with Constructed Wetlands	30	20	30	20	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	285,780	36
4/3/2012	0.008210	Membrane Bioreactor	15	10	15	10	2.6	1	2.6	1	61,240	7
8/5/2014	0.009000	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	20	15	3.1	1.2	7.5	2.9	203,698	23
1/1/2014	0.009000	Membrane Bioreactor	15	10	15	10	1.6	0.6	5.5	2.1	217,739	24
4/6/2012	0.009100	Membrane Bioreactor	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	222,160	24
3/7/2012	0.009158	Recirculating Gravel filter	30	20	30	20	3.7	1.5	6.5	2.5	163,681	18
6/1/2014	0.013125	Recirculating Sand Filter	45	30	45	30	3	1.1	6	2.3	189,985	14
8/4/2012	0.014000	Extended Aeration	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.8	188,208	13
7/1/2014	0.015540	Recirculating Sand Filter	23	15	23	15	3.9	1.5	7.8	3	450,986	29
7/5/2011	0.015750	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	20	15	7.8	2.5	7.8	2.5	226,969	14
2/27/2015	0.016500	Extended Aeration Package Plant	45	30	45	30	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	187,957	11
7/1/2012	0.016650	Extended Aeration	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	317,750	19
9/3/2014	0.017800	Extended Aeration Package Plant	45	30	45	30	1.4	0.6	2.9	2.1	507,618	29
5/11/2015	0.018000	Recirculating Sand Filter, Polishing Reactor, Chemical Phosphorus Removal	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	6.5	2.1	320,318	18
7/3/2013	0.018500	Recirculating Fabric Filter with Chemical & Filter Phosphorus Removal	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	130,000	7

Department’s Alternatives Analysis

2/27/2015	0.024000	Recirculating Gravel Filter	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	6.5	2.1	343,816	14
9/1/2014	0.030000	Recirculating Sand Filter, Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor, Chemical Phosphorus removal	15	10	20	15	1.7	0.6	5.6	2.1	1,157,390	39
6/2/2012	0.038000	Aerated Lagoon with Recirculating Sand Filter	45	30	45	30	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	4,309,665	113
2/3/2013	0.040000	Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (can be operated as IFAS)	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	2,963,181	74
8/20/2015	0.040000	Recirculating Sand Filter, Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor	15	10	20	15	3.7	1	5.6	2.1	1,812,000	45
6/4/2013	0.045000	Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor	15	10	15	10	1.7	0.6	5.6	2.1	479,344	11
3/9/2016	0.045000	Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor	15	10	15	10	1.7	0.6	5.6	2.1	479,344	11
6/4/2012	0.050000	New Technology Package Plant	30	20	30	20	7.5	2.9	7.5	2.9	942,050	19
7/3/2011	0.050000	Extended Aeration Package Plant	15	10	20	15	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	1,357,506	27
8/3/2014	0.050000	Recirculating Sand Filter	15	10	15	10	3.7	1.4	7.5	2.9	733,723	15

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

Additionally, the table of wastewater treatment technologies in the *Ammonia Criteria: New EPA Recommended Criteria* factsheet located at <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2481.htm> includes several technologies which have demonstrated capability in meeting ammonia effluent limits of less than 0.7 mg/L when designed appropriately.

As a result of this alternatives analysis, the Department has determined that for a facility which discharges less than 10,000 gallons per day, depending on site specific conditions, there are technologies available which may be economically efficient and practicable that are capable of meeting the effluent limitations in Table 3. If the facility owners do not believe that there is a treatment technology that is both economically efficient and practicable for their facility to meet the limits in Table 3, a site specific alternatives analysis may be required.

### **4.3. DESIGN FLOW DETERMINATION**

As part of the Department's alternatives analysis, facilities up to 50,000 gallons per day were evaluated. A design flow maximum of 10,000 gallons per day was chosen for applicability of this alternatives analysis for a variety of reasons. As facilities increase in size, site specific factors may require a more site specific alternatives analysis. For example, larger facilities are more likely to have wet weather flows that must be addressed and are more likely to need Whole Effluent Toxicity testing or nutrient monitoring. Larger facilities are also more likely to discharge a larger variety of pollutants of concern which may not be addressed in this review. Larger facilities also benefit from an economy of scale; smaller facilities tend to have a higher cost per gallon of wastewater treated, which is distributed over fewer paying customers. Finally, as we are working with a limited amount of data, limiting the design flow applicability for the Department's alternatives analysis ensures a factor of safety in our review.

### **4.4. REGIONALIZATION ALTERNATIVE**

Within Section II B 1. of the AIP, discussion of the potential for discharge to a regional wastewater collection system is mentioned. The applicant must provide justification for not pursuing regionalization on the *No Discharge Evaluation* form. If the information provided on the form is not sufficient to demonstrate that a regionalization alternative is not feasible, a more detailed evaluation will be required before the Department can complete its determination.

### **4.5. LOSING STREAM ALTERNATIVE DISCHARGE LOCATION**

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

Information provided by the applicant on the *No Discharge Evaluation* form must include evaluation and justification for why the owner is not pursuing land application, or connection to a regional facility.

### **4.6. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION**

Missouri's antidegradation implementation procedures specify that if the proposed activity results in significant degradation then a determination of social and economic importance is required.

Information provided by the applicant in the *Attachment E: Tier 2 – Significant Degradation Using Department's Alternatives Analysis for Domestic Wastewater Facilities with Design Flow Less Than 10,000 Gallons per Day* form must include a detailed social and economic importance evaluation. If the information provided on the form is not sufficient to demonstrate important social and economic importance, then a more detailed evaluation will be required before the Department can complete its determination.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### 5. GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WATER QUALITY AND ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW

1. A Water Quality and Antidegradation Review (WQAR) assumes that [10 CSR 20-6.010(3) Continuing Authorities and 10 CSR 20-6.010(4) (D), consideration for no discharge] has been or will be addressed in a Missouri State Operating Permit or Construction Permit Application.
2. A WQAR does not indicate approval or disapproval of alternative analysis as per [10 CSR 20-7.015(4) Losing Streams], and/or any section of the effluent regulations.
3. Changes to Federal and State Regulations made after the drafting of this WQAR may alter Water Quality Based Effluent Limits (WQBEL).
4. Effluent limitations derived from Federal or Missouri State Regulations (FSR) may be WQBEL or Effluent Limit Guidelines (ELG).
5. WQBEL supersede ELG only when they are more stringent. Mass limits derived from technology based limits are still appropriate.
6. A WQAR does not allow discharges to waters of the state, and shall not be construed as a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System or Missouri State Operating Permit to discharge or a permit to construct, modify, or upgrade.
7. Limitations and other requirements in a WQAR may change as Water Quality Standards, Methodology, and Implementation procedures change.
8. Nothing in this WQAR removes any obligations to comply with county or other local ordinances or restrictions.
9. If the proposed treatment technology is not covered in 10 CSR 20-8 Design Guides, the treatment process may be considered a new technology. As a new technology, the permittee will need to work with the review engineer to ensure equipment is sized properly. The operating permit may contain additional requirements to evaluate the effectiveness of the technology once the facility is in operation. This Antidegradation Review is based on the information provided by the facility and is not a comprehensive review of the proposed treatment technology. If the review engineer determines the proposed technology will not consistently meet proposed effluent limits, the permittee will be required to revise their Antidegradation Report.

### 6. PERMIT LIMITS AND MONITORING INFORMATION

TABLE 3. EFFLUENT LIMITS – ALL OUTFALLS

PARAMETER		UNITS	DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	BASIS FOR LIMIT (NOTE 1)	MONITORING FREQUENCY
FLOW		MGD	*		*	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND <sub>5</sub> **		MG/L		15	10	PEL	ONCE/MONTH
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS **		MG/L		15	10	PEL	ONCE/MONTH
pH		SU	6.5– 9.0		6.5 – 9.0	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
AMMONIA AS N (APR 1 – SEPT 30)		MG/L	1.7		0.6	PEL	ONCE/MONTH
AMMONIA AS N (OCT 1 – MAR 31)		MG/L	5.6		2.1	PEL	ONCE/MONTH
<i>ESCHERICHIA COLIFORM (E. COLI)</i>	WBC(A) (NOTE 2)	#/100ML	630***		126	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
	WBC(B) (NOTE 2)	#/100ML	1030***		206	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
	LOSING STREAM (NOTE 3)	#/100ML	126***		*	FSR	ONCE/MONTH

\* Monitoring requirements only.

\*\* Publicly owned treatment works will be required to meet a removal efficiency of 85% or more for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. Influent BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS data should be reported to ensure removal efficiency requirements are met.

\*\*\* Publicly owned treatment works will receive a weekly average *E. coli* limit and private facilities will receive a daily maximum *E. coli* limit.

NOTE 1 – PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE EFFLUENT LIMIT – PEL; OR FEDERAL/STATE REGULATION – FSR. ALSO, PLEASE SEE THE **GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WQAR #4 & #5**.

NOTE 2 – Effluent limitations and monitoring requirements for *E. coli* for WBC(A) and WBC(B) are applicable only during the recreational season from April 1 through October 31. The Monthly Average Limit for *E. coli* is expressed as a geometric mean. The Weekly Average for *E. coli* will be expressed as a geometric mean if more than one (1) sample is collected during a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday).

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

NOTE 3 – Effluent limits and monitoring requirements for *E. coli* are applicable year round for designated losing streams. No more than 10% of samples over the course of a calendar year shall exceed the 126 #/100 mL daily maximum.

Permit limits for other applicable parameters, including Oil & Grease, Total Residual Chlorine, Nitrates, and Total Phosphorus, will be included in the operating permit based on water quality standards and criteria as applicable.

### 7. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

No receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time.

### 8. DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS

Water quality-based – Using water quality criteria or water quality model results and the dilution equation below:

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

Where C = downstream concentration

C<sub>s</sub> = upstream concentration

Q<sub>s</sub> = upstream flow

C<sub>e</sub> = effluent concentration

Q<sub>e</sub> = effluent flow

Chronic wasteload allocations were determined using applicable chronic water quality criteria (CCC: criteria continuous concentration). Acute wasteload allocations were determined using applicable water quality criteria (CMC: criteria maximum concentration).

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

Note: Under 40 CFR 133.105, permitting authorities shall require more stringent limitations than equivalent to secondary treatment limitations for 1) existing facilities if the permitting authority determines that the 30-day average and 7-day average BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS effluent values that could be achievable through proper operation and maintenance of the treatment works, and 2) new facilities if the permitting authority determines that the 30-day average and 7-day average BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS effluent values that could be achievable through proper operation and maintenance of the treatment works, considering the design capability of the treatment process.

#### 8.1. LIMIT DERIVATION

- **Flow.** In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(1)(ii)] the volume of effluent discharged from each outfall is needed to assure compliance with permitted effluent limitations. If the permittee is unable to obtain effluent flow, then it is the responsibility of the permittee to inform the Department, which may require the submittal of an operating permit modification.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>).** BOD<sub>5</sub> limits of 10 mg/L monthly average and 15 mg/L average weekly were determined by the Department to be achievable and protective of beneficial uses and existing water quality.

As per the *DO Modeling & BOD Effluent Limit Development Administrative Guidance for the Purpose of Conducting Water Quality Assistance Reviews*, facilities less than 100,000 gallons per day, and proposing BOD treatment less than or equal to an average monthly of 10 mg/L and average weekly of 15 mg/L as demonstrated by performance specifications from a manufacturer or effluent sampling of an existing facility with the same treatment facility are exempt from the DO modeling requirement. See [http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/DO\\_Modeling\\_Administrative\\_Guidance\\_Dec\\_09.pdf](http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/DO_Modeling_Administrative_Guidance_Dec_09.pdf).

Influent monitoring may be required for this facility in its Missouri State Operating Permit.

- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** TSS limits of 10 mg/L monthly average and 15 mg/L average weekly were determined by the Department to be achievable based and protective of beneficial uses and existing water quality. According to EPA, because TSS and BOD are closely correlated, we apply the same limits for TSS as BOD.

Influent monitoring may be required for this facility in its Missouri State Operating Permit.

- **pH.** – 6.5-9.0 SU. Technology based effluent limitations of 6.0-9.0 SU [10 CSR 20-7.015] are not protective of the Water Quality Standard, which states that water contaminants shall not cause pH to be outside the range of 6.5-9.0 SU. No mixing zone is allowed when using the Department's Alternatives Analysis, therefore the water quality standard must be met at the outfall.
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** The Department has determined that the alternatives analysis-based technology limits of 0.6 mg/L monthly average and 1.7 mg/L daily maximum in summer, and 2.1 mg/L monthly average and 5.6 mg/L daily maximum in winter are achievable by some treatment technologies. Because these limits are more protective than the water quality-based limits calculated below for a stream with no mixing, the technology-based limits were used.

In choosing to use the Department's alternatives analysis, the facility is electing to build a treatment plant that provides a high level of treatment that meets the expected future limits based on the 2013 EPA Ammonia criteria and will potentially reduce the need to upgrade in the near future (See Notice to Permittee below). If the facility owners do not believe that there is a treatment technology that is both economically efficient and practicable for their facility to meet these limits, a site specific alternatives analysis may be required.

### Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits (WQBEL):

Early Life Stages Present Total Ammonia Nitrogen criteria apply

[10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(B)7.C. & Table B3]. Background total ammonia nitrogen = 0.01 mg/L

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

Summer: April 1 – September 30, Winter: October 1 – March 31.



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### Summer

$$C_e = (((Q_e + Q_s) * C) - (Q_s * C_s)) / Q_e$$

$$\text{Chronic WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)1.5 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / Q_e = 1.5 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$\text{Acute WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / Q_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$\text{LTA}_c = 1.5 \text{ mg/L (0.780)} = \mathbf{1.2 \text{ mg/L}} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile, 30 day avg.}]$$

$$\text{LTA}_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L (0.321)} = 3.88 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$

$$\text{MDL} = 1.2 \text{ mg/L (3.11)} = 3.7 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$

$$\text{AML} = 1.2 \text{ mg/L (1.19)} = 1.4 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 95^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile, } n = 30]$$

### Winter

$$\text{Chronic WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)3.1 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / Q_e = 3.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$\text{Acute WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0025 * 0.01)) / Q_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$\text{LTA}_c = 3.1 \text{ mg/L (0.780)} = \mathbf{2.4 \text{ mg/L}} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile, 30 day avg.}]$$

$$\text{LTA}_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L (0.321)} = 3.9 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$

$$\text{MDL} = 2.4 \text{ mg/L (3.11)} = 7.5 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$

$$\text{AML} = 2.4 \text{ mg/L (1.19)} = 2.9 \text{ mg/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 95^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile, } n = 30]$$

	Maximum Daily Limit (mg/l)		Average Monthly Limit (mg/l)	
	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter
WQBEL	3.7	7.5	1.4	2.9
Alternatives Analysis Limits	1.7	5.6	0.6	2.1

### Notice to Permittee:

On August 22, 2013, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a notice in the Federal Register announcing the final national recommended ambient water quality criteria for protection of aquatic life from the effects of ammonia in freshwater. The EPA's guidance, *Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Fresh Water 2013*, is not a rule, nor automatically part of a state's water quality standards. States must adopt new ammonia criteria consistent with EPA's published ammonia criteria into their water quality standards that protect the designated uses of the water bodies.

The Water Protection Program (WPP) is providing this notice to inform permittees that EPA's published ammonia criteria for aquatic life protection is lower than the current Missouri criteria. The Department of Natural Resources has initiated stakeholder discussions on how to best incorporate these new criteria into the State's rules. A date for when this rule change will occur has not been determined. The ammonia effluent limits proposed in this WQAR are expected to meet the new EPA criteria where mussels of the family Unionidae are present or expected to be present for a facility in a location that discharges to a receiving stream with no mixing. More information about the new ammonia criteria for aquatic life protection may be found at: <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2481.htm>.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

- **Escherichia coli (E. coli).** Limits will be applied based on the receiving stream designated use.

**Whole Body Contact (A):** Monthly average of 126 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Daily Maximum or Weekly Average as a geometric mean of 630 per 100 mL during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), to protect Whole Body Contact Recreation (A) designated use of the receiving water body, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C) and 10 CSR 20-7.015 (9)(B)1. An effluent limit for both monthly average and daily maximum or weekly average is required by 40 CFR 122.45(d). Publicly owned treatment works will receive weekly average limits, while non-publicly owned treatment works will receive daily maximum limits.

**Whole Body Contact (B):** Monthly average of 206 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Daily Maximum or Weekly Average as a geometric mean of 1030 per 100 mL during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), to protect Whole Body Contact Recreation (B) designated use of the receiving water body, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C) and 10 CSR 20-7.015 (9)(B)1. An effluent limit for both monthly average and daily maximum or weekly average is required by 40 CFR 122.45(d). Publicly owned treatment works will receive weekly average limits, while non-publicly owned treatment works will receive daily maximum limits.

**Losing Stream:** Discharges to losing streams shall not exceed 126 per 100 mL as a Daily Maximum at any time, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C). Monitoring only for a monthly average. No more than 10% of samples over the course of the calendar year shall exceed 126 #/100 mL daily maximum as per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(B)1.G.

Per the effluent regulations, the *E. coli* sampling/monitoring frequency for facilities less than 100,000 gallons per day shall be set to match the monitoring frequency of wastewater and sludge sampling program for the receiving water category in 7.015(1)(B)3. during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), with compliance to be determined by calculating the geometric mean of all samples collected during the reporting period (samples collected during the calendar week for the weekly average, and samples collected during the calendar month for the monthly average). Please see GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WQAR #7

- **Total Residual Chlorine (TRC).** These limits will apply to facilities which chlorinate. Warm-water Protection of Aquatic Life CCC = 10 µg/L, CMC = 19 µg/L [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]. Background TRC = 0.0 µg/L.

$$C_e = (((Q_e + Q_s) * C) - (Q_s * C_s)) / Q_e$$

$$\text{Chronic WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)10 - (0.0 * 0.0)) / Q_e = 10 \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$\text{Acute WLA: } C_e = ((Q_e + 0.0)19 - (0.0 * 0.0)) / Q_e = 19 \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$\text{LTA}_c = 10 \mu\text{g/L} (0.527) = \mathbf{5.3 \mu\text{g/L}} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{Percentile}]$$

$$\text{LTA}_a = 19 \mu\text{g/L} (0.321) = 6.1 \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{Percentile}]$$

$$\text{MDL} = \mathbf{5.3 \mu\text{g/L}} (3.11) = 16.5 \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 99^{\text{th}} \text{Percentile}]$$

$$\text{AML} = \mathbf{5.3 \mu\text{g/L}} (1.55) = 8.2 \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.6, 95^{\text{th}} \text{Percentile, } n = 4]$$

Total Residual Chlorine effluent limits of 0.017 mg/L daily maximum, 0.008 mg/L monthly average are recommended if chlorine is used as a disinfectant. Standard compliance language for TRC, including the minimum level (ML), should be included in the permit.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

- **Oil & Grease.** These limits will apply to publicly owned treatment works and may apply to other facilities as appropriate. Conventional pollutant, [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]. Effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.
- **Total Phosphorus.** Discharges to Table Rock Lake and Lake Taneycomo watersheds shall meet 0.5 mg/L per 10 CSR 20-7.015(3). Discharges to the White River Basin and outside of the area designated above for phosphorus limitations shall have monitoring only for phosphorus at a frequency the same as BOD and TSS as per 10 CSR 20-7.015(3)(E).

Permit limits for any other applicable parameters may be included in the operating permit based on water quality standards and criteria as applicable.

### 7. ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

The proposed new or expanded facility discharge is assumed to result in significant degradation of the receiving waterbody. The Department has used available data to complete a review of available treatment technologies and expected performance. As a result of this review, the Department has determined that, depending on site specific conditions, there may be technologies available which are economically efficient and practicable for a facility that are capable of meeting the effluent limits in Table 3. If the facility owners do not believe that there is a treatment technology that is both economically efficient and practicable for their facility to meet the limits in Table 3, a site specific WQAR may be requested.

Any treatment option designed to meet these effluent limits may be considered a reasonable alternative in moving forward with the appropriate facility plan, construction permit application, or other future submittals.

If the proposed treatment system is not covered in 10 CSR 20-8 Design Guides and is considered a new treatment technology, your construction permit application must address approvability of the technology in accordance with the *New Technology Definitions and Requirements* factsheet available at <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2453.htm>. If you have any questions regarding the new technology factsheet, please contact Cindy LePage of the Water Protection Program. The permittee will need to work with the review engineer to ensure equipment is sized properly and that the technology will consistently achieve the proposed effluent limits. The operating permit may contain additional requirements to evaluate the effectiveness of the technology once the facility is in operation.

Per the requirements of the AIP, the effluent limits in this review were developed to be protective of beneficial uses and to attain the highest statutory and regulatory requirements. The Department has determined that the submitted review is sufficient and meets the requirements of the AIP. No further analysis is needed for this discharge.

### WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM



John Rustige, P.E.

Wastewater Engineering Unit Chief

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### Appendix A: Map of Discharge Location

(A USGS topographic map can be obtained on the web at <http://www.dnr.mo.gov/internetmapviewer/>.)




## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### Appendix B: Antidegradation Review Summary Attachments

The attachments that follow contain summary information provided by the applicant.


Department staff determined that the following changes must be made to the information contained within these attachments:

#### 1) Water Quality Review Assistance/Antidegradation Review Request form:

 <b>MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES</b> <b>WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM</b> <b>WATER QUALITY REVIEW ASSISTANCE/</b> <b>ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW REQUEST</b> PRE-CONSTRUCTION REVIEW FOR PROTECTION OF BENEFICIAL USES AND DEVELOPING EFFLUENT LIMITS		<b>RECEIVED</b> <b>NOV 19 2018</b> ACT 522 For Office Use Only CHECK NUMBER 1831 DATE RECEIVED 11-19-18 FEE SUBMITTED \$250.00 KB	
TYPE OF PROJECT <input type="checkbox"/> Grant <input type="checkbox"/> SRF Loan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Other Projects		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE	
REQUESTER Chris Thompson		MSCP NUMBER (IF APPLICABLE) MO - 0111902	
PERMITTEE / FACILITY NAME Westview Mobile Home Park (MO-0444093)		SIC / NAICS CODE 6515	
COUNTY Franklin			
<b>REASON FOR REQUEST</b> <input type="checkbox"/> New Discharge (See Instruction #9) <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade (No expansion) (See AIP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expansion <input type="checkbox"/> QAPP or Study Review			
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY Adding two Aquapoint BioClere units and additional tankage to achieve ammonia removal. Also installing Ultraviolet Disinfection for bacteria control.			
<b>FACILITY INFORMATION</b> METHOD OF BACTERIA COMPLIANCE <input type="checkbox"/> Chlorine Disinfection <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ultraviolet Disinfection <input type="checkbox"/> Ozone <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable			
WATER QUALITY ISSUES* The existing facility is having problems meeting the current ammonia limits, and disinfection limits. The potable well is reading discharges up to 9,300 gpd which is over the permitted discharge. The DMR's have reported discharges up to 14,000 gpd. *Water quality issues include: effluent limit compliance issues, notices of violation, water body beneficial uses not attained or supported, etc.			
OUTFALL	LOCATION (UTM OR LAT/LONG OR LEGAL DESCRIPTION)	MAPPED <sup>1</sup> (CHECK)	RECEIVING WATER BODY <sup>2</sup>
001	x = 667829 y = 4257510	✓	Un-named tributary Audrain Branch
<sup>1</sup> Please attach topographic map (See: <a href="http://www.dnr.mo.gov/Internetmapviewer/">www.dnr.mo.gov/Internetmapviewer/</a> ) with outfall locations clearly marked. For additional outfalls, attach a separate form. <sup>2</sup> Please see general instructions for discharges to streams.			
OUTFALL	NEW DESIGN FLOW ** (MGD)	TREATMENT TYPE	EFFLUENT TYPES*
001	10000	Fixed Film aerated, with aerated trickling filter, Clarifier	domestic
* Describe predominating character of effluent. Example: Domestic Wastewater, Municipal Wastewater, Industrial Wastewater, Storm water, Mining Leachate, etc. ** If expansion, indicate new design flow.			
See General Instructions. Additional information may be needed to complete your request. Your request may be returned if items are missing. The water quality review assistance is a process to determine effluent limits for new facilities or existing facilities seeking to increase loading into the receiving stream.			
SIGNATURE Chris Thompson		DATE 11-9-18	
PRINT NAME Chris Thompson		EMAIL ADDRESS thompson@unionfd.org	
Applicant supplied (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Fee. See Instructions <input type="checkbox"/> Attachment A - Significant Degradation <input type="checkbox"/> Attachment B - Minimal Degradation <input type="checkbox"/> Attachment C - Temporary degradation <input type="checkbox"/> Attachment D - Tier 1 Review <input type="checkbox"/> No Degradation Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Heritage Review Determination. See Instruction #8. <input type="checkbox"/> Geohydrologic Evaluation. See Instruction #9. <input type="checkbox"/> Tier Analysis for minimal degradation (see Page 3, Tier 2 Reviews). <input type="checkbox"/> Quality Assurance Project Plan. <input type="checkbox"/> Time of travel study (see Instruction #3) or model (see Instruction #2).		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 636 262 6020 Submit request to: Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Water Protection Program, ATTN: WPCB Engineering Section P.O. Box 176 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0176 Telephone: 573-751-1300 Fax: 573-522-9920	



Department's Alternatives Analysis



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

- 2) Attachment E: Tier 2 – Significant Degradation Using Department's Alternatives Analysis for Domestic Wastewater Facilities with Design Flow Less Than 10,000 Gallons Per Day form:

RECEIVED  
NOV 19 2018  
Water Protection Program



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BRANCH  
**ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW SUBMITTAL**  
**ATTACHMENT E: TIER 2 – SIGNIFICANT DEGRADATION USING DEPARTMENT'S ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS FOR DOMESTIC WASTEWATER FACILITIES WITH DESIGN FLOW LESS THAN 10,000 GALLONS PER DAY**

<b>1. APPLICABILITY</b>			
<p>If you answer "Yes" to any of the below questions, a site specific alternatives analysis may be required.</p> <p>The department's alternatives analysis is <i>not</i> applicable to facilities that have a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) or are 303(d) or 305(b) listed for the pollutants of concerns addressed in this alternatives analysis, with an exception for <i>E. coli</i> since disinfection will be required.</p> <p>Facilities currently under enforcement will need to coordinate with the Water Protection Program's compliance and enforcement section to determine applicability for the department's alternatives analysis.</p>			
1.1	Does the receiving waterbody or downstream waterbody have a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)? (This can be checked at: <a href="http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/tmdl/">http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/tmdl/</a> )	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1.2	Is the receiving waterbody or downstream waterbody 303(d) or 305(b) listed as impaired or potentially impaired? (This can be checked at: <a href="http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/waterquality/303d/303d.htm">dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/waterquality/303d/303d.htm</a> )	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1.3	Is the facility currently under enforcement with the department or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1.4	Is the design flow 10,000 gallons per day or more?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
1.5	Is a nondischarging system a viable option	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>The following forms must also be submitted with this form:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Discharge Evaluation Form (<a href="http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2805-f.pdf">dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2805-f.pdf</a>)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Review Assistance/Antidegradation Review Request Form (<a href="http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-1893-f.pdf">http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-1893-f.pdf</a>)</p>			
<b>2. FACILITY</b>			
NAME Westview Mobile Home Park		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (636) 262-6020	
ADDRESS (PHYSICAL) 712 Star Circle	CITY Union	STATE Mo	ZIP CODE 63084
<b>3. OWNER</b>			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Chris Thompson - Owner			
ADDRESS 755 KOKO Loop	CITY Union	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 63084
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (636) 262-6020		EMAIL ADDRESS <i>thompson@unionfd.org</i>	
<b>4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY</b> The regulatory requirement regarding continuing authority is found in 10 CSR 20-6.010(3) available at <a href="http://www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6a.pdf">www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6a.pdf</a> .			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Same as Above			
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		EMAIL ADDRESS	



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

<b>5. RECEIVING WATER BODY SEGMENT #1</b>	
NAME Tributary to Audrain Branch	
5.1	UPPER END OF SEGMENT (Location of discharge) UTM X=667829 Y=4257510 OR Lat _____, Long _____
5.2	LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM X=666511 Y=4258253 OR Lat _____, Long _____
Per the Missouri Antidegradation Implementation Procedure, or AIP, the definition of a segment is: "A section of water that is bound, at a minimum, by significant existing sources and confluences with other significant water bodies."	
<b>6. WATER BODY SEGMENT #2</b>	
NAME Audrain Branch	
6.1	UPPER END OF SEGMENT UTM X=666511 Y=4258253 OR Lat _____, Long _____
6.2	LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM X=664844 Y=4259578 OR Lat _____, Long _____
<b>7. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</b>	
This section must be completed with adequate and thorough descriptions of the social and economic importance associated with the proposed project in accordance with the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.E.1. for discharge to be allowed.	
Social and economic importance is defined as the social and economic benefits to the community that will occur from any activity involving a new or expanding discharge.	
<b>7.1 Identify the affected community:</b> (The affected community is defined in 10 CSR 20-7.031(2)(B) as the community "in the geographical area in which the waters are located: Per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.E.1, "the affected community should include those living near the site of the proposed project as well as those in the community that are expected to directly or indirectly benefit from the project.")  Westview Mobile Home Park, since being constructed, has provided the Franklin County, Missouri community with affordable, clean housing for lower income families. Originally the mobile home park was able to house approximately 30 families. The improvements completed in 2014 allowed the mobile home park to expand to 52 family units. This has increased the availability of affordable housing, and increased the tax base for Westview Mobile Home Park. The increased tax base has benefited both the state and local governments, local fire department, local ambulance department, and local schools. The additional affordable housing also helps increase Franklin County, Missouri available work force by providing affordable lower income housing.	
<b>7.2 Identify the important social and economic development associated with the project:</b>  Will the proposed discharging activity:	
Create or expand employment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Increase median family income?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Reduce the number of households below the poverty line?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Increase the community tax base?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Increase needed housing supply?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Provide necessary public services (e.g., school, infrastructure, fire department, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Correct a public health, safety, or environmental problem?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Other:	



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### 7.3 Describe the important social and economic development associated with the project:

The applicant must describe the expected changes in the factors identified in question 7.2 that are associated with the project and provide information on any additional items demonstrating important social and economic development. The applicant should first describe the existing condition of the affected community. This base condition should then be compared to the predicted change (benefit) in social and economic condition after the discharge is allowed. The social and economic measures identified above do not constitute a comprehensive list. Each situation and community is different and will require an analysis of unique social and economic factors in accordance with the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.E.1.

The owner currently employs persons to maintain the mobile home park. Items like cutting grass, removing snow, providing safe drinking water and disposal of trash and sewage all create local employment for persons from the community.

The additional homes within the mobile home park will increase community tax base. Since these homes are rental units, the mobile home park owner will need to pay taxes on the homes even if they are not rented.

As with all communities low income affordable housing is a must. Westview mobile home park provides a place for starter housing for low income families. The increase of low income housing helps the community by providing a larger available work force that may help attract manufacturing to the community.

Currently Westview Mobile Home Park has an existing wastewater facility that is having problems meeting its current discharge limits. The proposed improvements will help the existing facility meet the state and EPA mandated reduction in allowable ammonia discharge. This will help correct the current public health, safety, and environmental problem that the existing facility is experiencing.

### 7.4 Is any other written correspondence or documentation included with this application to provide further evidence of social and economic importance:

☒ No

☐ Yes

- ☐ Letter(s) from the mayor or community in support of the proposed project
- ☐ Rezoning approval
- ☐ Other:

### 6. NO DISCHARGE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

According to 10 CSR 20-6.010(4)(D), reports for the purpose of constructing a wastewater treatment facility shall consider the feasibility of constructing and operating a no discharge facility. Per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.1, for discharges likely to cause significant degradation, applicants must provide an analysis of non-degrading alternatives. No-discharge alternatives may include surface land application, subsurface land application, and connection to a regional treatment facility.

You must submit the *No-Discharge Evaluation Form* available at [dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2805-f.pdf](http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2805-f.pdf) to demonstrate that a nondischarging alternative is not feasible. If sufficient information is not provided on the *No-Discharge Evaluation Form* to demonstrate that a nondischarging facility is not feasible, a more detailed evaluation of no discharge options must be submitted.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

**9. IDENTIFY PREFERRED TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE**

Describe your preferred treatment alternative that has been recommended or approved by a registered professional engineer licensed to practice in Missouri. The preferred treatment alternative must be capable of meeting the effluent limits in the table under item 10 of this form.

Applicants choosing to use a new wastewater technology considered an "unproven technology" in Missouri must comply with the requirements set forth in the Innovative Technology factsheet found at: [dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2453.htm](http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2453.htm)

The existing facility was meeting the allowable discharge limits within the State Operating Permit, until the permit was re-issued. At that time the allowable discharge ammonia limits were reduced. Currently it is being proposed that two BioClere Units which are an aerated trickling filter above a clarifier be installed. Waste will be recycled back to the beginning of the treatment train to promote anoxic conditions at the beginning of the treatment train. Alkalinity corrections will be made to help promote ammonia reduction. A ultraviolet light disinfection unit will reduce E.coli. The manufacture of the BioClere units, believes that proposed system will meet the POC limits below in section 10.0

ENGINEERING CONSULTANT NAME

Kirby Scheer, P.E.,

COMPANY NAME

Scheer Design Group, LLC

**10. SUMMARY OF THE POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN AND EFFLUENT LIMITS**

Pollutants of concern to be considered include those pollutants reasonably expected to be present in the discharge per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.A. and assumed or demonstrated to cause significant degradation.

The tier protection levels are specified and defined in rule at 10 CSR 20-7.031 (2).

All POCs in this alternatives analysis were considered to be Tier 2 and significantly degrading in the absence of existing water quality.

As a result of this alternatives analysis review, the department has determined, depending on site specific conditions, there are treatment technologies available that may be economically efficient and practicable, which are capable of meeting the effluent limitations below. If the facility owners do not believe there is a treatment technology that is economically efficient, affordable, or practicable for their facility to meet these limits, a site specific alternatives analysis will be required.

The chosen alternative must be capable of meeting the following effluent limitations:

Pollutant of Concern*	Units	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average
BOD <sub>5</sub>	mg/L	-	15	10
TSS	mg/L		15	10
Ammonia as N Summer	mg/L	1.7		0.6
Ammonia as N Winter	mg/L	5.6		2.1
pH	SU	6.5– 9.0		6.5 – 9.0
<i>Escherichia coli</i> ( <i>E. coli</i> )	WBC(A)	#/100 mL	630***	126
	WBC(B)	#/100 mL	1030***	206
	Losing Stream**	#/100 mL	126***	Monitoring only

\* Permit limits for other parameters, including oil and grease, total residual chlorine, nitrates, and total phosphorus, will be included in the operating permit based on applicable water quality standards and criteria as applicable.

Total residual chlorine (TRC) effluent limits of 0.017 mg/L daily maximum, 0.008 mg/L monthly average are recommended if chlorine is used as a disinfectant. Standard compliance language for TRC, including the minimum level (ML), may be included in the operating permit.

\*\* For any facility that will discharge to a waterbody designated as a losing stream or within two miles flow distance upstream of a losing stream.

\*\*\* Publicly owned treatment works will receive a weekly average limit and private facilities will receive a daily maximum limit.

If any Tier 1 Pollutants of Concern not addressed in this alternatives analysis will be discharged, the applicant must submit *Attachment D: Tier 1 Review* ([dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2024-f.pdf](http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2024-f.pdf)) for those pollutants.

**OWNER:** I have read and reviewed the prepared documents and agree with this submittal.

SIGNATURE



DATE

11-9-18

**CONTINUING AUTHORITY:** I have read and reviewed the prepared documents and agree with this submittal.

SIGNATURE



DATE

11-9-18

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### 3) No Discharge Evaluation Form:

RECEIVED  
NOV 19 2018  
Water Protection Program

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
 WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BRANCH  
**NO DISCHARGE EVALUATION**

**NO DISCHARGE EVALUATION**

According to 10 CSR 20-6.010(4)(D), reports for the purpose of constructing a wastewater treatment facility shall consider the feasibility of constructing and operating a no-discharge facility. Per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.1, for discharges likely to cause significant degradation, applicants must provide an analysis of nondegrading alternatives. No-discharge alternatives may include surface land application, subsurface land application, and connection to a regional treatment facility.

Please refer to the *No-Discharge Evaluation Memo and Matrix* available at [dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/20160217-no-discharge-memo.pdf](http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/20160217-no-discharge-memo.pdf) for examples of information and documentation to provide to justify common reasons for not pursuing no-discharge land application. If sufficient information is not provided on this form to demonstrate that a no-discharge facility is not feasible, a more detailed evaluation of no-discharge options may have to be submitted.

Additional pages may be attached if more room is needed.

**1. FACILITY:**

NAME Westview Mobile Home Park MO - 0111902	COUNTY Franklin
------------------------------------------------	--------------------

**2. EVALUATION OF NO-DISCHARGE LAND APPLICATION**  
Check all applicable reasons why no-discharge land application was not pursued:

☒ **2.1 Land Availability and Cost:**

A. How many acres are required for land application of the effluent? 3.05 acres

B. What is the cost to purchase any necessary additional land within 1.5 miles of the facility? \$32,500

C. Were costs evaluated for transporting and land applying at a location farther from the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

D. What is the capital cost estimate for piping and pumps to transport effluent to a suitable land application site? \$615,800

E. Did you evaluate entering a long-term lease with a farmer or other land owner? ☐ Yes ☒ No

How many land owners were contacted and what restrictions were presented?

The local area is residential housing and subdivision. The areas along US Highway 50 are zoned commercial and demand a premium price.

Could controls be built into the contract, such as requiring the owner to use a certain percentage of the water annually?

not applicable

F. Were increased application rates evaluated in order to use less land? ☐ Yes ☒ No

G. Was using multiple application sites evaluated to optimize application rate per site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

H. Can the facility do seasonal discharge or seasonal application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

I. Was land applying to public use areas, such as golf courses or parks, evaluated? ☐ Yes ☐ No

J. Were long-term costs evaluated and compared for upgrading to a mechanical plant with future Water Quality Standards changes (i.e. mussel ammonia, bacteria, TP, TN) versus cost for a land application system? ☐ Yes ☒ No

☒ **2.2 Easements**

A. Were land owners contacted for rights to an easement? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B. What is the cost of easement acquisition? most land owners are against mobile home parks and will refuse easements

750-2808 (05-17)



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>2.3 Zoning or Suitability of Site in Proximity to Neighboring Sites or Waterbodies:</b>		
A. Can buffer distances be increased to reduce neighbor complaints?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
B. Was drip or subsurface irrigation evaluated as opposed to surface application?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
C. Does the county ordinance specifically restrict land application, surface and subsurface?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
D. Can a vegetated buffer be installed to reduce necessary buffer distances?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
E. Can higher application rates requiring less land be used?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
F. Are there other steps or considerations that can be made (see 2.1)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
G. What is the distance to a neighboring county without zoning restrictions? to far to consider		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>2.4 Unsuitability of Geology or Soils</b>		
A. Is a geohydrologic evaluation, county soils survey map, or other resource showing suitability and application rates included with this application?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
B. Is it cost-effective to bring in additional soils?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
C. Can the application rate be decreased to a suitable rate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
D. Were subsurface application alternatives (e.g. low pressure pipe, drip) considered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
E. If collapse potential is a concern, was using a liner or alternative site (see 2.1) evaluated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>2.5 Summarize why no-discharge land application was not a practicable or economically efficient alternative</b> Residential home owners in the area are not in favor of the mobile home park. The nearest regional facility would be the wastewater treatment facility at Twin Lakes Subdivision which is now managed by Franklin County Public Water Supply District No. 1. Twin Lakes Subdivision's WWTF was sized only to treat the flow from the existing subdivision. Expanding Twin Lakes Subdivision's treatment facility and installing a pumping station will cost more than improving the existing system. The next nearest Collection System would be The City of Union. This would be approximately 3.5 miles in length and with out eminent domain easements would be impossible.  The existing site does not offer enough area for a above ground irrigation system or a sub surface drip irrigation system. The anticipated cost of this system is greater than the cost of improving the existing system. The discharge from the improved system will be of a higher quality than any regional system is able to provide.		
<b>3. EVALUATION OF REGIONALIZATION</b>		
<b>3.1 Regionalization Feasibility:</b>		
A. What is the distance to connect to the closest municipality's line or other facility's line? 3700 feet		
B. Is there any planning or zoning in the area regarding development and services? none		
C. What is the estimated capital cost for piping and pumps to regionalize? \$322,700		
D. Does a regional facility have the capacity to treat the additional effluent from this project, and if not, what would it cost to upgrade the regional facility?		
NO, The nearest facility is designed to treat the waste flow from the Twin Lakes Subdivision only. We would need multiple easements.		
<b>3.2 Summarize why regionalization was not a practicable or economically efficient alternative</b> The nearest regional facility is approximately 3,700 feet away from the existing facility. The force main system would require several different easements from individual home owners to reach the beginning of the collection line at Twin Lakes Subdivision. The package treatment plant that treats the waste from Twin Lakes Subdivision is sized only for the subdivision. The anticipated expansion cost to the existing facility at Twin Lakes Subdivision combined with the cost of the lift station and force main would far exceed the cost of improving the treatment facility that currently serves Westview Mobile Home Park.		

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

<b>4. DOCUMENTATION</b>	
<p><b>4.1</b> Is any other written correspondence or documentation included with this application to provide further justification for not pursuing a no-discharge option or regionalization?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence with land owners regarding land for sale or lease or easement rights.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Letters from the community or a consulting engineer regarding availability, proximity, and location of suitable land and the reasonable cost of such land.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of recent land sales or appraisals.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calculations for sizing a land application system.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed cost estimates for a land application system or regionalization including lift stations, piping, easements, liners, and/or connection costs.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geohydrologic evaluation or other soils report.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Copy of a county or city ordinance.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Council meeting minutes.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A letter from an existing higher preference continuing authority waiving preferential status where service is not available in accordance with 10 CSR 20-6.0 10 (3) or if capacity is not available.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A letter from the existing higher preference continuing authority stating that the regional facility has no interest in taking flow from the new or expanded facility.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A letter from the regional municipality stating that the project area is outside city limits and annexation would be required.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Verification of funding from State Revolving Fund, which does not fund projects outside city limits.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other:</li> </ul>	
<p><b>OWNER:</b> I have read and reviewed the prepared documents and agree with this submittal.</p> <p>NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES  <i>Chris Thompson      Owner of Glo Homes</i></p> <p>SIGNATURE <i>Ch Thompson</i> DATE <i>11-9-18</i></p> <p><b>CONTINUING AUTHORITY:</b> I have read and reviewed the prepared documents and agree with this submittal. The regulatory requirement regarding continuing authority is found in 10 CSR 20-6.010(3) available at <a href="http://sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6.pdf">sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6.pdf</a>.</p> <p>NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES  <i>Same as above</i></p> <p>SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____</p>	

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### On-Site Drip Irrigation System For a Non-Discharge System

1.) Average design flow for on Site system	15,000 gpd
2.) Assumed Drip Irrigation soils loading rate	0.15 gal/day sq ft
3.) Approximate area needed for absorption field	2.30 ac
4.) Approximate area for setbacks and access to site	0.75 ac
5.) Total Site Needed for On Site Drip Irrigation	3.05 ac
6.) 15 acres of property listed for \$160,000 near the project site	\$10,667 asking cost per acre
7.) Cost of the soils absorption site only	\$32,487
8.) Average Residential Home field flow loading rate	360 gallon per day
9.) Average cost of residential home on-site sytem	\$14,000
10.) Average cost per treated gallon for residentail drip irrigation system	\$39 per treated gallon
11.) Assumed cost of drip irrigation system for the anticipated design flow from Westview MHP	\$583,333
12.) Adding the cost of the land if necessary to purchase	\$615,821



## Department's Alternatives Analysis

### Rough sizing and estimated cost of Lift Station to Nearest Treatment facility


1.)	Average Design Flow for WestView MHP Lift Station	15000 gpd
2.)	Average design flow in gallons per minute	10.42 gpm
3.)	Assumed Peaking Factor for Peak Hourly Flow Rate	4
4.)	Assumed Peak Hourly Flow Rate	41.67 gpm
5.)	lowest ground elevation in the system from usgs topo map	725 ft
6.)	Highest ground elevation in the system from usgs topo map	860 ft
7.)	Assumed depth of the lift station	12 ft
8.)	Assumed static head for pumping system from usgs topo map	147 ft
9.)	length of pressure main from usgs topo map	3700 ft
10.)	Size of force main line	4 in
11.)	minimum flow for scour velocity	78.30 gpm
12.)	Hazen-Williams head loss per 100 ft of discharge pipe	0.56 ft / 100 ft
13.)	Friction loss in the pipe	20.80 feet of head
14.)	Total Dynamic Head for the pumping system neglecting minor losses at this time	168 of TDH
15.)	Homa grinder pump 3 phase electric required. 180 ft head @ 80 gpm	
16.)	cost of three phase electric \$15,000 + \$10,000 each mile to site	\$45,000.00 rough estimate
17.)	2 - 13 hp Homa Pumps grinders with control panel	\$80,000
18.)	Concrete lift station with emergency holding	\$60,000
19.)	Cost to install 4" force main per running foot	\$21
20.)	Assumed installed cost of force main	\$77,700
21.)	Cost of required easements cannot be quantified	
22.)	Highway Road Boring Under Highway BB	\$60,000.00
23.)	rough estimated cost of a pressure force main to Twin Lakes Sub	\$322,700

Department's Alternatives Analysis





Septic Tank Absorption Fields—Franklin County, Missouri  
(cde)



Department's Alternatives Analysis

### Septic Tank Absorption Fields

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Component name (percent)	Rating reasons (numeric values)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
67140	Gladden-Midco complex, 1 to 3 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Very limited	Gladden (65%)	Flooding (1.00)	0.1	0.3%
				Seepage, bottom layer (1.00)		
				Slow water movement (0.50)		
			Midco (20%)	Flooding (1.00)		
				Seepage, bottom layer (1.00)		
			Twomile (5%)	Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		
				Slow water movement (1.00)		
73090	Useful silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Very limited	Useful (90%)	Flooding (0.40)	9.7	26.3%
				Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		
				Slow water movement (1.00)		
73094	Gatewood very gravelly silt loam, 15 to 35 percent slopes, stony	Very limited	Gatewood (85%)	Depth to bedrock (0.62)	24.1	64.9%
				Depth to bedrock (1.00)		
				Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		
				Slow water movement (1.00)		
73135	Union silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Very limited	Union (90%)	Slope (1.00)	3.2	8.6%
				Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		
			Glensted (5%)	Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

Septic Tank Absorption Fields—Franklin County, Missouri

site

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Component name (percent)	Rating reasons (numeric values)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
				Slow water movement (1.00)		
			Mariosa (3%)	Depth to saturated zone (1.00)		
				Slow water movement (1.00)		
Totals for Area of Interest					37.1	100.0%

Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Very limited	37.1	100.0%
Totals for Area of Interest	37.1	100.0%

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

Septic Tank Absorption Fields—Franklin County, Missouri

site

## Description

Septic tank absorption fields are areas in which effluent from a septic tank is distributed into the soil through subsurface tiles or perforated pipe. Only that part of the soil between depths of 24 and 60 inches is evaluated. The ratings are based on the soil properties that affect absorption of the effluent, construction and maintenance of the system, and public health. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ksat), depth to a water table, ponding, depth to bedrock or a cemented pan, and flooding affect absorption of the effluent. Stones and boulders, ice, and bedrock or a cemented pan interfere with installation. Subsidence interferes with installation and maintenance. Excessive slope may cause lateral seepage and surfacing of the effluent in downslope areas.

Some soils are underlain by loose sand and gravel or fractured bedrock at a depth of less than 4 feet below the distribution lines. In these soils the absorption field may not adequately filter the effluent, particularly when the system is new. As a result, the ground water may become contaminated.

The ratings are both verbal and numerical. Rating class terms indicate the extent to which the soils are limited by all of the soil features that affect the specified use. "Not limited" indicates that the soil has features that are very favorable for the specified use. Good performance and very low maintenance can be expected. "Somewhat limited" indicates that the soil has features that are moderately favorable for the specified use. The limitations can be overcome or minimized by special planning, design, or installation. Fair performance and moderate maintenance can be expected. "Very limited" indicates that the soil has one or more features that are unfavorable for the specified use. The limitations generally cannot be overcome without major soil reclamation, special design, or expensive installation procedures. Poor performance and high maintenance can be expected.

Numerical ratings indicate the severity of individual limitations. The ratings are shown as decimal fractions ranging from 0.01 to 1.00. They indicate gradations between the point at which a soil feature has the greatest negative impact on the use (1.00) and the point at which the soil feature is not a limitation (0.00).

The map unit components listed for each map unit in the accompanying Summary by Map Unit table in Web Soil Survey or the Aggregation Report in Soil Data Viewer are determined by the aggregation method chosen. An aggregated rating class is shown for each map unit. The components listed for each map unit are only those that have the same rating class as listed for the map unit. The percent composition of each component in a particular map unit is presented to help the user better understand the percentage of each map unit that has the rating presented.

Other components with different ratings may be present in each map unit. The ratings for all components, regardless of the map unit aggregated rating, can be viewed by generating the equivalent report from the Soil Reports tab in Web Soil Survey or from the Soil Data Mart site. Onsite investigation may be needed to validate these interpretations and to confirm the identity of the soil on a given site.

## Department's Alternatives Analysis

Septic Tank Absorption Fields—Franklin County, Missouri

site

### Rating Options

*Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition*

*Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified*

*Tie-break Rule: Higher*



STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS  
ISSUED BY  
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
REVISED  
AUGUST 1, 2014

These Standard Conditions incorporate permit conditions as required by 40 CFR 122.41 or other applicable state statutes or regulations. These minimum conditions apply unless superseded by requirements specified in the permit.

## Part I – General Conditions

### Section A – Sampling, Monitoring, and Recording

1. **Sampling Requirements.**
  - a. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.
  - b. All samples shall be taken at the outfall(s) or Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Department) approved sampling location(s), and unless specified, before the effluent joins or is diluted by any other body of water or substance.
2. **Monitoring Requirements.**
  - a. Records of monitoring information shall include:
    - i. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
    - ii. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;
    - iii. The date(s) analyses were performed;
    - iv. The individual(s) who performed the analyses;
    - v. The analytical techniques or methods used; and
    - vi. The results of such analyses.
  - b. If the permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by the permit at the location specified in the permit using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 CFR subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reported to the Department with the discharge monitoring report data (DMR) submitted to the Department pursuant to Section B, paragraph 7.
3. **Sample and Monitoring Calculations.** Calculations for all sample and monitoring results which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in the permit.
4. **Test Procedures.** The analytical and sampling methods used shall conform to the reference methods listed in 10 CSR 20-7.015 unless alternates are approved by the Department. The facility shall use sufficiently sensitive analytical methods for detecting, identifying, and measuring the concentrations of pollutants. The facility shall ensure that the selected methods are able to quantify the presence of pollutants in a given discharge at concentrations that are low enough to determine compliance with Water Quality Standards in 10 CSR 20-7.031 or effluent limitations unless provisions in the permit allow for other alternatives. A method is “sufficiently sensitive” when; 1) the method minimum level is at or below the level of the applicable water quality criterion for the pollutant or, 2) the method minimum level is above the applicable water quality criterion, but the amount of pollutant in a facility’s discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of pollutant in the discharge, or 3) the method has the lowest minimum level of the analytical methods approved under 10 CSR 20-7.015. These methods are also required for parameters that are listed as monitoring only, as the data collected may be used to determine if limitations need to be established. A permittee is responsible for working with their contractors to ensure that the analysis performed is sufficiently sensitive.
5. **Record Retention.** Except for records of monitoring information required by the permit related to the permittee’s sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five (5) years (or longer as required by 40 CFR part 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 the permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for the permit, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Department at any time.

6. **Illegal Activities.**
  - a. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under the permit shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two (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 four (4) years, or both.
  - b. The Missouri Clean Water Law provides that any person or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six (6) months, or by both. Second and successive convictions for violation under this paragraph by any person shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two (2) years, or both.

### Section B – Reporting Requirements

1. **Planned Changes.**
  - a. The permittee shall give notice to the Department as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility when:
    - i. 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 CFR 122.29(b); or
    - ii. 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 under 40 CFR 122.42;
    - iii. 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;
    - iv. Any facility expansions, production increases, or process modifications which will result in a new or substantially different discharge or sludge characteristics must be reported to the Department 60 days before the facility or process modification begins. Notification may be accomplished by application for a new permit. If the discharge does not violate effluent limitations specified in the permit, the facility is to submit a notice to the Department of the changed discharge at least 30 days before such changes. The Department may require a construction permit and/or permit modification as a result of the proposed changes at the facility.
2. **Non-compliance Reporting.**
  - a. The permittee shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Relevant information shall be provided orally or via the current electronic method approved by the Department, within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances, and shall be reported to the appropriate Regional Office during normal business hours or the Environmental Emergency Response hotline at 573-634-2436 outside of normal business hours. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) business days of the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission 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.





STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS  
ISSUED BY  
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
REVISED  
AUGUST 1, 2014

- b. The following shall be included as information which must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph.
    - i. Any unanticipated bypass which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit.
    - ii. Any upset which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit.
    - iii. Violation of a maximum daily discharge limitation for any of the pollutants listed by the Department in the permit required to be reported within 24 hours.
  - c. The Department may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports under paragraph 2. b. of this section if the oral report has been received within 24 hours.
3. **Anticipated Noncompliance.** The permittee shall give advance notice to the Department of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements. The notice shall be submitted to the Department 60 days prior to such changes or activity.
  4. **Compliance Schedules.** Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of the permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. The report shall provide an explanation for the instance of noncompliance and a proposed schedule or anticipated date, for achieving compliance with the compliance schedule requirement.
  5. **Other Noncompliance.** The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under paragraphs 2, 3, and 6 of this section, at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in paragraph 2. a. of this section.
  6. **Other Information.** Where the permittee becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Department, it shall promptly submit such facts or information.
  7. **Discharge Monitoring Reports.**
    - a. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the permit.
    - b. Monitoring results must be reported to the Department via the current method approved by the Department, unless the permittee has been granted a waiver from using the method. If the permittee has been granted a waiver, the permittee must use forms provided by the Department.
    - c. Monitoring results shall be reported to the Department no later than the 28<sup>th</sup> day of the month following the end of the reporting period.
- b. Notice.
    - i. Anticipated bypass. If the permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.
    - ii. Unanticipated bypass. The permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Section B – Reporting Requirements, paragraph 5 (24-hour notice).
  - c. Prohibition of bypass.
    - i. Bypass is prohibited, and the Department may take enforcement action against a permittee for bypass, unless:
      1. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;
      2. 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 preventive maintenance; and
      3. The permittee submitted notices as required under paragraph 2. b. of this section.
    - ii. The Department may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Department determines that it will meet the three (3) conditions listed above in paragraph 2. c. i. of this section.
3. **Upset Requirements.**
    - a. 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 3. b. 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.
    - b. 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:
      - i. An upset occurred and that the permittee can identify the cause(s) of the upset;
      - ii. The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated; and
      - iii. The permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in Section B – Reporting Requirements, paragraph 2. b. ii. (24-hour notice).
      - iv. The permittee complied with any remedial measures required under Section D – Administrative Requirements, paragraph 4.
    - c. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

## Section C – Bypass/Upset Requirements

1. **Definitions.**
  - a. *Bypass*: the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility, except in the case of blending.
  - b. *Severe Property Damage*: 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.
  - c. *Upset*: an exceptional incident in which there is 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 improper operation.
2. **Bypass Requirements.**
  - a. 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 2. b. and 2. c. of this section.

## Section D – Administrative Requirements

1. **Duty to Comply.** The permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law and Federal Clean Water 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 Federal 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. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who violates section 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of the Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any such sections in a permit issued under section 402, or any requirement imposed in a pretreatment program approved under sections 402(a)(3) or 402(b)(8) of the Act, is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$25,000 per day for each violation. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who negligently violates sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act, or any condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of the Act, or any requirement



STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS  
ISSUED BY  
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
REVISED  
AUGUST 1, 2014

imposed in a pretreatment program approved under section 402(a)(3) or 402(b)(8) of the Act, is subject to criminal penalties of \$2,500 to \$25,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment of not more than one (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 two (2) years, or both. Any person who knowingly violates such sections, or such conditions or limitations is subject to criminal penalties of \$5,000 to \$50,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment for not more than three (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 six (6) years, or both. Any person who knowingly violates section 301, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of the Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of the Act, and who knows at that time that he thereby places 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 imprisonment of not more than 15 years, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a knowing 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 CWA, 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.

- c. Any person may be assessed an administrative penalty by the EPA Director for violating section 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of this Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of this Act. Administrative penalties for Class I violations are not to exceed \$10,000 per violation, with the maximum amount of any Class I penalty assessed not to exceed \$25,000. Penalties for Class II violations are not to exceed \$10,000 per day for each day during which the violation continues, with the maximum amount of any Class II penalty not to exceed \$125,000.
  - d. It is unlawful for any person to cause or permit any discharge of water contaminants from any water contaminant or point source located in Missouri in violation of sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law, or any standard, rule or regulation promulgated by the commission. In the event the commission or the director determines that any provision of sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law or standard, rules, limitations or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, or permits issued by, or any final abatement order, other order, or determination made by the commission or the director, or any filing requirement pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law or any other provision which this state is required to enforce pursuant to any federal water pollution control act, is being, was, or is in imminent danger of being violated, the commission or director may cause to have instituted a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction for the injunctive relief to prevent any such violation or further violation or for the assessment of a penalty not to exceed \$10,000 per day for each day, or part thereof, the violation occurred and continues to occur, or both, as the court deems proper. Any person who willfully or negligently commits any violation in this paragraph shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than \$2,500 nor more than \$25,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. Second and successive convictions for violation of the same provision of this paragraph by any person shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two (2) years, or both.
2. **Duty to Reapply.**
    - a. 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.
    - b. A permittee with a currently effective site-specific permit shall submit an application for renewal at least 180 days before the expiration date of the existing permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the Department. (The Department shall not grant permission

for applications to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.)

- c. A permittee with currently effective general permit shall submit an application for renewal at least 30 days before the existing permit expires, unless the permittee has been notified by the Department that an earlier application must be made. The Department may grant permission for a later submission date. (The Department shall not grant permission for applications to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.)
3. **Need to Halt or Reduce Activity 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.
  4. **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.
  5. **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.
  6. **Permit Actions.**
    - a. Subject to compliance with statutory requirements of the Law and Regulations and applicable Court Order, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked in whole or in part during its term for cause including, but not limited to, the following:
      - i. Violations of any terms or conditions of this permit or the law;
      - ii. Having obtained this permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully any relevant facts;
      - iii. A change in any circumstances or conditions that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; or
      - iv. Any reason set forth in the Law or Regulations.
    - b. 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 condition.
  7. **Permit Transfer.**
    - a. Subject to 10 CSR 20-6.010, an operating permit may be transferred upon submission to the Department of an application to transfer signed by the existing owner and the new owner, unless prohibited by the terms of the permit. Until such time the permit is officially transferred, the original permittee remains responsible for complying with the terms and conditions of the existing permit.
    - b. The Department 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 Missouri Clean Water Law or the Federal Clean Water Act.
    - c. The Department, within 30 days of receipt of the application, shall notify the new permittee of its intent to revoke or reissue or transfer the permit.
  8. **Toxic Pollutants.** The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under section 307(a) of the Federal Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under section 405(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act 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.
  9. **Property Rights.** This permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege.





STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS  
ISSUED BY  
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
REVISED  
AUGUST 1, 2014

10. **Duty to Provide Information.** The permittee shall furnish to the Department, within a reasonable time, any information which the Department 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 Department upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.
11. **Inspection and Entry.** The permittee shall allow the Department, or an authorized representative (including an authorized contractor acting as a representative of the Department), 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 the 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 Federal Clean Water Act or Missouri Clean Water Law, any substances or parameters at any location.
12. **Closure of Treatment Facilities.**
  - a. Persons who cease operation or plan to cease operation of waste, wastewater, and sludge handling and treatment facilities shall close the facilities in accordance with a closure plan approved by the Department.
  - b. Operating Permits under 10 CSR 20-6.010 or under 10 CSR 20-6.015 are required until all waste, wastewater, and sludges have been disposed of in accordance with the closure plan approved by the Department and any disturbed areas have been properly stabilized. Disturbed areas will be considered stabilized when perennial vegetation, pavement, or structures using permanent materials cover all areas that have been disturbed. Vegetative cover, if used, shall be at least 70% plant density over 100% of the disturbed area.
13. **Signatory Requirement.**
  - a. All permit applications, reports required by the permit, or information requested by the Department shall be signed and certified. (See 40 CFR 122.22 and 10 CSR 20-6.010)
  - b. The Federal Clean Water Act 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 six (6) months per violation, or by both.
  - c. The Missouri Clean Water Law provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.
14. **Severability.** The provisions of the permit are severable, and if any provision of the permit, or the application of any provision of the permit to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of the permit, shall not be affected thereby.



STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS  
ISSUED BY  
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
REVISED  
MAY 1, 2013

PART II - SPECIAL CONDITIONS – PUBLICLY OWNED  
TREATMENT WORKS  
SECTION A – INDUSTRIAL USERS

**1. Definitions**

Definitions as set forth in the Missouri Clean Water Laws and approved by the Missouri Clean Water Commission shall apply to terms used herein.

Significant Industrial User (SIU). Except as provided in the *General Pretreatment Regulation* 10 CSR 20-6.100, the term Significant Industrial User means:

1. All Industrial Users subject to Categorical Pretreatment Standards; and
2. Any other Industrial User that: discharges an average of 25,000 gallons per day or more of process wastewater to the Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW) (excluding sanitary, noncontact cooling and boiler blowdown wastewater); contributes a process wastestream which makes up 5 percent or more of the average dry weather hydraulic or organic capacity of the POTW treatment plant; or is designated as such by the Control Authority on the basis that the Industrial User has a reasonable potential for adversely affecting the POTW's or for violating any Pretreatment Standard or requirement.

Clean Water Act (CWA) is the the federal Clean Water Act of 1972, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq. (2002).

**2. Identification of Industrial Discharges**

Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(j)(1), all POTWs shall identify, in terms of character and volume of pollutants, any Significant Industrial Users discharging to the POTW subject to Pretreatment Standards under section 307(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR 403.

**3. Application Information**

Applications for renewal or modification of this permit must contain the information about industrial discharges to the POTW pursuant to 40 CFR 122.21(j)(6)

**4. Notice to the Department**

Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.42(b), all POTWs must provide adequate notice of the following:

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger which would be subject to section 301 or 306 of CWA if it were directly discharging these pollutants; and
2. Any substantial change into 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.
3. For purposes of this paragraph, adequate notice shall include information on:
  - i. the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW, and
  - ii. any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW.

For POTWs without an approved pretreatment program, the notice of industrial discharges which was not included in the permit application shall be made as soon as practicable. For POTWs with an approved pretreatment program, notice is to be included in the annual pretreatment report required in the special conditions of this permit. Notice may be sent to:

Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
Water Protection Program  
Attn: Pretreatment Coordinator  
P.O. Box 176  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

**STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS**  
**ISSUED BY**  
**THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**  
**MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION**  
**August 1, 2019**

**PART III – BIOSOLIDS AND SLUDGE FROM DOMESTIC TREATMENT FACILITIES**

**SECTION A – GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

1. PART III Standard Conditions pertain to biosolids and sludge requirements under the Missouri Clean Water Law and regulations for domestic and municipal wastewater and also incorporates federal sludge disposal requirements under 40 CFR Part 503 for domestic wastewater. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has principal authority for permitting and enforcement of the federal sludge regulations under 40 CFR Part 503 for domestic biosolids and sludge.
2. PART III Standard Conditions apply only to biosolids and sludge generated at domestic wastewater treatment facilities, including public owned treatment works (POTW) and privately owned facilities.
3. Biosolids and Sludge Use and Disposal Practices:
  - a. The permittee is authorized to operate the biosolids and sludge generating, treatment, storage, use, and disposal facilities listed in the facility description of this permit.
  - b. The permittee shall not exceed the design sludge/biosolids volume listed in the facility description and shall not use biosolids or sludge disposal methods that are not listed in the facility description, without prior approval of the permitting authority.
  - c. For facilities operating under general operating permits that incorporate Standard Conditions PART III, the facility is authorized to operate the biosolids and sludge generating, treatment, storage, use and disposal facilities identified in the original operating permit application, subsequent renewal applications or subsequent written approval by the department.
4. Biosolids or Sludge Received from other Facilities:
  - a. Permittees may accept domestic wastewater biosolids or sludge from other facilities as long as the permittee's design sludge capacity is not exceeded and the treatment facility performance is not impaired.
  - b. The permittee shall obtain a signed statement from the biosolids or sludge generator or hauler that certifies the type and source of the sludge
5. Nothing in this permit precludes the initiation of legal action under local laws, except to the extent local laws are preempted by state law.
6. This permit does not preclude the enforcement of other applicable environmental regulations such as odor emissions under the Missouri Air Pollution Control Law and regulations.
7. This permit may (after due process) be modified, or alternatively revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable biosolids or sludge disposal standard or limitation issued or approved under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act or under Chapter 644 RSMo.
8. In addition to Standard Conditions PART III, the Department may include biosolids and sludge limitations in the special conditions portion or other sections of a site specific permit.
9. Exceptions to Standard Conditions PART III may be authorized on a case-by-case basis by the Department, as follows:
  - a. The Department may modify a site-specific permit following permit notice provisions as applicable under 10 CSR 20-6.020, 40 CFR § 124.10, and 40 CFR § 501.15(a)(2)(ix)(E).
  - b. Exceptions cannot be granted where prohibited by the federal sludge regulations under 40 CFR Part 503.

## **SECTION B – DEFINITIONS**

1. Best Management Practices are practices to prevent or reduce the pollution of waters of the state and include agronomic loading rates (nitrogen based), soil conservation practices, spill prevention and maintenance procedures and other site restrictions.
2. Biosolids means organic fertilizer or soil amendment produced by the treatment of domestic wastewater sludge.
3. Biosolids land application facility is a facility where biosolids are spread onto the land at agronomic rates for production of food, feed or fiber. The facility includes any structures necessary to store the biosolids until soil, weather, and crop conditions are favorable for land application.
4. Class A biosolids means a material that has met the Class A pathogen reduction requirements or equivalent treatment by a Process to Further Reduce Pathogens (PFRP) in accordance with 40 CFR Part 503.
5. Class B biosolids means a material that has met the Class B pathogen reduction requirements or equivalent treatment by a Process to Significantly Reduce Pathogens (PSRP) in accordance with 40 CFR Part 503.
6. Domestic wastewater means wastewater originating from the sanitary conveniences of residences, commercial buildings, factories and institutions; or co-mingled sanitary and industrial wastewater processed by a (POTW) or a privately owned facility.
7. Feed crops are crops produced primarily for consumption by animals.
8. Fiber crops are crops such as flax and cotton.
9. Food crops are crops consumed by humans which include, but is not limited to, fruits, vegetables and tobacco.
10. Industrial wastewater means any wastewater, also known as process wastewater, not defined as domestic wastewater. Per 40 CFR Part 122.2, 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. Land application of industrial wastewater, residuals or sludge is not authorized by Standard Conditions PART III.
11. Mechanical treatment plants are wastewater treatment facilities that use mechanical devices to treat wastewater, including, sand filters, extended aeration, activated sludge, contact stabilization, trickling filters, rotating biological contact systems, and other similar facilities. It does not include wastewater treatment lagoons or constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.
12. Plant Available Nitrogen (PAN) is nitrogen that will be available to plants during the growing seasons after biosolids application.
13. Public contact site is land with a high potential for contact by the public. This includes, but is not limited to, public parks, ball fields, cemeteries, plant nurseries, turf farms, and golf courses.
14. Sludge is the solid, semisolid, or liquid residue removed during the treatment of wastewater. Sludge includes septage removed from septic tanks or equivalent facilities. Sludge does not include carbon coal byproducts (CCBs), sewage sludge incinerator ash, or grit/screenings generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage.
15. Sludge lagoon is part of a mechanical wastewater treatment facility. A sludge lagoon is an earthen or concrete lined basin that receives sludge that has been removed from a wastewater treatment facility. It does not include a wastewater treatment lagoon or sludge treatment units that are not a part of a mechanical wastewater treatment facility.
16. Septage is the sludge pumped from residential septic tanks, cesspools, portable toilets, Type III marine sanitation devices, or similar treatment works such as sludge holding structures from residential wastewater treatment facilities with design populations of less than 150 people. Septage does not include grease removed from grease traps at a restaurant or material removed from septic tanks and other similar treatment works that have received industrial wastewater. The standard for biosolids from septage is different from other sludges. See Section H for more information.

## **SECTION C – MECHANICAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES**

1. Biosolids or sludge shall be routinely removed from wastewater treatment facilities and handled according to the permit facility description and the requirements of Standard Conditions PART III or in accordance with Section A.3.c., above.
2. The permittee shall operate storage and treatment facilities, as defined by Section 644.016(23), RSMo, so that there is no biosolids or sludge discharged to waters of the state. Agricultural storm water discharges are exempt under the provisions of Section 644.059, RSMo.
3. Mechanical treatment plants shall have separate biosolids or sludge storage compartments in accordance with 10 CSR 20, Chapter 8. Failure to remove biosolids or sludge from these storage compartments on the required design schedule is a violation of this permit.

## **SECTION D – BIOSOLIDS OR SLUDGE DISPOSED AT OTHER TREATMENT FACILITY OR BY CONTRACT HAULER**

1. Permittees that use contract haulers, under the authority of their operating permit, to dispose of biosolids or sludge, are responsible for compliance with all the terms of this permit. Contract haulers that assume the responsibility of the final disposal of biosolids or sludge, including biosolids land application, must obtain a Missouri State Operating Permit unless the hauler transports the biosolids or sludge to another permitted treatment facility.
2. Testing of biosolids or sludge, other than total solids content, is not required if biosolids or sludge are hauled to a permitted wastewater treatment facility, unless it is required by the accepting facility.

## **SECTION E – INCINERATION OF SLUDGE**

1. Please be aware that sludge incineration facilities may be subject to the requirements of 40 CFR Part 503 Subpart E, Missouri Air Conservation Commission regulations under 10 CSR 10, and solid waste management regulations under 10 CSR 80, as applicable.
2. Permittee may be authorized under the facility description of this permit to store incineration ash in lagoons or ash ponds. This permit does not authorize the disposal of incineration ash. Incineration ash shall be disposed in accordance with 10 CSR 80; or, if the ash is determined to be hazardous, with 10 CSR 25.
3. In addition to normal sludge monitoring, incineration facilities shall report the following as part of the annual report, mass of sludge incinerated and mass of ash generated. Permittee shall also provide the name of the ash disposal facility and permit number if applicable.

## **SECTION F – SURFACE DISPOSAL SITES AND BIOSOLIDS AND SLUDGE LAGOONS**

1. Please be aware that surface disposal sites of biosolids or sludge from wastewater treatment facilities may be subject to other laws including the requirements in 40 CFR Part 503 Subpart C, Missouri Air Conservation Commission regulations under 10 CSR 10, and solid waste management regulations under 10 CSR 80, as applicable.
2. Biosolids or sludge storage lagoons are temporary facilities and are not required to obtain a permit as a solid waste management facility under 10 CSR 80. In order to maintain biosolids or sludge storage lagoons as storage facilities, accumulated biosolids or sludge must be removed routinely, but not less than once every two years unless an alternate schedule is approved in the permit. The amount of biosolids or sludge removed will be dependent on biosolids or sludge generation and accumulation in the facility. Enough biosolids or sludge must be removed to maintain adequate storage capacity in the facility.
  - a. In order to avoid damage to the lagoon seal during cleaning, the permittee may leave a layer of biosolids or sludge on the bottom of the lagoon, upon prior approval of the Department; or
  - b. Permittee shall close the lagoon in accordance with Section I.

## **SECTION G – LAND APPLICATION OF BIOSOLIDS**

1. The permittee shall not land apply biosolids unless land application is authorized in the facility description, the special conditions of the issued NPDES permit, or in accordance with Section A.3.c., above.
2. This permit only authorizes “Class A” or “Class B” biosolids derived from domestic wastewater to be land applied onto grass land, crop land, timber, or other similar agricultural or silviculture lands at rates suitable for beneficial use as organic fertilizer and soil conditioner.
3. Class A Biosolids Requirements: Biosolids shall meet Class A requirements for application to public contact sites, residential lawns, home gardens or sold and/or given away in a bag or other container.
4. Class B biosolids that are land applied to agricultural and public contact sites shall comply with the following restrictions:
  - a. Food crops that touch the biosolids/soil mixture and are totally above the land surface shall not be harvested for 14 months after application of biosolids.
  - b. Food crops below the surface of the land shall not be harvested for 20 months after application of biosolids when the biosolids remain on the land surface for four months or longer prior to incorporation into the soil.
  - c. Food crops below the surface of the land shall not be harvested for 38 months after application of biosolids when the biosolids remain on the land surface for less than four months prior to incorporation into the soil.
  - d. Animal grazing shall not be allowed for 30 days after application of biosolids.
  - e. Food crops, feed crops, and fiber crops shall not be harvested for 30 days after application of biosolids.
  - f. Turf shall not be harvested for one year after application of biosolids if used for lawns or high public contact sites in close proximity to populated areas such as city parks or golf courses.
  - g. After Class B biosolids have been land applied to public contact sites with high potential for public exposure, as defined in 40 CFR § 503.31, such as city parks or golf courses, access must be restricted for 12 months.
  - h. After Class B biosolids have been land applied public contact sites with low potential for public exposure as defined in 40 CFR § 503.31, such as a rural land application or reclamation sites, access must be restricted for 30 days.
5. Pollutant limits
  - a. Biosolids shall be monitored to determine the quality for regulated pollutants listed in Table 1, below. Limits for any pollutants not listed below may be established in the permit.
  - b. The number of samples taken is directly related to the amount of biosolids or sludge produced by the facility (See Section J, below). Samples should be taken only during land application periods. When necessary, it is permissible to mix biosolids with lower concentrations of biosolids as well as other suitable Department approved material to achieve pollutant concentration below those identified in Table 1, below.
  - c. Table 1 gives the ceiling concentration for biosolids. Biosolids which exceed the concentrations in Table 1 may not be land applied.

**TABLE 1**

Biosolids ceiling concentration	
Pollutant	Milligrams per kilogram dry weight
Arsenic	75
Cadmium	85
Copper	4,300
Lead	840
Mercury	57
Molybdenum	75
Nickel	420
Selenium	100
Zinc	7,500

- d. Table 2 below gives the low metal concentration for biosolids. Because of its higher quality, biosolids with pollutant concentrations below those listed in Table 2 can safely be applied to agricultural land, forest, public contact sites, lawns, home gardens or be given away without further analysis. Biosolids containing metals in concentrations above the low metals concentrations but below the ceiling concentration limits may be land applied but shall not exceed the annual loading rates in Table 3 and the cumulative loading rates in Table 4. The permittee is required to track pollutant loading onto application sites for parameters that have exceeded the low metal concentration limits.

**TABLE 2**

Biosolids Low Metal Concentration	
Pollutant	Milligrams per kilogram dry weight
Arsenic	41
Cadmium	39
Copper	1,500
Lead	300
Mercury	17
Nickel	420
Selenium	100
Zinc	2,800

- e. Annual pollutant loading rate.

**Table 3**

Biosolids Annual Loading Rate	
Pollutant	Kg/ha (lbs./ac) per year
Arsenic	2.0 (1.79)
Cadmium	1.9 (1.70)
Copper	75 (66.94)
Lead	15 (13.39)
Mercury	0.85 (0.76)
Nickel	21 (18.74)
Selenium	5.0 (4.46)
Zinc	140 (124.96)

- f. Cumulative pollutant loading rates.

**Table 4**

Biosolids Cumulative Pollutant Loading Rate	
Pollutant	Kg/ha (lbs./ac)
Arsenic	41 (37)
Cadmium	39 (35)
Copper	1500 (1339)
Lead	300 (268)
Mercury	17 (15)
Nickel	420 (375)
Selenium	100 (89)
Zinc	2800 (2499)

6. Best Management Practices. The permittee shall use the following best management practices during land application activities to prevent the discharge of biosolids to waters of the state.
- Biosolids shall not be applied to the land if it is likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species listed under § 4 of the Endangered Species Act or its designated critical habitat.
  - Apply biosolids only at the agronomic rate of nitrogen needed (see 5.c. of this section).
  - The applicator must document the Plant Available Nitrogen (PAN) loadings, available nitrogen in the soil, and crop

nitrogen removal when either of the following occurs: 1) When biosolids are greater than 50,000 mg/kgTN; or 2) When biosolids are land applied at an application rate greater than two dry tons per acre per year.

- i. PAN can be determined as follows:  
(Nitrate + nitrite nitrogen) + (organic nitrogen x 0.2) + (ammonia nitrogen x volatilization factor<sup>1</sup>).  
<sup>1</sup> Volatilization factor is 0.7 for surface application and 1 for subsurface application. Alternative volatilization factors and mineralization rates can be utilized on a case-by-case basis.
- ii. Crop nutrient production/removal to be based on crop specific nitrogen needs and realistic yield goals. **NOTE:** There are a number of reference documents on the Missouri Department of Natural Resources website that are informative to implement best management practices in the proper management of biosolids, including crop specific nitrogen needs, realistic yields on a county by county basis and other supporting references.
- iii. Biosolids that are applied at agronomic rates shall not cause the annual pollutant loading rates identified in Table 3 to be exceeded.
- d. Buffer zones are as follows:
  - i. 300 feet of a water supply well, sinkhole, water supply reservoir or water supply intake in a stream;
  - ii. 300 feet of a losing stream, no discharge stream, stream stretches designated for whole body contact recreation, wild and scenic rivers, Ozark National Scenic Riverways or outstanding state resource waters as listed in the Water Quality Standards, 10 CSR 20-7.031;
  - iii. 150 feet of dwellings or public use areas;
  - iv. 100 feet (35 feet if biosolids application is down-gradient or the buffer zone is entirely vegetated) of lake, pond, wetlands or gaining streams (perennial or intermittent);
  - v. 50 feet of a property line. Buffer distances from property lines may be waived with written permission from neighboring property owner.
  - vi. For the application of dry, cake or liquid biosolids that are subsurface injected, buffer zones identified in 5.d.i. through 5.d.iii above, may be reduced to 100 feet. The buffer zone may be reduced to 35 feet if the buffer zone is permanently vegetated. Subsurface injection does not include methods or technology reflective of combination surface/shallow soil incorporation.
- e. Slope limitation for application sites are as follows:
  - i. For slopes less than or equal to 6 percent, no rate limitation;
  - ii. Applied to a slope 7 to 12 percent, the applicator may apply biosolids when soil conservation practices are used to meet the minimum erosion levels;
  - iii. Slopes > 12 percent, apply biosolids only when grass is vegetated and maintained with at least 80 percent ground cover at a rate of two dry tons per acre per year or less.
  - iv. Dry, cake or liquid biosolids that are subsurface injected, may be applied on slopes not to exceed 20 percent. Subsurface injection does not include the use of methods or technology reflective of combination surface/shallow soil incorporation.
- f. No biosolids may be land applied in an area that it is reasonably certain that pollutants will be transported into waters of the state.
- g. Biosolids may be land applied to sites with soil that are snow covered, frozen, or saturated with liquid when site restrictions or other controls are provided to prevent pollutants from being discharged to waters of the state during snowmelt or stormwater runoff. During inclement weather or unfavorable soil conditions use the following management practices:
  - i. A maximum field slope of 6% and a minimum 300 feet grass buffer between the application site and waters of the state. A 35 feet grass buffer may be utilized for the application of dry, cake or liquid biosolids that are subsurface injected. Subsurface injection does not include the use of methods or technology reflective of combination surface/shallow soil incorporation;
  - ii. A maximum field slope of 2% and 100 feet grass buffer between the application site and waters of the state. A 35 feet grass buffer may be used for the application of dry, cake or liquid biosolids that are subsurface injected. Subsurface injection does not include the use of methods or technology reflective of combination surface/shallow soil incorporation;
  - iii. Other best management practices approved by the Department.

## SECTION H – SEPTAGE

1. Haulers that land apply septage must obtain a state permit. An operating permit is not required for septage haulers who transport septage to another permitted treatment facility for disposal.
2. Do not apply more than 30,000 gallons of septage per acre per year or the volume otherwise stipulated in the operating permit.
3. Septic tanks are designed to retain sludge for one to three years which will allow for a larger reduction in pathogens and vectors, as compared to mechanical treatment facilities.
4. Septage must comply with Class B biosolids regarding pathogen and vector attraction reduction requirements before it may be applied to crops, pastures or timberland. To meet required pathogen and vector reduction requirements, mix 50 pounds of hydrated lime for every 1,000 gallons of septage and maintain a septage pH of at least 12 pH standard units for 30 minutes or more prior to application.
5. Lime is to be added to the pump truck and not directly to the septic tanks, as lime would harm the beneficial bacteria of the septic tank.
6. As residential septage contains relatively low levels of metals, the testing of metals in septage is not required.

## SECTION I– CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

1. This section applies to all wastewater facilities (mechanical and lagoons) and sludge or biosolids storage and treatment facilities. It does not apply to land application sites.
2. Permittees of a domestic wastewater facility who plan to cease operation must obtain Department approval of a closure plan which addresses proper removal and disposal of all sludges and/or biosolids. Permittee must maintain this permit until the facility is closed in accordance with the approved closure plan per 10 CSR 20 – 6.010 and 10 CSR 20 – 6.015.
3. Biosolids or sludge that are left in place during closure of a lagoon or earthen structure or ash pond shall not exceed the agricultural loading rates as follows:
  - a. Biosolids and sludge shall meet the monitoring and land application limits for agricultural rates as referenced in Section G, above.
  - b. If a wastewater treatment lagoon has been in operation for 15 years or more without sludge removal, the sludge in the lagoon qualifies as a Class B biosolids with respect to pathogens due to anaerobic digestion, and testing for fecal coliform is not required. For other lagoons, testing for fecal coliform is required to show compliance with Class B biosolids limitations. In order to reach Class B biosolids requirements, fecal coliform must be less than 2,000,000 colony forming units or 2,000,000 most probable number. All fecal samples must be presented as geometric mean per gram.
  - c. The allowable nitrogen loading that may be left in the lagoon shall be based on the plant available nitrogen (PAN) loading. For a grass cover crop, the allowable PAN is 300 pounds/acre. Alternative, site-specific application rates may be included in the closure plan for department consideration.
    - i. PAN can be determined as follows:
$$(\text{Nitrate} + \text{nitrite nitrogen}) + (\text{organic nitrogen} \times 0.2) + (\text{ammonia nitrogen} \times \text{volatilization factor}^1).$$
<sup>1</sup> Volatilization factor is 0.7 for surface application and 1 for subsurface application. Alternative volatilization factors and mineralization rates can be utilized on a case-by-case basis.
4. Domestic wastewater treatment lagoons with a design treatment capacity less than or equal to 150 persons, are “similar treatment works” under the definition of septage. Therefore the sludge within the lagoons may be treated as septage during closure activities. See Section B, above. Under the septage category, residuals may be left in place as follows:
  - a. Testing for metals or fecal coliform is not required.
  - b. If the wastewater treatment lagoon has been in use for less than 15 years, mix lime with the sludge at a rate of 50 pounds of hydrated lime per 1000 gallons (134 cubic feet) of sludge.
  - c. The amount of sludge that may be left in the lagoon shall be based on the plant available nitrogen (PAN) loading. 100 dry tons/acre of sludge may be left in the basin without testing for nitrogen. If 100 dry tons/acre or more will be left in the lagoon, test for nitrogen and determine the PAN using the calculation above. Allowable PAN loading is 300 pounds/acre.
5. Biosolids or sludge left within the domestic lagoon shall be mixed with soil on at least a 1 to 1 ratio, and unless otherwise approved, the lagoon berm shall be demolished, and the site shall be graded and contain  $\geq 70\%$  vegetative density over 100% of the site so as to avoid ponding of storm water and provide adequate surface water drainage without creating erosion. Alternative biosolids or sludge and soil mixing ratios may be included in the closure plan for department consideration.
6. Lagoon and earthen structure closure activities shall obtain a storm water permit for land disturbance activities that equal or exceed one acre in accordance with 10 CSR 20-6.200.
7. When closing a mechanical wastewater plant, all biosolids or sludge must be cleaned out and disposed of in accordance with the Department approved closure plan before the permit for the facility can be terminated.
  - a. Land must be stabilized which includes any grading, alternate use or fate upon approval by the Department, remediation, or other work that exposes sediment to stormwater per 10 CSR 20-6.200. The site shall be graded and contain  $\geq 70\%$  vegetative density over 100% of the site, so as to avoid ponding of storm water and provide adequate



- surface water drainage without creating erosion.
- b. Hazardous Waste shall not be land applied or disposed during mechanical plant closures unless in accordance with Missouri Hazardous Waste Management Law and Regulations pursuant to 10 CSR 25.
  - c. After demolition of the mechanical plant, the site must only contain clean fill defined in Section 260.200.1(6) RSMo as uncontaminated soil, rock, sand, gravel, concrete, asphaltic concrete, cinderblocks, brick, minimal amounts of wood and metal, and inert solids as approved by rule or policy of the Department for fill, reclamation, or other beneficial use. Other solid wastes must be removed.
8. If biosolids or sludge from the domestic lagoon or mechanical treatment plant exceeds agricultural rates under Section G and/or I, a landfill permit or solid waste disposal permit must be obtained if the permittee chooses to seek authorization for on-site sludge disposal under the Missouri Solid Waste Management Law and regulations per 10 CSR 80, and the permittee must comply with the surface disposal requirements under 40 CFR Part 503, Subpart C.

## SECTION J – MONITORING FREQUENCY

1. At a minimum, biosolids or sludge shall be tested for volume and percent total solids on a frequency that will accurately represent sludge quantities produced and disposed. Please see the table below.

**TABLE 5**

Biosolids or Sludge produced and disposed (Dry Tons per Year)	Monitoring Frequency (See Notes 1, and 2)		
	Metals, Pathogens and Vectors, Total Phosphorus, Total Potassium	Nitrogen TKN, Nitrogen PAN <sup>1</sup>	Priority Pollutants <sup>2</sup>
319 or less	1/year	1 per month	1/year
320 to 1650	4/year	1 per month	1/year
1651 to 16,500	6/year	1 per month	1/year
16,501+	12/year	1 per month	1/year

<sup>1</sup> Calculate plant available nitrogen (PAN) when either of the following occurs: 1) when biosolids are greater than 50,000 mg/kg TN; or 2) when biosolids are land applied at an application rate greater than two dry tons per acre per year.

<sup>2</sup> Priority pollutants (40 CFR 122.21, Appendix D, Tables II and III) are required only for permit holders that must have a pre-treatment program. Monitoring requirements may be modified and incorporated into the operating permit by the Department on a case-by-case basis.

Note 1: Total solids: A grab sample of sludge shall be tested one per day during land application periods for percent total solids. This data shall be used to calculate the dry tons of sludge applied per acre.

Note 2: Table 5 is not applicable for incineration and permit holders that landfill their sludge.

2. Permittees that operate wastewater treatment lagoons, peak flow equalization basins, combined sewer overflow basins or biosolids or sludge lagoons that are cleaned out once a year or less, may choose to sample only when the biosolids or sludge is removed or the lagoon is closed. Test one composite sample for each 319 dry tons of biosolids or sludge removed from the lagoon during the reporting year or during lagoon closure. Composite sample must represent various areas at one-foot depth.
3. Additional testing may be required in the special conditions or other sections of the permit.
4. Biosolids and sludge monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with federal regulation 40 CFR § 503.8, Sampling and analysis.

## SECTION K – RECORD KEEPING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1. The permittee shall maintain records on file at the facility for at least five years for the items listed in Standard Conditions PART III and any additional items in the Special Conditions section of this permit. This shall include dates when the biosolids or sludge facility is checked for proper operation, records of maintenance and repairs and other relevant information.
2. Reporting period
  - a. By February 19<sup>th</sup> of each year, applicable facilities shall submit an annual report for the previous calendar year period for all mechanical wastewater treatment facilities, sludge lagoons, and biosolids or sludge disposal facilities.
  - b. Permittees with wastewater treatment lagoons shall submit the above annual report only when biosolids or sludge are removed from the lagoon during the report period or when the lagoon is closed.
3. Report Form. The annual report shall be prepared on report forms provided by the Department or equivalent forms approved by the Department.
4. Reports shall be submitted as follows:  
Major facilities, which are those serving 10,000 persons or more or with a design flow equal to or greater than 1 million gallons per day or that are required to have an approved pretreatment program, shall report to both the Department and EPA if the facility land applied, disposed of biosolids by surface disposal, or operated a sewage sludge incinerator. All other facilities shall maintain their biosolids or sludge records and keep them available to Department personnel upon request. State reports shall be submitted to the address listed as follows:

DNR regional or other applicable office listed in the  
permit (see cover letter of permit)  
ATTN: Sludge Coordinator

Reports to EPA must be electronically submitted online via the Central Data Exchange at: <https://cdx.epa.gov/> Additional information is available at: <https://www.epa.gov/biosolids/compliance-and-annual-reporting-guidance-about-clean-water-act-laws>

5. Annual report contents. The annual report shall include the following:
  - a. Biosolids and sludge testing performed. If testing was conducted at a greater frequency than what is required by the permit, all test results must be included in the report.
  - b. Biosolids or sludge quantity shall be reported as dry tons for the quantity produced and/or disposed.
  - c. Gallons and % solids data used to calculate the dry ton amounts.
  - d. Description of any unusual operating conditions.
  - e. Final disposal method, dates, and location, and person responsible for hauling and disposal.
    - i. This must include the name and address for the hauler and sludge facility. If hauled to a municipal wastewater treatment facility, sanitary landfill, or other approved treatment facility, give the name of that facility.
    - ii. Include a description of the type of hauling equipment used and the capacity in tons, gallons, or cubic feet.
  - f. Contract Hauler Activities:

If using a contract hauler, provide a copy of a signed contract from the contractor. Permittee shall require the contractor to supply information required under this permit for which the contractor is responsible. The permittee shall submit a signed statement from the contractor that he has complied with the standards contained in this permit, unless the contract hauler has a separate biosolids or sludge use permit.
  - g. Land Application Sites:
    - i. Report the location of each application site, the annual and cumulative dry tons/acre for each site, and the landowners name and address. The location for each spreading site shall be given as a legal description for nearest ¼, ¼, Section, Township, Range, and county, or UTM coordinates. The facility shall report PAN when either of the following occurs: 1) When biosolids are greater than 50,000 mg/kg TN; or 2) when biosolids are land applied at an application rate greater than two dry tons per acre per year.
    - ii. If the “Low Metals” criteria are exceeded, report the annual and cumulative pollutant loading rates in pounds per acre for each applicable pollutant, and report the percent of cumulative pollutant loading which has been reached at each site.
    - iii. Report the method used for compliance with pathogen and vector attraction requirements.
    - iv. Report soil test results for pH and phosphorus. If no soil was tested during the year, report the last date when tested and the results.



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

**FORM B: APPLICATION FOR OPERATING PERMIT FOR  
FACILITIES THAT RECEIVE PRIMARILY DOMESTIC WASTE AND  
HAVE A DESIGN FLOW LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 100,000  
GALLONS PER DAY**

**FOR AGENCY USE ONLY**

CHECK NUMBER

DATE RECEIVED

FEE SUBMITTED

03/18/21

JETPAY CONFIRMATION NUMBER

**READ THE ACCOMPANYING INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM**

**1. THIS APPLICATION IS FOR:**

- ☐ An operating permit for a new or unpermitted facility. Construction Permit # \_\_\_\_\_  
(Include completed antidegradation review or request for antidegradation review, see instructions)
- ☐ A new site-specific operating permit formerly general permit #MOG \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ A site-specific operating permit renewal: Permit #MO- 011902 Expiration Date 6-30-2021
- ☐ A site-specific operating permit modification: Permit #MO- \_\_\_\_\_ Reason: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ General permit (NON-POTWs) (MOGD –discharging < 50,000 GPD or MOG823 – Land Application of Domestic Wastewater):  
Permit #MO- \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

1.1 Is the appropriate fee included with the application (see instructions for appropriate fee)? ☐ YES ☒ NO

**2. FACILITY**

NAME Westview Mobile Home Park TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 636 262 6020  
ADDRESS (PHYSICAL) 712 Star Circle CITY Union STATE MO ZIP CODE 63084

2.1 Legal description: 1/4 SE, Sec. 30, T 43N, R 1W County Franklin

2.2 UTM Coordinates Easting (X): 661829 Northing (Y): 4257510  
For Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), Zone 15 North referenced to North American Datum 1983 (NAD83)

2.3 Name of receiving stream: Tributary to St Johns Creek

2.4 Number of outfalls: \_\_\_\_\_ Wastewater outfalls: \_\_\_\_\_ Stormwater outfalls: \_\_\_\_\_ Instream monitoring sites: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. OWNER:**

NAME Glo Homes LLC EMAIL ADDRESS alohomes@earthlink.net TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 636 388 1242  
ADDRESS 755 Koko Loop CITY Union STATE MO ZIP CODE 63084

3.1 Request review of draft permit prior to public notice? ☐ YES ☒ NO

3.2 Are you a publicly owned treatment works? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, please attach the Financial Questionnaire.

See: <https://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2511-f.pdf>

3.3 Are you a privately owned treatment works? ☒ YES ☐ NO

3.4 Are you a privately owned treatment facility regulated by the Public Service Commission? ☐ YES ☒ NO

**4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY:**

NAME Glo Homes LLC EMAIL ADDRESS alohomes@earthlink.net TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 636 388 1242  
ADDRESS 755 Koko Loop CITY Union STATE MO ZIP CODE 63084

If the continuing authority is different than the owner, include a copy of the contract agreement between the two parties and a description of the responsibilities of both parties within the agreement.

**5. OPERATOR**

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE \_\_\_\_\_ CERTIFICATE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
EMAIL ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE \_\_\_\_\_

**6. FACILITY CONTACT**

NAME Dawn Thompson TITLE member / manager  
EMAIL ADDRESS dawnslistings25@yahoo.com TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 636 388 1242  
ADDRESS 755 Koko Loop CITY Union STATE MO ZIP CODE 63084

## 7. DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY

**7.1 Process Flow Diagram or Schematic:** Provide a diagram showing the processes of the treatment plant. Show all of the treatment units, including disinfection (e.g. – chlorination and dechlorination), influents, and outfalls. Specify where samples are taken. Indicate any treatment process changes in the routing of wastewater during dry weather and peak wet weather. Include a brief narrative description of the diagram.

Attach sheets as necessary.

pre treatment cell  
extended aeration

**7.2** Attach an aerial photograph or USGS topographic map showing the location of the facility and outfall.

Please see the following website:

<https://modnr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=1d81212e0854478ca0dae87c33c8c5ce>

8. ADDITIONAL FACILITY INFORMATION		
8.1	Number of people presently connected or population equivalent (P.E.) <u>52</u>	Design P.E. <u>90</u>
8.2	Connections to the facility: Number of units presently connected: Residential: _____ Commercial: _____ Industrial: _____ <u>+trailers 52</u>	
8.3	Design flow: <u>10,000</u>	Actual flow: <u>10,000</u>
8.4	Will discharge be continuous through the year? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Discharge will occur during the following months: _____ How many days of the week will discharge occur? <u>7</u>	
8.5	Is industrial wastewater discharged to the facility? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, attach a list of the industries that discharge to your facility	
8.6	Does the facility accept or process leachate from landfills? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
8.7	Is wastewater land applied? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, attach Form I. See: <a href="https://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-1686-f.pdf">https://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-1686-f.pdf</a>	
8.8	Does the facility discharge to a losing stream or sinkhole? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
8.9	Has a wasteload allocation study been completed for this facility? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
9. LABORATORY CONTROL INFORMATION		
LABORATORY WORK CONDUCTED BY PLANT PERSONNEL		
Lab work conducted outside of plant. <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> Push-button or visual methods for simple test such as pH, settleable solids. <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span> Additional procedures such as dissolved oxygen, chemical oxygen demand, biological oxygen demand, titrations, solids, volatile content. <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span> More advanced determinations such as BOD seeding procedures, fecal coliform/ <i>E. coli</i> , nutrients (including Ammonia), Oil & Grease, \ total oils, phenols, etc. <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span> Highly sophisticated instrumentation, such as atomic absorption and gas chromatograph. <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>		
10. COLLECTION SYSTEM		
10.1 Are there any municipal satellite collection systems connected to this facility? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please list all connected to this facility, contact phone number and length of each collection system		
FACILITY NAME	CONTACT PHONE NUMBER	LENGTH OF SYSTEM (FEET OR MILES)
10.2 Length of pipe in the sewer collection system? (If available, include totals from satellite collection systems) _____ Feet, or _____ Miles (either unit is appropriate)		
10.3 Does significant infiltration occur in the collection system? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, briefly explain any steps underway or planned to minimize inflow and infiltration:		

**11. BYPASSING**Does any bypassing occur in the collection system or at the treatment facility? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain:

**12. SLUDGE HANDLING, USE AND DISPOSAL**12.1 Is the sludge a hazardous waste as defined by 10 CSR 25? ☐ Yes ☒ No12.2 Sludge production, including sludge received from others: 1.5 Design dry tons/year \_\_\_\_\_ Actual dry tons/year

12.3 Capacity of sludge holding structures:

Sludge storage provided: \_\_\_\_\_ cubic feet; \_\_\_\_\_ days of storage; \_\_\_\_\_ average percent solids of sludge;  
☐ No sludge storage is provided. ☐ Sludge is stored in lagoon.

12.4 Type of Storage:

☒ Holding tank ☐ Building  
☐ Basin ☐ Lagoon  
☐ Concrete Pad ☐ Other (Describe) \_\_\_\_\_

12.5 Sludge Treatment:

☒ Anaerobic Digester ☐ Lagoon ☐ Composting  
☐ Storage Tank ☐ Aerobic Digester ☐ Other (Attach description)  
☐ Lime Stabilization ☐ Air or Heat Drying

12.6 Sludge Use or Disposal:

☐ Land Application ☐ Surface Disposal (Sludge Disposal Lagoon, Sludge held for more than two years)  
☐ Contract Hauler ☒ Hauled to Another treatment facility  
☐ Incineration ☐ Sludge Retained in Wastewater treatment lagoon  
☐ Solid waste landfill

12.7 Person responsible for hauling sludge to disposal facility:

☐ By applicant ☒ By others (complete below)

NAME

EMAIL ADDRESS

Waste Management

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

CONTACT PERSON

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE

PERMIT NO.  
MO-

12.8 Sludge use or disposal facility

☐ By applicant ☐ By others (Complete below.)

NAME

EMAIL ADDRESS

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

CONTACT PERSON

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE

PERMIT NO.  
MO-

12.9 Does the sludge or biosolids disposal comply with federal sludge regulations under 40 CFR 503?

☒ Yes ☐ No (Explain)



**13. ELECTRONIC DISCHARGE MONITORING REPORT (eDMR) SUBMISSION SYSTEM**

Per 40 CFR Part 127, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Electronic Reporting Rule, reporting of effluent limits and monitoring shall be submitted by the permittee via an electronic system to ensure a timely, complete, accurate, and nationally- consistent set of data. One of the following options must be checked in order for this application to be considered complete. Visit <https://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/edmr.htm> to for information on the Department's eDMR system and how to register.

- ☐ I will register an account online to participate in the Department's eDMR system through the Missouri Gateway for Environmental Management (MoGEM) before any reporting is due, in compliance with the Electronic Reporting Rule.
- ☒ I have already registered an account online to participate in the Department's eDMR system through MoGEM.
- ☐ I have submitted a written request for a waiver from electronic reporting. See instructions for further information regarding waivers.
- ☐ The permit I am applying for does not require the submission of discharge monitoring reports.

**14. JETPAY**

Permit fees may be paid online by credit card or eCheck through a system called JetPay. Use the URL provided to access JetPay and make an online payment.

New Site Specific Permit: <https://magic.collectorsolutions.com/magic-ui/payments/mo-natural-resources/591/>

Construction Permits: <https://magic.collectorsolutions.com/magic-ui/payments/mo-natural-resources/592/>

Modification Fee: <https://magic.collectorsolutions.com/magic-ui/payments/mo-natural-resources/596/>

New General Domestic WW: <https://magic.collectorsolutions.com/magic-ui/payments/mo-natural-resources/772/>

**15. CERTIFICATION**

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

NAME (TYPE OR PRINT)	OFFICIAL TITLE	TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
Dawn Thompson	Managing member	636-388-1242
SIGNATURE		DATE SIGNED
Dawn Thompson		3-10-2021