

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 R.S. Mo. as amended, hereinafter, the Law), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 92-500, 92nd Congress) as amended,

Permit No. MO-0138525

Owner: TCRSD, Taney County Regional Sewer District
Address: 6733 E. Highway Street 76, Kirbyville, MO 65679

Continuing Authority: Same as above
Address: Same as above

Facility Name: TCRSD, Lakeway Village Wastewater Treatment Facility
Facility Address: 575 Salmon Street, Kisse Mills, MO 65680

Legal Description: See Page 2
UTM Coordinates: See Page 2

Receiving Stream: See Page 2
First Classified Stream and ID: See Page 2
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: See Page 2

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

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

See Page 2


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.

May 1, 2020 September 1, 2021
Effective Date Modification Date

March 31, 2025
Expiration Date



Edward B. Galbraith, Director, Division of Environmental Quality



Chris Wieberg, Director, Water Protection Program

FACILITY DESCRIPTION (continued):

Outfall #001 – POTW

The use or operation of this facility shall be by or under the supervision of a Certified “D” Operator.

Septic tank / recirculation tank / recirculating sand filter / Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor /

Ultraviolet disinfection / sludge is hauled to another permitted facility for disposal

Design population equivalent is 400.

Design flow is 40,000 gallons per day.

Actual flow is 9,300 gallons per day.

Design sludge production is 7.33 dry tons/year.

Legal Description:	Sec. 36, T24N, R20W, Taney County
UTM Coordinates:	X = 494793, Y = 4059492
Receiving Stream:	Bull Shoals Lake Tributary (C)
First Classified Stream and ID:	Bull Shoals Lake Tributary (C) (3993) (losing)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.:	(11010003-0306)

Permitted Feature INF – Influent Monitoring Location

OUTFALL #001	TABLE A-1. FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
The permittee is authorized to discharge from outfall(s) with serial number(s) as specified in the application for this permit. The final effluent limitations in Table A-1 shall become effective on May 1, 2020 and remain in effect until 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
Limit Set: Q						
Flow	MGD	*		*	once/quarter***	24 hr. total
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅	mg/L		15	10	once/quarter***	grab
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L		20	15	once/quarter***	grab
<i>E. coli</i> (Note 1)	#/100mL	126		*	once/quarter***	grab
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Sep 30) (Oct 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	3.7 5.6		1.0 2.1	once/quarter***	grab
Oil & Grease	mg/L	15		10	once/quarter***	grab
Total Phosphorus	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter***	grab
EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	MINIMUM		MAXIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
pH – Units**	SU	6.5		9.0	once/quarter***	grab
EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)			UNITS	MONTHLY AVERAGE MINIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅ – Percent Removal (Note 2)			%	85	once/quarter***	calculated
Total Suspended Solids – Percent Removal (Note 2)			%	85	once/quarter***	calculated
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE JULY 28, 2020 . THERE SHALL BE NO DISCHARGE OF FLOATING SOLIDS OR VISIBLE FOAM IN OTHER THAN TRACE AMOUNTS.						

* Monitoring requirement only.

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

*** See table on Page 4 for quarterly sampling.

Note 1 – Effluent limits of 126 #/100 mL daily maximum and monitoring only for monthly average for *E. coli* are applicable year round due to losing stream designation. No more than 10% of samples over the course of a calendar year shall exceed the 126 #/100 mL daily maximum.

Note 2 – Calculate Percent Removal by using the following formula: [(Average Influent – Average Effluent) / Average Influent] x 100% = Percent Removal. Influent and effluent samples are to be taken during the same month. The Average Influent and Average Effluent values are to be calculated by adding the respective values together and dividing by the number of samples taken during the month.

PERMITTED FEATURE <u>INF</u>	TABLE B-1. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
	The monitoring requirements in Table B-1 shall become effective on <u>May 1, 2020</u> and remain in effect until expiration of the permit. The influent wastewater shall be monitored by the permittee as specified below:					
PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
		DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
Limit Set: IQ						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅ (Note 3)	mg/L			*	once/quarter**	grab
Total Suspended Solids (Note 3)	mg/L			*	once/quarter**	grab
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED <u>QUARTERLY</u> ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE <u>JULY 28, 2020</u> .						

* Monitoring requirement only.

** See table below.

Note 3 – Influent sampling for BOD₅ and TSS is not required when the facility does not discharge effluent during the reporting period. Samples are to be collected prior to any treatment process. Influent and effluent samples are to be taken during the same month. Influent samples are to be collected as a grab sample.

Quarterly Minimum Sampling Requirements			
Quarter	Months	Quarterly Influent Parameters	Report is Due
First	January, February, March	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	April 28 th
Second	April, May, June	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	July 28 th
Third	July, August, September	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	October 28 th
Fourth	October, November, December	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	January 28 th

C. STANDARD CONDITIONS

In addition to specified conditions stated herein, this permit is subject to the attached Parts I, II, & III standard conditions dated August 1, 2014, May 1, 2013, and August 1, 2019, and hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.

D. 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.
 - (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/mogem>. Information about the eDMR system can be found at <https://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/edmr.htm>. 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 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. Only permittees with an approved waiver request may submit monitoring data and reports on paper to the Department for the period that the approved electronic reporting waiver is effective. The permittee may obtain an electronic reporting waiver by first submitting an eDMR Waiver

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

Request Form: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2692-f.pdf>. 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.
 - (b) To incorporate an approved pretreatment program or modification thereto pursuant to 40 CFR 403.8(c) or 40 CFR 403.18(e), respectively.
3. All outfalls must be clearly marked in the field.
4. Permittee will cease discharge by connection to a facility with an area-wide management plan per 10 CSR 20-6.010(2)(B) within the timeframe allotted by the continuing authority with its notice of its availability. The permittee shall obtain Department approval for closure according to section 10 CSR 20-6.010(12) or alternate use of these facilities.
5. Report as no-discharge when a discharge does not occur during the report period.
6. 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) The permittee shall not report a sample result as “Non-Detect” without also reporting the detection limit of the test. Reporting as “Non Detect” without also including the detection limit will be considered failure to report, which is a violation of this permit.
 - (c) The permittee shall provide the “Non-Detect” sample result using the less than sign and the minimum detection limit (e.g. <10).
 - (d) Where the permit contains a Minimum 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.
 - (e) See Standard Conditions Part I, Section A, #4 regarding proper detection limits used for sample analysis.
 - (f) When a parameter is not detected above ML, the permittee must report the data qualifier signifying less than ML for that parameter (e.g., < 50 µg/L, if the ML for the parameter is 50 µg/L). For reporting an average based on a mix of values detected and not detected, assign a value of “0” for all non-detects for that reporting period and report the average of all the results.
7. It is a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law to fail to pay fees associated with this permit (644.055 RSMo).
8. The permittee shall comply with any applicable requirements listed in 10 CSR 20-9, unless the facility has received written notification that the Department has approved a modification to the requirements. The monitoring frequencies contained in this permit shall not be construed by the permittee as a modification of the monitoring frequencies listed in 10 CSR 20-9. To request a modification of the operational control testing requirements listed in 10 CSR 20-9, the permittee shall submit a permit modification application and fee to the Department requesting a deviation from the operational control monitoring requirements. Upon approval of the request, the Department will modify the permit.
9. The permittee shall develop and implement a program for maintenance and repair of its collection system. The permittee may compare collection system performance results and other data with the benchmarks used in the Departments’ Capacity, Management, Operation, And Maintenance (CMOM) Model located at <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/cmom-template.doc>. Additional information regarding the Departments’ CMOM Model is available at <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2574.htm>.

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

The permittee shall also submit a report via the Electronic Discharge Monitoring Report (eDMR) Submission System annually, by January 28th, for the previous calendar year. The report shall contain the following information:

- (a) A summary of the efforts to locate and eliminate specific sources of excessive infiltration and inflow into the collection system serving the facility for the previous year.
 - (b) A summary of the general maintenance and repairs to the collection system serving the facility for the previous year.
 - (c) A summary of any planned maintenance and repairs to the collection system serving the facility for the upcoming calendar year. This list shall include locations (GPS, 911 address, manhole number, etc.) and actions to be taken.
10. 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 Southwest Regional Office during normal business hours or by using the online Sanitary Sewer Overflow/Facility Bypass Application located at: <https://dnr.mo.gov/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.
 11. The facility must be sufficiently secured to restrict entry by children, livestock and unauthorized persons as well as to protect the facility from vandalism.
 12. 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.
 13. An all-weather access road to the treatment facility shall be maintained.
 14. 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.
 15. The media in the filter beds shall be properly maintained to prevent surface pooling, vegetative growth, and accumulation of leaf litter.

E. 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
STATEMENT OF BASIS
MO-0138525
LAKEWAY VILLAGE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY

This Statement of Basis (Statement) gives pertinent information regarding modification(s) to the above listed operating permit. A Statement is not an enforceable part of a Missouri State Operating Permit.

Part I – Facility Information

Facility Type: POTW

Facility Description: Septic tank / recirculation tank / recirculating sand filter / Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor /
Ultraviolet disinfection / sludge is hauled to another permitted facility for disposal

Part II – Modification Rationale

This operating permit is hereby modified to reflect a change of the address for the Taney County Regional Sewer District. During this modification the eDMR special condition was updated to reflect the change of the new MOGEM eDMR system.

No other changes were made at this time.

Part III – 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.

DATE OF FACT SHEET: AUGUST 5, 2021

COMPLETED BY:

MYRANDA ALFORD, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM
OPERATING PERMITS SECTION - DOMESTIC WASTEWATER UNIT
(573) 526-4029
Myranda.Alford@dnr.mo.gov

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
FACT SHEET
FOR THE PURPOSE OF RENEWAL
OF
MO-0138525
LAKEWAY VILLAGE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY

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.

This Factsheet is for a Minor facility.

Part I – Facility Information

Facility Type: POTW

Facility Description:

Septic tank / recirculation tank / recirculating sand filter / Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor /
Ultraviolet disinfection / sludge is hauled to another permitted facility for disposal

Have any changes occurred at this facility or in the receiving water body that affects effluent limit derivation?

✓ No.

Application Date: 09/23/19

Expiration Date: 03/31/20

OUTFALL(S) TABLE:

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	EFFLUENT TYPE
#001	0.062	Tertiary	Domestic

Facility Performance History:

This facility was last inspected on November 5-6th, 2018. The conditions of the facility at the time of inspection were found to be satisfactory. A review of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) revealed the following permit limit exceedances (month/year):

- BOD: 02/18; Ammonia: 02/18 & 03/18; TSS % Removal: 03/18

Comments:

Changes in this permit include the removal of alkalinity monitoring and acute WET test requirements, and a reduced sampling and reporting frequency for all parameters from monthly to quarterly. See Part VI of the Fact Sheet for further information regarding the addition, revision, and removal of effluent parameters. Special conditions were updated to include a requirement to maintain the media filter beds.

Part II – Operator Certification Requirements

- ✓ This facility is required to have a certified operator.

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, if applicable, as listed below:

Owned or operated by or for a

☐ - Municipalities

☐ - County

☒ - Public Sewer District

☐ - State agency

☐ - Public Water Supply Districts

☐ - Private Sewer Company regulated by the Public Service Commission

Each of the above entities are only applicable if they have a Population Equivalent greater than two hundred (200).

This facility currently requires a chief operator with a D Certification Level. Please see **Appendix - Classification Worksheet**. Modifications made to the wastewater treatment facility may cause the classification to be modified.

Operator's Name: Jonathan Coxie

Certification Number: 8686

Certification Level: WW-A

The listing of the operator above only signifies that staff drafting this operating permit have reviewed appropriate Department records and determined that the name listed on the operating permit application has the correct and applicable Certification Level.

Part III – Operational Control Testing Requirements

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 required to conduct operational monitoring. Operational monitoring reports are to be submitted to the Department along with the MSOP discharge monitoring reports.

- ✓ The facility is a recirculating media filter and is required to conduct operational control monitoring as follows:

Operational Monitoring Parameter	Frequency
Pressure – Squirt height in each zone at the orifice furthest from pump (Recirculating media beds only)	Twice/year

Part IV – Receiving Stream Information

RECEIVING STREAM(S) TABLE: OUTFALL #001

WATER-BODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	DESIGNATED USES*	12-DIGIT HUC	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
Bull Shoals Lake Tributary (losing)	C	3993	AQL-WWH, HHP, IRR, LWW, SCR, WBC-B	11010003-0306	0.0
Bull Shoals Lake	L2	7315	AQL-WWH & CDF, HHP, IRR, LWW, SCR, WBC-A		1.6

*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 1st 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 HHHF) = 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
Bull Shoals Lake Tributary	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 STREAM MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:

No receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time.

Receiving Water Body's Water Quality

Currently, the Department has not conducted a stream survey for this waterbody. When a stream survey is conducted, more information may be available about the receiving stream.

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

ALTERNATIVE EVALUATIONS FOR NEW FACILITIES:

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

- ✓ The facility discharges to a Losing Stream as defined by [10 CSR 20-2.010(40)] & [10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(O)], or is an existing facility, and has submitted an alternative evaluation.

ANTI-BACKSLIDING:

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

- ✓ Limitations in this operating permit for the reissuance of this permit conform to the anti-backsliding provisions of Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR Part 122.44.
- ✓ Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.
 - **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) test.** The previous permit included requirements to conduct an Acute WET test once during the permit cycle. The permit writer conducted a reasonable potential determination for all anticipated pollutants and established numeric effluent limitations where reasonable potential exists. Also, the facility has passed a previous Acute WET test. The permit writer determined the facility does not have reasonable potential to exceed narrative water quality standards for acute toxicity at this time and the acute WET testing requirements have been removed from this permit. This determination will be reevaluated during the next permit renewal.
 - **Alkalinity.** The previous permit included a demonstration project that required influent and internal monitoring for alkalinity to assess its impact on the wastewater treatment's facility ability to remove ammonia. The permit also required effluent Alkalinity monitoring to assess residual alkalinity. The acquired data has shown that the facility's wastewater has sufficient alkalinity to carry out nitrification to remove ammonia, and the effluent has sufficient residual alkalinity to maintain a near neutral pH. The demonstration project that required influent and internal Alkalinity has ended, and this permit will no longer require effluent monitoring.
 - **Sampling and Reporting Frequency.** The previous permit contained monthly sampling and reporting frequencies. This permit contains quarterly sampling and reporting frequencies due to the low design flow of the facility, consistency amongst effluent data, and compliance with effluent limits. The permit is still protective of water quality.
- ✓ The Department determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b).
 - **General Criteria.** The previous permit contained a special condition which described a specific set of prohibitions related to general criteria found in 10 CSR 20-7.031(4). In order to comply with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1), the permit writer has conducted reasonable potential determinations for each general criterion and established numeric effluent limitations where reasonable potential exists. While the removal of the previous permit special condition creates the appearance of backsliding, since this permit establishes numeric limitations where reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of the general criteria exists the permit maintains sufficient effluent limitations and monitoring requirements in order to protect water quality, this permit is equally protective as compared to the previous permit. Therefore, given this new information, and the fact that the previous permit special condition was not consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1), an error occurred in the establishment of the general criteria as a special condition of the previous permit. Please see Part VI – Effluent Limits Determination for more information regarding the reasonable potential determinations for each general criterion related to this facility.

ANTIDEGRADATION:

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

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

For stormwater discharges, the stormwater BMP chosen for the facility, through the antidegradation analysis performed by the facility, must be implemented and maintained at the facility. Failure to implement and maintain the chosen BMP alternative is a permit violation; see SWPPP.

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

AREA-WIDE WASTE TREATMENT MANAGEMENT & CONTINUING AUTHORITY:

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(2)(C)], ...An applicant may utilize a lower preference continuing authority by submitting, as part of the application, when a higher level authority is available, must submit information 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 is solids, semi-solids, or liquid residue generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works; including but not limited to, domestic septage; scum or solids removed in primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment process; and a material derived from sewage sludge. Sewage sludge does not include ash generated during the firing of sewage sludge in a sewage sludge incinerator or grit and screening generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works.

- ✓ Permittee is not authorized to land apply biosolids. Sludge is hauled to another permitted facility for disposal.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT:

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

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

ELECTRONIC DISCHARGE MONITORING REPORT (EDMR) SUBMISSION SYSTEM:

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

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

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

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

Per 40 CFR 127.15 and 127.24, permitted facilities may request a temporary waiver for up to 5 years or a permanent waiver from electronic reporting from the Department. To obtain an electronic reporting waiver, a permittee must first submit an eDMR Waiver Request Form: <http://dnr.mo.gov/forms/780-2692-f.pdf>. 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 discharges into a lake watershed (Bull Shoals Lake) where numeric lake nutrient criteria are applicable. However, regulations established in 10 CSR 20-7.015 as well as the Department's lake nutrient criteria implementation plan do not require nutrient monitoring for facilities with design flows less than or equal to 0.1 MGD. Should the lake within this watershed be identified as impaired due to nutrient loading, the Department will conduct watershed modeling to determine if this facility has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the impairment. Consequently, monitoring or effluent limitations may be established at a later date based on the modeling results. For more information, please see the Department's Nutrient Criteria Implementation Plan at: <https://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/rules/documents/nutrient-implementation-plan-final-072618.pdf>

PRETREATMENT PROGRAM:

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

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

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

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

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

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS (RPA):

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

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

✓ An RPA was conducted on appropriate parameters. Please see **APPENDIX – RPA RESULTS**.

REMOVAL EFFICIENCY:

Removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day (BOD₅) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals.

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

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

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are defined as untreated sewage releases and are considered bypassing under state regulation [10 CSR 20-2.010(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. The permit also contains requirements for permittees to develop and implement a program for maintenance and repair of the collection system. The permit requires that the permittee submit an annual report to the Department for the previous

calendar year that contains a summary of efforts taken by the permittee to locate and eliminate sources of excess I & I, a summary of general maintenance and repairs to the collection system, and a summary of any planned maintenance and repairs to the collection system for the upcoming calendar year.

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

SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE (SOC):

Per 644.051.4 RSMo, a permit may be issued with a Schedule of Compliance (SOC) to provide time for a facility to come into compliance with new state or federal effluent regulations, water quality standards, or other requirements. Such a schedule is not allowed if the facility is already in compliance with the new requirement, or if prohibited by other statute or regulation. A SOC includes an enforceable sequence of interim requirements (actions, operations, or milestone events) leading to compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law, its implementing regulations, and/or the terms and conditions of an operating permit. *See also* Section 502(17) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR §122.2. For new effluent limitations, the permit 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 a SOC.

SEWER EXTENSION AUTHORITY SUPERVISED PROGRAM:

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

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

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP):

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

In accordance with the EPA's *Developing Your Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, A Guide for Industrial Operators*, (Document number EPA 833-B-09-002) [published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in June 2015], BMPs are measures or practices used to reduce the amount of pollution entering (regarding this operating permit) waters of the state. BMPs may take the form of a process, activity, or physical structure.

Additionally in accordance with the Stormwater Management, a SWPPP is a series of steps and activities to (1) identify sources of pollution or contamination, and (2) select and carry out actions which prevent or control the pollution of stormwater discharges. The purpose of a SWPPP is to comply with all applicable stormwater regulations by creating an adaptive management plan to control and mitigate stream pollution from stormwater runoff. Developing a SWPPP provides opportunities to employ appropriate BMPs to minimize the risk of pollutants being discharged during storm events. The following paragraph outlines the general steps the permittee should take to determine which BMPs will work to achieve the benchmark values or limits in the permit. This section is not intended to be all encompassing or restrict the use of any physical BMP or operational and maintenance procedure assisting in pollution control. Additional steps or revisions to the SWPPP may be required to meet the requirements of the permit.

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

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

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

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

✓ At this time, the permittee is not required to develop and implement a SWPPP.

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

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

Where C = downstream concentration C_e = effluent concentration
Cs = upstream concentration Q_e = effluent flow
Q_s = upstream flow

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

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

Number of Samples "n":

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

WLA MODELING:

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

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

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 BOD₅ 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 NH₃)
- ☒ 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. The permit writer determined the facility does not have reasonable potential to exceed narrative water quality standards for acute toxicity at this time and the acute WET testing requirements have been removed from this permit. This determination will be reevaluated during the next permit renewal.

40 CFR 122.41(M) - BYPASSES:

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

✓ This facility does not anticipate bypassing.

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

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

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

✓ This facility does not discharge to a 303(d) listed stream.

Part VI – Effluent Limits Determination

CATEGORIES OF WATERS OF THE STATE:

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

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

OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL

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

EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS TABLE:

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ***
Flow	MGD	1	*		*	*/	1/quarter	quarterly	T
BOD ₅	mg/L	1		15	10	15/10	1/quarter	quarterly	G
TSS	mg/L	1		20	15	20/15	1/quarter	quarterly	G
<i>Escherichia coli</i> **	#/100mL	1, 3	126		*	126/*	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Sep 30)	mg/L	2, 3	3.7		1.0	3.7/1.0	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Ammonia as N (Oct 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	2, 3	5.6		2.1	5.6/2.1	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Oil & Grease	mg/L	1, 3	15		10	15/10	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Total Phosphorus	mg/L	1	*		*	*/	1/quarter	quarterly	G
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Minimum		Maximum	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
pH	SU	1	6.5		9.0	6.5-9.0	1/quarter	quarterly	G
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Minimum		Monthly Avg. Min	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
BOD ₅ Percent Removal	%	1			85	85	1/quarter	quarterly	M
TSS Percent Removal	%	1			85	85	1/quarter	quarterly	M

* - Monitoring requirement only.

** - No more than 10% of samples over the course of the calendar year shall exceed 126 #/100 mL daily maximum.

*** - G = Grab

T = 24-hr. total

M = Measured/calculated

Basis for Limitations Codes:

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. State or Federal Regulation/Law | 5. Antidegradation Policy | 9. WET Test Policy |
| 2. Water Quality Standard (includes RPA) | 6. Water Quality Model | 10. Multiple Discharger Variance |
| 3. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits | 7. Best Professional Judgment | 11. Nutrient Criteria Implementation Plan |
| 4. Antidegradation Review | 8. TMDL or Permit in lieu of TMDL | |

OUTFALL #001 – DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS:

- **Flow.** In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(1)(ii)] the volume of effluent discharged from each outfall is needed to assure compliance with permitted effluent limitations. If the permittee is unable to obtain effluent flow, then it is the responsibility of the permittee to inform the Department, which may require the submittal of an operating permit modification.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅).**
 - ✓ Operating permit retains 15 mg/L as a Weekly Average and 10 mg/L as a Monthly Average. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet.

- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).**
 - ✓ Operating permit retains 20 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).**
 - ✓ 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.
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Operating permit retains 3.7 mg/L as a Daily Maximum and 1.0 mg/L as a Monthly Average for summer designated months, and 5.6 mg/L as a Daily Maximum and 2.1 mg/L as a Monthly Average for winter designated months. Please see the attached Antidegradation Review Sheet for more information.
- **Oil & Grease.** Conventional pollutant, effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.
- **pH.** 6.5-9.0 SU. 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.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅) Percent Removal.** In accordance with 40 CFR Part 133, removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to BOD₅ and TSS for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals. This facility is required to meet 85% removal efficiency for BOD₅.
- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS) Percent Removal.** In accordance with 40 CFR Part 133, removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to BOD₅ and TSS for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals. This facility is required to meet 85% removal efficiency for TSS.
- **Total Phosphorus.**
 - ✓ Monitoring only. Discharges in the White River basin and outside of the area designated in 10 CSR 20-7.015(3)(G) for phosphorus limitations shall be monitored for phosphorus discharges, and the frequency of monitoring shall be the same as that for BOD₅ and TSS, but not less than annually.

Parameters Removed.

- **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) test.** The previous permit included requirements to conduct an Acute WET test once during the permit cycle. The permit writer conducted a reasonable potential determination for all anticipated pollutants and established numeric effluent limitations where reasonable potential exists. Also, the facility has passed a previous Acute WET test. The permit writer determined the facility does not have reasonable potential to exceed narrative water quality standards for acute toxicity at this time and the acute WET testing requirements have been removed from this permit. This determination will be reevaluated during the next permit renewal.
- **Alkalinity.** The previous permit included a demonstration project that required influent and internal monitoring for alkalinity to assess its impact on the wastewater treatment's facility ability to remove ammonia. The permit also required effluent Alkalinity monitoring to assess residual alkalinity. The acquired data has shown that the facility's wastewater has sufficient alkalinity to carry out nitrification to remove ammonia, and the effluent has sufficient residual alkalinity to maintain a near neutral pH. The demonstration project that required influent and internal Alkalinity has ended, and this permit will no longer require effluent monitoring.

Sampling Frequency Justification: Sampling and Reporting Frequency was reduced to quarterly for all parameters due to the demonstration project ending and the facility's consistent effluent data that meets permit limits. Sampling for *E. coli* is set at quarterly per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D)7.C.

Sampling Type Justification: As per 10 CSR 20-7.015, BOD₅ and TSS collected for media filters may be grab samples. Grab samples must be collected for pH, *E. coli*, and Oil & Grease in accordance with recommended analytical methods. For further information on sampling and testing methods please review 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(D) 2.

PERMITTED FEATURE INF – INFLUENT MONITORING

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

INFLUENT MONITORING TABLE:

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ***
BOD ₅	mg/L	1			*	***	1/quarter	quarterly	G
TSS	mg/L	1			*	***	1/quarter	quarterly	G

* - Monitoring requirement only.

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

**** - C = Composite

G = Grab

Basis for Limitations Codes:

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. State or Federal Regulation/Law | 5. Antidegradation Policy | 9. WET Test Policy |
| 2. Water Quality Standard (includes RPA) | 6. Water Quality Model | 10. Multiple Discharger Variance |
| 3. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits | 7. Best Professional Judgment | 11. Nutrient Criteria Implementation Plan |
| 4. Antidegradation Review | 8. TMDL or Permit in lieu of TMDL | |

Influent Parameters

- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS)**. An influent sample is required to determine the removal efficiency. In accordance with 40 CFR Part 133, removal efficiency is a method by which the Federal Regulations define Secondary Treatment and Equivalent to Secondary Treatment, which applies to BOD₅ and TSS for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)/municipals.

Sampling Frequency Justification: The sampling and reporting frequencies for influent BOD₅ and TSS have been established to match the required sampling frequency of these parameters in the effluent.

Sampling Type Justification: Sample types for influent parameters were established to match the required sampling type of these parameters in the effluent. Samples should be analyzed as soon as possible after collection and/or properly preserved according to method requirements.

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 Report of Compliance Inspection for the inspection conducted on November 5-6th, 2018, no evidence of an excursion of this criterion has been observed by the Department in the past and the facility has not disclosed any other information related to the characteristics of the discharge on their permit application which has the potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this narrative criterion. Additionally, this facility utilizes secondary treatment technology and is currently in compliance with effluent limitations that are more stringent than the secondary treatment technology based effluent limits established in 40 CFR 133 and there has been no indication to the Department that the stream has had issues maintaining beneficial uses as a result of this discharge. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, these final effluent limitations appear to have protected against the excursion of this criterion in the past. Therefore, the discharge does not have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.
- (B) Waters shall be free from oil, scum and floating debris in sufficient amounts to be unsightly or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.

- (C) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause unsightly color or turbidity, offensive odor or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses. Please see (A) above as justification is the same.
- (D) Waters shall be free from substances or conditions in sufficient amounts to result in toxicity to human, animal or aquatic life. This permit contains final effluent limitations which are protective of both acute and chronic toxicity for various pollutants that are either expected to be discharged by domestic wastewater facilities or that were disclosed by this facility on the application for permit coverage. Based on the information reviewed during the drafting of this permit, it has been determined if the facility meets final effluent limitations established in this permit, there is no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause an excursion of this criterion.
- (E) 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 made up of treated domestic wastewater. No evidence of an excursion of this criterion has been observed by the Department in the past and the facility has not disclosed any other information related to the characteristics of the discharge on their permit application which has the potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this narrative criterion. Additionally, any solid wastes received or produced at this facility are wholly contained in appropriate storage facilities, are not discharged, and are disposed of offsite. This discharge is subject to Standard Conditions Part III, which contains requirements for the management and disposal of sludge to prevent its discharge. Therefore, this discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of this criterion.

Part VII – Cost Analysis for Compliance

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

- ✓ The Department is not required to determine Cost Analysis for Compliance because the permit contains no new conditions or requirements that convey a new cost to the facility.

Part VIII – Administrative Requirements

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

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 and 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.

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 January 31, 2020 to March 2, 2020. No responses received.

DATE OF FACT SHEET: DECEMBER 24, 2019

COMPLETED BY:

SAM BUCKLER, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM
OPERATING PERMITS SECTION - DOMESTIC WASTEWATER UNIT
(573) 526-0827
sam.buckler@dnr.mo.gov

Appendices

APPENDIX - CLASSIFICATION WORKSHEET:

Item	Points Possible	Points Assigned
Maximum Population Equivalent (P.E.) served , peak day	1 pt./10,000 PE or major fraction thereof. (Max 10 pts.)	
Design Flow (avg. day) or peak month's flow (avg. day) whichever is larger	1 pt. / MGD or major fraction thereof. (Max 10 pts.)	
Effluent Discharge		
Missouri or Mississippi River	0	
All other stream discharges except to losing streams and stream reaches supporting whole body contact recreation	1	
Discharge to lake or reservoir outside of designated whole body contact recreational area	2	
Discharge to losing stream, or stream, lake or reservoir area supporting whole body contact recreation	3	3
Direct reuse or recycle of effluent	6	
Land Application/Irrigation		
Drip Irrigation	3	
Land application/irrigation	5	
Overland flow	4	
Variation in Raw Wastes (highest level only)		
Variations do not exceed those normally or typically expected	0	
Reoccurring deviations or excessive variations of 100 to 200 percent in strength and/or flow	2	
Reoccurring deviations or excessive variations of more than 200 percent in strength and/or flow	4	
Department-approved pretreatment program	6	
Preliminary Treatment		
STEP systems (operated by the permittee)	3	
Screening and/or comminution	3	
Grit removal	3	
Plant pumping of main flow	3	
Flow equalization	5	
Primary Treatment		
Primary clarifiers	5	
Chemical addition (except chlorine, enzymes)	4	
Secondary Treatment		
Trickling filter and other fixed film media with or without secondary clarifiers	10	
Activated sludge (including aeration, oxidation ditches, sequencing batch reactors, membrane bioreactors, and contact stabilization)	15	15
Stabilization ponds without aeration	5	
Aerated lagoon	8	
Advanced Lagoon Treatment – Aerobic cells, anaerobic cells, covers, or fixed film	10	
Biological, physical, or chemical	12	
Carbon regeneration	4	
Total from page ONE (1)	----	18

APPENDIX - CLASSIFICATION WORKSHEET (CONTINUED):

ITEM	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS ASSIGNED
Solids Handling		
Sludge Holding	5	
Anaerobic digestion	10	
Aerobic digestion	6	
Evaporative sludge drying	2	
Mechanical dewatering	8	
Solids reduction (incineration, wet oxidation)	12	
Land application	6	
Disinfection		
Chlorination or comparable	5	
On-site generation of disinfectant (except UV light)	5	
Dechlorination	2	
UV light	4	4
Required Laboratory Control Performed by Plant Personnel (highest level only)		
Lab work done outside the plant	0	
Push – button or visual methods for simple test such as pH, settleable solids	3	3
Additional procedures such as DO, COD, BOD, titrations, solids, volatile content	5	
More advanced determinations, such as BOD seeding procedures, fecal coliform, nutrients, total oils, phenols, etc.	7	
Highly sophisticated instrumentation, such as atomic absorption and gas chromatograph	10	
Total from page TWO (2)	----	7
Total from page ONE (1)	---	18
Grand Total	---	25

- ☐ - A: 71 points and greater
☐ - B: 51 points – 70 points
☐ - C: 26 points – 50 points
☒ - D: 0 points – 25 points

Water Quality and Antidegradation Review

*For the Protection of Water Quality
and Determination of Effluent Limits for Discharge to
Tributary to Bull Shoal Lake*

by

Lakeway Village Wastewater Treatment Facility



November, 2015

Table of Contents

<u>1.</u>	<u>Facility Information</u>	20
<u>2.</u>	<u>Water Quality Information</u>	20
<u>2.1.</u>	<u>Water Quality History:</u>	20
<u>3.</u>	<u>Receiving Waterbody Information</u>	20
<u>5.</u>	<u>Antidegradation Review Information</u>	21
<u>5.1.</u>	<u>TIER DETERMINATION</u>	21
	<u>Table 1: Pollutants of Concern and Tier Determination</u>	21
<u>5.2.</u>	<u>EXISTING WATER QUALITY</u>	22
<u>5.3.</u>	<u>DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE</u>	22
	<u>Table 2: Alternatives Analysis Comparison</u>	23
<u>5.3.1.</u>	<u>REGIONALIZATION ALTERNATIVE</u>	23
<u>5.3.2</u>	<u>LOSING STREAM ALTERNATIVE DISCHARGE LOCATION</u>	23
<u>5.3.3</u>	<u>SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION</u>	23
<u>6.</u>	<u>General Assumptions of the Water Quality and Antidegradation Review</u>	24
<u>7.</u>	<u>Mixing Considerations</u>	25
<u>8.</u>	<u>Permit Limits and Monitoring Information</u>	25
	<u>Table 3: Effluent Limits Outfall 001</u>	25
<u>9.</u>	<u>Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements</u>	25
<u>10.</u>	<u>Derivation and Discussion of Limits</u>	25
<u>10.1.</u>	<u>OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL</u>	26
<u>10.2.</u>	<u>LIMIT DERIVATION</u>	26
<u>11.</u>	<u>ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION</u>	27
	<u>Appendix A: Map of Discharge Location</u>	28
	<u>Appendix B: Natural Heritage Review</u>	28
	<u>Appendix C: Geohydrologic Evaluation</u>	35
	<u>Appendix D: Antidegradation Review Summary Attachments</u>	37

1. FACILITY INFORMATION

FACILITY NAME: Lakeway Village WWTF NPDES #: MO-0109479

FACILITY TYPE: NON-POTW – Residential Subdivision – SIC #4952

FACILITY DESCRIPTION: The facility is currently served by a 5,625 gallon per day system consisting of a septic tank, two single-pass reed bed wetland filters in series, a single-pass hyacinth filter, and a chlorine contact chamber. As a result of the submitted alternative analysis, the applicant has two preferred alternatives with the first being recirculating sand filter/moving bed biofilm reactor/UV disinfection and the second being extended aeration/moving bed biofilm reactor/UV disinfection. The design flow of the new system will be 0.04 MGD and will serve 162 houses and trailers at the site.

COUNTY:	<u>Taney</u>	UTM COORDINATES:	<u>X= 494763 / Y= 4059500</u>
12- DIGIT HUC:	<u>11010003-0306</u>	LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	<u>SW ¼ , SW ¼, Section 36, T24N, R20W</u>
EDU*:	<u>Ozark/White</u>	ECOREGION:	<u>Ozarks</u>

* - Ecological Drainage Unit

2. 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 (MDNR) 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 May 2, 2012, a facility is required to use *Missouri's Antidegradation Implementation Procedure (AIP)* for new and expanded wastewater discharges.

2.1. WATER QUALITY HISTORY:

The facility is currently in enforcement with the Attorney General's office for failing to comply. No DMR data has been received since June of 2014. No receiving water information.

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	RECEIVING WATERBODY	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
001	0.06	Secondary	Tributary to Bull Shoals Lake	0.0

3. RECEIVING WATERBODY INFORMATION

WATERBODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)			DESIGNATED USES**
			1Q10	7Q10	30Q10	
8-20-13 MUDD V1.0	C (losing)	3960	0.0	0.0	0.0	AQL, IRR, SCR, WBC(B), HHP
Bull Shoals Lake	L2	7315	--	--	--	AQL, CDF, IRR, LWV, SCR, WBC(A), HHP

** Irrigation (IRR), Livestock & Wildlife Watering (LWW), Protection of Warm Water Aquatic Life (AQL), Human Health Protection (HHP), Cool Water Fishery (CLF), Cold Water Fishery (CDF), Whole Body Contact Recreation – Category A (WBC-A), Whole Body Contact Recreation – Category B (WBC-B), Secondary Contact Recreation (SCR), Drinking Water Supply (DWS), Industrial (IND), Groundwater (GRW).

RECEIVING WATER BODY SEGMENT #1: Tributary to Bull Shoal Lake

Upper end segment* UTM coordinates: X= 494763/ Y= 4059500

Lower end segment* UTM coordinates: X= 494045 /Y = 4057350 (confluence with Bull Shoals Lake)

*Segment is the portion of the stream where discharge occurs. Segment is used to track changes in assimilative capacity and is bound at a minimum by existing sources and confluences with other significant water bodies.

4. GENERAL COMMENTS

Great River Engineering prepared, on behalf of Taneycomo Projects, Inc., the Antidegradation Review Report for Lakeway Village WWTF dated August, 2015. Applicant elected to assume that all pollutants of concern (POC) are significantly degrading the receiving stream in the absence of existing water quality. An alternative analysis was conducted to fulfill the requirements of the AIP. Information that was provided by the applicant in the submitted report and summary forms in Appendix D was used to develop this review document.

Proposed BOD₅ limits of 10 mg/L average monthly and of 15 mg/L average weekly were submitted and therefore a dissolved oxygen modeling analysis was not required to be submitted in accordance with the DO Modeling & BOD Effluent Limit Development Administrative Guidance for the Purpose of Conducting Water Quality Assistance Reviews, which can be found at: http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/permits/docs/DO_Modeling_Administrative_Guidance_Dec_09.pdf.

A Geohydrological Evaluation was submitted with the request and the unnamed tributary to Bull Shoals Lake is classified as losing from the discharge point to the lake boundary (Appendix C: Geohydrological Evaluation).

A Missouri Department of Conservation Natural Heritage Review was obtained by the applicant and no records of federally listed threatened or endangered species were found for the project area. However, state endangered species, other species, or natural communities of conservation concern were found to be known to occur in the project area. The Department of Conservation was contacted for more information and it was determined that no state-listed endangered species, state-ranked endangered species and/or natural communities of concern are located within one miles of the project site.

5. ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW INFORMATION

The following is a review of the *Antidegradation Review Report for Lakeway Village WWTF* dated August, 2015.

5.1. TIER DETERMINATION

Below is a list of pollutants of concern reasonably expected to be in the discharge (see Appendix D: Tier Determination and Effluent Limit Summary). 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). Tier 2 was assumed for all POCs (see Appendix D).

Table 1: Pollutants of Concern and Tier Determination

POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN	TIER*	DEGRADATION	COMMENT
BOD ₅ /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	
Total Phosphorous	2	Significant	Monitoring Only

* Tier assumed. Tier determination not possible.

** No in-stream standards for these parameters.

*** Standards for these parameters are ranges.

The following Antidegradation Review Summary attachments in Appendix D were used by the applicant:

For pollutants of concern, the attachments are:

☒ Attachment A, Tier 2 with significant degradation.

5.2. EXISTING WATER QUALITY

According to the Geohydrologic Evaluation (Appendix C), the tributary to Bull Shoals Lake that the facility discharges to was determined to be losing from the point of discharge to the lake boundary, which is approximately 1.5 miles. At the existing discharge point no flow was observed upstream. Flow was observed for approximately 300 feet downstream of the facility flow and was presumed to be effluent. The outfall discharge appeared to be largely untreated effluent and the concrete settling apparatus was leaking in several places. For approximately 50 feet downstream of the discharge point, the alluvial material in the bed of the tributary was covered in a green sludge-like material and the water was a murky, bluish color with a surface sheen. Also, an odor was present within approximately 10 feet of the discharge point. The new discharge point is proposed to be moved upstream of the current discharge point and the alternatives selected by the applicant will result in an improved quality of effluent.

No existing water quality data was submitted. All POCs were considered to be Tier 2 and significantly degraded in the absence of existing water quality.

5.3. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE

Missouri's antidegradation implementation procedures specify that if the proposed activity does result in significant degradation then a demonstration of necessity (i.e., alternatives analysis) and a determination of social and economic importance are required. Seven alternatives from non-degrading to less degrading to degrading alternatives were evaluated. The first two non-degrading alternatives considered were slow rate irrigation and subsurface irrigation. Both were determined to not be practicable due to soil conditions, land availability and land value, as well as right-of-way or easement acquisition. The third alternative evaluated, which was non-degrading, was regionalization of wastewater treatment. The nearest wastewater treatment facility is Taneyville WWTF, which is located 3 miles north of the Village. Regionalization was determined to be impracticable after consideration of the shallow bedrock and vertical grade of the area, the time and cost of land acquisition, and the need for the receiving wastewater treatment facility to construct an equalization basin to accept flows. Only those alternatives that were considered practicable were included in the economic efficiency analysis.

The remaining four alternatives were included in the economic efficiency analysis. In all cases ultraviolet disinfection was assumed to follow the wastewater treatment system. The report originally evaluated alternatives that would be in compliance with the current effluent ammonia limits (1.4 mg/L for summer and 2.7 mg/L for winter). However, it was later determined that the proposed technologies are capable of producing superior water quality and a Monthly Average limit of 1.0 mg/L for summer was proposed. The monthly average winter limit from the proposed EPA criteria, 2.1 mg/L, was proposed as the winter limit.

Alternative four was a recirculating sand filter with a Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (MBBR) downstream of the filter bed. The tank will be operated under aerobic conditions so that the bacteria will consume ammonia in the wastewater utilizing the oxygen for metabolism and for growing bacterial colonies. The proposed aeration grid also supplies mixing energy to maintain complete-mix conditions in the reactor. Having a relatively smaller footprint as well as low installation, operation, and maintenance costs, the recirculating sand filter with a MBBR and UV disinfection is a cost efficient alternative for providing improved effluent quality. This alternative was the base case as it was the most economically efficient.

Alternative five was a Schreiber Continuously Sequencing Reactor (CSR), which is an activated-sludge system with Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) capability. The wastewater enters a circular basin which produces the three process phases required for BNR (oxic, anoxic, and anaerobic) as well as provides mixing. The Schreiber CSR is capable of producing very low effluent ammonia when optimized and is able to meet potential future requirements for Total Phosphorous with the addition of a chemical such as Alum.

Alternative six involves transporting the existing 50,000 gpd extended aeration package plant that is utilized at the Branson Creek WWTF (MO-0123781) in Hollister, MO to Lakeway Village to serve the community. The Taney County Regional Sewer District is currently working on alternatives to provide public centralized sanitary sewer services to the Ridgedale/Turkey Creek area. Most of the alternatives include building an interceptor sewer from Hollister WWTF up through Turkey Creek to the connection point for the Branson Creek Development. If the interceptor was built, the Branson Creek WWTF would be taken offline. Review of the discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) from the Branson Creek WWTF over the past year indicate it is consistently producing ammonia effluent of less than 1.0 mg/L during summer months but is having issues during winter months. It was recommended that the package treatment plant be

partially buried to help mitigate the temperature issue and a MBBR would be added to this system to help meet the proposed ammonia limits.

The seventh alternative was a Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) by OVIVO. In the MBR process, the influent is screened and equalized before barrier filtration using membranes to separate solids and liquids as well as activated sludge that oxidizes organic constituents, BOD, and Ammonia to Nitrates. The OVIVO MBR uses membrane cartridges to support a very high concentration of attached biomass which provide a stable base for growth of a diverse community of microorganisms.

This analysis showed that the return on environmental benefits with increasing cost of treatment did not justify more expenditure beyond the base case treatment alternative (see Appendix D, Attachment A). The preferred alternative chosen based on this analysis is alternative 4, the recirculating sand filter with a MBBR. Alternative 6, transportation of the existing 50,000 gpd extended aeration package plant serving Branson Creek WWTF (MO-0123781) to Lakeway Village and adding an MBBR to aid in ammonia removal was also determined to be economical and practicable and may also be perused. The affordability analysis further argued the value the selected alternatives.

Table 2: Alternatives Analysis Comparison

	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6	Alternative 7
BOD	10	10	10	10
TSS	15	15	15	15
Ammonia (s/w)	1.0/2.1	1.0/2.1	1.0/2.1	1.0/2.1
Practical	Y	Y	Y	Y
Economical	Y	N	Y	N
Life Cycle Cost*	\$1,812,000	\$2,736,000	\$1,889,000	\$2,245,000
Ratio	1.0	1.6	1.1	1.3

* Life cycle cost at 20 year design life and 2% interest

Although the Schreiber CSR (Alternative 5) and the MBR (Alternative 7) were determined to be impracticable, the Taney County Regional Sewer District would like to continue to evaluate the technologies and other activated sludge technologies capable of producing excellent water quality to see if they are affordable.

5.3.1. 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 provided discussion of this alternative. The alternative analysis mentions Taney County Regional Sewer District as the continuing authority and Taneyville WWTF as the closest regional sanitary sewer treatment facility, which is 3 miles north of the Village. Connecting to Taneyville WWTF was determined to not be practicable after consideration of the cost of installation including rock removal, the vertical grade difference which would require four lift stations, and right-of-way and easement acquisition.

NEEDS A WAIVER TO PREVENT CONFLICT WITH AREA WIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVED UNDER SECTION 208 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND/OR UNDER 10 CSR 20-6.010(3) (B) 1 OR 2 CONTINUING AUTHORITIES? (Y OR N) N

5.3.2 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.* The Discharge does discharge to a losing stream segment. All non-degrading alternatives were found to not be practicable due to existing soil conditions, land availability/values, right-of-way and easement acquisition. The nearest gaining stream was determined to be Bull Shoals Lake. Discharge to Bull Shoals Lake was found to be both uneconomical and impracticable due to the distance of the facility from the lake, topography of the area, which would require the installation of a pump station, and easement acquisition.

5.3.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION

The applicant first identified the community that will be affected by the proposed degradation of water quality as Lakeway Village Subdivision, neighboring undeveloped land, and those who live and recreate on Bull Shoals Lake. Lakeway Village is a subdivision located just off of U.S. Highway 160 in Kisse Mills, MO, in Taney County. According

to the plat map filed with Taney County on July 21, 1981 and the Taney County GIS system, there are approximately 652 lots which are owned by approximately 162 owners within the subdivision. However, the existing sewer collection and wastewater treatment system was not built to serve the entire subdivision.

The existing system, which has a design flow of 5,625 gpd, is incapable of serving the current loading and is leaking partially treated wastewater into the surrounding area. As a result of these conditions, the facility is currently in enforcement with the Attorney General's Office (AGO) for noncompliance issues and a moratorium on construction of residences was put on the subdivision. In the Consent Judgement sent by the AGO and dated October 23, 2012, 63 connections were referenced at the site and 85 houses and trailers were identified within Lakeway Village proper by means of a house count. However, based on a sewer collection map provided by the Owner, the existing system can provide sewer services to approximately 162 lots. The proposed phase of the wastewater treatment plant expansion is to serve all existing 162 lots. Therefore, this project will result in a more reliable wastewater treatment system for existing customers and a higher level of service for everyone connected to the system.

The upgrade of the facility should result in the lifting of the moratorium on construction within the subdivision and the proposed design of the wastewater treatment facility will have the capacity to accept and treat wastewater from new residences. Future development of the Lakeway Village Subdivision could include up to 652 residential homes and trailers. The construction of these new residences could increase the land and real estate value within the subdivision as well as facilitate the continued development of the area including possible commercial development. The construction of the proposed infrastructure as well as residences in the area would also be a benefit to construction and building material companies within the area and employ numerous people of different trades. As Lakeway Village Subdivision and the surrounding area grow, a future phase of this project could be to expand the sewer collection system and wastewater treatment facility.

Appendix D, Attachment A: Tier 2 with Significant Degradation form contains a summary of this information

6. 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.

7. MIXING CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

8. PERMIT LIMITS AND MONITORING INFORMATION

WASTELOAD ALLOCATION
STUDY CONDUCTED (Y OR N):

☐ N

USE ATTAINABILITY
ANALYSIS CONDUCTED (Y OR N):

☐ N

WHOLE BODY CONTACT
USE RETAINED (Y OR N):

☐ Y

OUTFALL #001

WET TEST (Y OR N):

☐ Y

FREQUENCY: ONCE/PERMIT CYCLE AEC: 100% METHOD: MULTIPLE

Table 3: Effluent Limits Outfall 001

PARAMETER	UNITS	DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	BASIS FOR LIMIT (NOTE 2)	MONITORING FREQUENCY
FLOW	MGD	*		*	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND ₅	MG/L		15	10	FSR/PEL	ONCE/MONTH
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	MG/L		20	15	FSR/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	3.7		1.0	WQBEL/PEL	ONCE/MONTH
AMMONIA AS N (OCT 1 – MAR 31)	MG/L	5.6		2.1	WQBEL/PEL	ONCE/MONTH
<i>ESCHERICHIA COLIFORM (E. COLI)</i>	NOTE 1	126**		126**	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
OIL & GREASE	MG/L	15		10	FSR	ONCE/MONTH
TOTAL PHOSPHOROUS	MG/L	*		*	FSR	ONCE/MONTH

NOTE 1 – COLONIES/100 ML

NOTE 2– WATER QUALITY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATION – WQBEL; OR MINIMALLY DEGRADING EFFLUENT LIMIT –MDEL; OR PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE EFFLUENT LIMIT – PEL; OR TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMIT – TBEL; OR NO DEGRADATION EFFLUENT LIMIT – NDEL; OR FEDERAL/STATE REGULATION – FSR; OR NOT APPLICABLE – N/A. ALSO, PLEASE SEE THE **GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WQAR #4 & #5.**

* Monitoring requirements only.

** The Monthly and Weekly Average for *E. coli* shall be reported 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).

9. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

No receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time.

10. DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS

Wasteload allocations and limits were calculated using two methods:

1) 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_s = upstream concentration

Q_s = upstream flow

C_e = effluent concentration

Q_e = effluent flow

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

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).

2) Alternative Analysis-based – Using the preferred alternative's treatment capacity for conventional pollutants such as BOD₅ and TSS that are provided by the consultant as the WLA, the significantly-degrading effluent average monthly and average weekly limits are determined by applying the WLA as the average monthly (AML) and multiplying the AML by 1.5 to derive the average weekly limit (AWL). For toxic and nonconventional pollutant such as ammonia, the treatment capacity is applied as the significantly-degrading effluent monthly average (AML). A maximum daily can be derived by dividing the AML by 1.19 to determine the long-term average (LTA). The LTA is then multiplied by 3.11 to obtain the maximum daily limitation. This is an accepted procedure that is defined in USEPA's "Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control" (EPA/505/2-90-001).

Note: Significantly-degrading effluent limits have been based on the authority included in Section III. Permit Consideration of the AIP. Also 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 BOD₅ 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 BOD₅ 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.

10.1. OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL

10.2. 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.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅).** BOD₅ limits of 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L average weekly limits were proposed and are in accordance with 10 CSR 20-7.015(4), Effluent Limitations for Losing Streams.

Dissolved oxygen modeling is required to demonstrate that waste load allocations (WLA) for 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) are protective of water quality standards for dissolved oxygen (DO). According to the DO Modeling & BOD Effluent Limit Development Administrative Guidance for the Purpose of Conducting Water Quality Assistance Reviews, the applicant has the option to submit documentation that demonstrates the performance of the new or expanded facility in lieu of the DO modeling requirement. Facility performance exemptions from the required DO modeling for new and expanded facilities include those less than 100,000 gpd and proposing advanced BOD₅ treatment less than or equal to an average monthly of 10 mg/L and average weekly 15 mg/L.

As a result of this analysis, MDNR staff concludes that the above mentioned effluent limits are protective of beneficial uses and existing water quality.

- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** 15 mg/L monthly average and 20 mg/L average weekly limit, as per 10 CSR 20-7.015(4).
- **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 due to the classification of the receiving stream, therefore the water quality standard must be met at the outfall.
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Applicant originally proposed the current effluent ammonia limits (1.4 mg/L for summer and 2.7 mg/L for winter). However, after discussion it was determined that the proposed technologies are capable of meeting a monthly average limit of 1.0 mg/L for summer. The proposed EPA ammonia criterion was used for the winter limits. The daily maximum limits were calculated as demonstrated below.

Summer:

AML = 1.0 mg/L

LTA = 1.0 mg/L / (1.19) = 1.19 mg/L

MDL = 1.19 mg/L (3.11) = 3.7 mg/L

Winter:

AML = 2.1 mg/L

LTA = 2.1 mg/L / (1.19) = 1.79 mg/L

MDL = 1.79 mg/L (3.11) = 5.6 mg/L

Season	Maximum Daily Limit (mg/l)	Average Monthly Limit (mg/l)
Summer	3.7	1.0
Winter	5.6	2.1

- **Escherichia coli (E. coli)**. Discharges to losing streams shall not exceed 126 per 100 mL as a Daily Maximum and Monthly Average at any time, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C). No more than 10% of samples (collected over long series of sampling events) shall exceed 126 cfu per 100 mL daily maximum as per 10 CSR 20-7.015(9)(B)1.G.

For facilities less than 100,000 gpd: Per the effluent regulations the *E. coli* sampling/monitoring frequency 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 month for the monthly average). Please see **GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS OF THE WQAR #7**. The facility is planning to use ultraviolet disinfection for meet *E. coli* effluent limits.

- **Oil & Grease**. 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 Phosphorous**. Monitoring requirement only. Discharges in the White River basin and outside of the area between Table Rock Dam and Power Site Dam shall be monitored for phosphorous discharges in accordance with 10 CSR 20-7.015(3)(E)2. The frequency of monitoring shall be the same as that for BOD₅ and TSS.
- **WET Test**. Monitoring requirement only. Monitoring is required to determine if reasonable potential exists for this facility's discharge to exceed water quality standards.

11. ANTIDegradation REVIEW PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

The proposed new facility at Lakeway WWTF will discharge 0.04 MGD and result in significant degradation of the segment identified in the tributary to Bull Shoals Lake. The applicant selected a recirculating sand filter with a MBBR and UV Disinfection, which was the base case technology (lowest cost alternative that meets technology and water quality based effluent limitations), as the preferred alternative. The applicant also elected to pursue the transportation and use of the existing 50,000 gpd extended aeration package plant at the Branson Creek Development with the addition of a MBBR if Branson Creek is connected to Hollister WWTF. These are considered reasonable alternatives provided they are designed to be capable of meeting the effluent limitations developed based on the preferred alternative.

The cost effectiveness of the technologies were evaluated and the recirculating sand filter with a MBBR and UV disinfection as well as the extended aeration package plant with UV disinfection and a MBBR were found to be cost effective and determined to be the preferred alternatives. If any of these options are selected, you may proceed with the appropriate facility plan, construction permit application, or other future submittals without the need to modify this Antidegradation review document.

The MBBR in the proposed arrangement is not covered in 10 CSR 20-8 Design Guides and is considered a new treatment technology. To proceed with a new 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. Alternatively, you may select one of the other reasonable treatment options approved in the WQAR that is capable of meeting the proposed effluent limits in this document and avoid this step unless this option is also an unproven technology. These submittals must reflect the design flow, facility description, and general treatment components of this WQAR or this preliminary determination may have to be revised.


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. MDNR has determined that the submitted review is sufficient and meets the requirements of the AIP. No further analysis is needed for this discharge.

Reviewer: Rachel Schneider, EI

Date: 11/12/015

Unit Chief: John Rustige, P.E.

Appendix A: Map of Discharge Location



On-line LEVEL 2 Report

Your project information

First Name: Timothy

Last Name: Schoenhoff

Email Address: tschoenhoff@greatriv.com

Business: Great River Engineering

Project: Land Development


Your query information

Township: 24

Range: 20

Section: 36

Direction: w



Details

Thank you for accessing the Missouri Natural Heritage Review Web Site developed by the Missouri Department of Conservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with funding assistance by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The purpose of this web site is to provide information to federal, state and local agencies, organizations, municipalities, corporations and consultants regarding sensitive fish, wildlife, plants and their habitats to assist in planning, designing and permitting stages of projects.

The results of a database query of the above referenced location indicate that **no** federally-listed threatened or endangered species (including those species proposed for listing) or critical habitat (designated or proposed) are known to occur on or near the project site. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service response is provided under the authority of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4347) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543).

The results of a database query of the above-referenced location indicate that state endangered species other species or natural communities of conservation concern (e.g., prairie, glade, fen) **are known** to occur on or near the project site and may be impacted by project construction activities. An MDC specialist needs to review your request to determine if your project is close enough to impact the resource in question. Please contact the Missouri Department of Conservation for further consultation. A written request containing the project description, county name, U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 topographic quadrangle name, township, range and section, and a location map (e.g., U.S.G.S topo. quad.) with the project area clearly identified, and a copy of this document noting the unique reference code should be sent to: Missouri Department of Conservation, Resource Science Division, Missouri Natural Heritage Review Web Site, P.O. Box 180, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0180.

The web site also provides additional information regarding management practices for planning purposes if your project is within the known range of certain sensitive species and habitats (e.g., karst areas, grasslands, stream reaches with critical spawning restrictions). Please note that this information does not serve as a substitute for direct consultation with Missouri Department of Conservation staff.

If you need additional information, please contact:

MDC Natural Heritage Review Resource Science Division P.O. Box 180 Jefferson City , MO 65102-0180 (Phone 573-522-4115 ext. 3182) www.mdc.mo.gov	or	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services 101 Park Deville Drive , Suite A Columbia , Missouri 65203-0007 (Phone 573-234-2132)
---	----	--


A HERITAGE REVIEW provides information about species and habitats of concern that could be affected by the project. Heritage records note things that were positively identified at some date and time, marked at a location that may be more or less precise. Animals move quickly but plant communities can move also. To say “there is a record” does not mean the species/habitat is still there. To say that “there is no record” does not mean the project may not encounter something. Because of this, reports include information about records near but not necessarily on the project site. Three different kinds of information are provided.

- FEDERAL Concerns are species/habitats protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act and that have been known near enough to the project site to warrant consideration. For these, project managers must contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services (101 Park Deville Drive Suite A, Columbia , Missouri 65203-0007 ; Phone 573-234-2132; Fax 573-234-2181) for consultation.
- STATE Concerns are species/habitats known to exist near enough to the project site to warrant concern and protected under the Wildlife Code of Missouri (RSMo 3 CSR 10). “State Endangered Status” is determined by the Missouri Conservation Commission under constitutional authority, with requirements expressed in the Missouri Wildlife Code, rule 3CSR10-4.111. “State Rank” is numeric rank of relative rarity, protected under general provisions of the Wildlife Code but not endangered.
- “Concerns & management recommendations” are things for which one might prudently look. There is no specific heritage record, but our knowledge of the surrounding landscape suggests consideration. 93% of Missouri 's land is in private ownership, so most sites have never been carefully inspected by conservation professionals

This report is not a site clearance letter. Rather, it provides an indication of whether or not public lands and sensitive resources are known to be (or are likely to be) located close to the proposed project. Incorporating information from our Heritage Database into project plans is

an important step that can help reduce unnecessary impacts to Missouri's sensitive natural resources. However, the Heritage Database is only one reference that should be used to evaluate potential adverse impacts. Other types of information, such as wetland and soils maps and on-site inspections or surveys, should be considered. Reviewing current landscape and habitat information and species biological characteristics would additionally ensure that species of conservation concern are appropriately identified and addressed.

Additional information on rare, endangered and watched species may be found at <http://mdc.mo.gov/discover-nature/field-guide/endangered-species>. Detailed information about species mentioned may be accessed at http://mdc4.mdc.mo.gov/applications/mofwis/mofwis_search1.aspx. If you would like printed copies of best management practices cited as internet URLs, please contact us.

	<p align="center">Missouri Department of Conservation Natural Heritage Review Report January 7, 2015 -- Page 1 of 2</p>		<p>Resource Science Division P. O. Box 180 Jefferson City, MO 65102 Prepared by: Brittne Brauner Brittne.Brauner@mdc.mo.gov (573) 522 – 4115 ext. 3182</p>
<p>Timothy Schoenhoff Great Rivers Engineering 2826 South Ingram Mill Rd. Springfield, MO 65804</p>	<p>Project type: Location/Scope: County: Query reference: Query received:</p>	<p>Wastewater Section 36 T24N R20W Taney Lakeway Village WWTF 12/02/2014</p>	
<p><i>This NATURAL HERITAGE REVIEW is not a site clearance letter. Rather, it identifies public lands and sensitive resources known to have been located close to and/or potentially affected by the proposed project. On-site verification is the responsibility of the project. Natural Heritage records were identified at some date and location. This report considers records near but not necessarily at the project site. Animals move and, over time, so do plant communities. To say "there is a record" does not mean the species/habitat is still there. To say that "there is no record" does not mean a protected species will not be encountered. These records only provide one reference and other information (e.g. wetland or soils maps, on-site inspections or surveys) should be considered. Look for additional information about the biological and habitat needs of records listed in order to avoid or minimize impacts. More information is at http://mdc.mo.gov/discover-nature/places-go/natural-areas and mdc4.mdc.mo.gov/applications/mofwis/mofwis_search1.aspx.</i></p>			
<p>Level 3 issues: Records of <u>federal-listed</u> (these are also state-listed) species or critical habitats near the project site: Natural Heritage records identify <u>no</u> wildlife preserves, no designated wilderness areas or critical habitats, and <u>no</u> federal-listed species records within one mile of the site, or in the public land survey section listed above or sections adjacent</p> <p><small>FEDERAL LIST species/habitats are protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (101 Park Deville Drive Suite A, Columbia, Missouri 65203-0007; 573-234-2132) for Endangered Species Act coordination and concurrence information.</small></p>			
<p>Level 2 issues: Records of <u>state-listed</u> (not federal-listed) endangered species AND / OR <u>state-ranked</u> (not state-listed endangered) species and natural communities of conservation concern. The Department tracks these species and natural communities due to population declines and/or apparent vulnerability. Natural Heritage records identify <u>no</u> state-listed endangered species within one mile of the site.</p> <p>Natural Heritage records identify <u>no</u> state-ranked species and/or natural communities within one mile of the site.</p> <p>See http://mdc.mo.gov/sites/default/files/resources/2010/04/2014_species_concern.pdf for a complete list of species and communities of conservation concern.</p> <p><small>STATE ENDANGERED species are listed in and protected under the Wildlife Code of Missouri (3CSR10-4.111).</small></p>			
<p>General recommendations related to this project or site, or based on information about the historic range of species (unrelated to any specific Natural Heritage records):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Indiana bats (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>, federally and state listed endangered) hibernate during winter months in caves and mines. During the summer months, they roost and raise young under the bark of trees in riparian forests and upland forests near perennial streams. During project activities, avoid degrading stream quality and where possible leave snags standing and preserve mature forest canopy. Do not enter caves known to harbor Indiana bats, especially from September to April. If any trees need to be removed by your project, please contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Ecological Services, 101 Park Deville Drive, Suite A, Columbia, Missouri 65203-0007; Phone 573-234-2132) for further coordination. ➤ Gray bats (<i>Myotis grisescens</i>, federal and state-listed endangered) occur in Taney county and could occur in the project area, as they forage over streams, rivers, and reservoirs. Avoid entry or disturbance of any cave inhabited by gray bats and when possible retain forest vegetation along 			

the stream and from the gray bat cave opening to the stream. See <http://mdc.mo.gov/104> for best management recommendations.

- The project should be managed to minimize erosion and sedimentation/runoff to nearby streams and lakes, including adherence to [any "Clean Water Act Permit" conditions](#). Revegetate areas in which the natural cover is disturbed to minimize erosion using native plant species compatible with the local landscape and wildlife needs. Annual ryegrass may be combined with native perennials for quicker green-up. Avoid aggressive exotic perennials such as crownvetch and sericea lespedeza. Pollutants, including sediment, can have significant impacts far downstream. Use silt fences and/or vegetative filter strips to buffer streams and drainages, and monitor those after rain events and until a well-rooted ground cover is reestablished.
- Taney County has known [karst geologic features](#) (e.g. caves, springs, and sinkholes, all characterized by subterranean water movement). Few karst features are recorded in Natural Heritage records, and ones not noted here may be encountered at the project site or affected by the project. Cave fauna (many of which are species of conservation concern) are influenced by changes to water quality, so check your project site for any karst features and make every effort to protect groundwater in the project area.
- Invasive exotic species are a significant issue for fish, wildlife and agriculture in Missouri. Seeds, eggs, and larvae may be moved to new sites on boats or construction equipment, so inspect and clean equipment thoroughly before moving between project sites.
 - Remove any mud, soil, trash, plants or animals from equipment before leaving any water body or work area.
 - Drain water from boats and machinery that have operated in water, checking motor cavities, live-well, bilge and transom wells, tracks, buckets, and any other water reservoirs.
 - When possible, wash and rinse equipment thoroughly with hard spray or HOT water ($\geq 104^{\circ}$ F, typically available at do-it-yourself carwash sites), and dry in the hot sun before using again.

These recommendations are ones project managers might prudently consider based on a general understanding of species needs and landscape conditions. Natural Heritage records largely reflect sites visited by specialists in the last 30 years. Many privately owned tracts have not been surveyed and could host remnants of species once but no longer common.



Appendix C: Geohydrologic Evaluation



Missouri Department Of Natural Resources

Division of Geology and Land Survey
P.O. Box 250
Rolla, Missouri 65402-0250
Phone - 573.368.2161 Fax - 573.368.2111
E-mail - gspgeol@dnr.mo.gov

Project ID Number

LWE15050

County

TANEY

Geohydrologic Evaluation of Liquid-Waste Treatment Site

Project **Lakeway Village WWTF** Quadrangle **FORSYTH**
Location **SW1/4,SE1/4,SW1/4** Section **36** Township **24 N** Range **20 W**
Additional Location Information **Lakeway subdivision on Salmon Rd-PO Box 15 Kissee Mills**
Latitude **36** Deg **40** Min **52** Sec Longitude **93** Deg **3** Min **31** Sec

Owner

Richard Scott (417) 561-4641
PO Box 18 Rockaway Beach MO 65740

Requestor

Great River Engineering (417) 886-7171
Timothy L Schoenhoff
2826 South Ingram Mill Rd Springfield MO 65807

Previous Report **Not Applicable**

Date **9/88**
Identification Number **110-88**
Fiscal Year

Facility Type

- ☐ Mechanical treatment plant
☐ Recirculating filter bed
☐ Earthen lagoon with discharge
☐ Earthen holding basin
☐ Land application
☒ Other type of facility

Type of Waste

- ☐ Animal
☒ Human
☐ Process or industrial
☐ Leachate
☐ Other waste type

Funding Source

- ☒ PPG
☐ WWLF-SRF
☐ Non-Point Source

Other Information

- ☐ Plans were submitted
☐ Site was investigated by NRCS
☐ Soil or geotechnical data were submitted

Date of Field Visit **01/28/2015**

Stream Classification

- ☐ Gaining ☒ Losing ☐ No discharge

Overall Geologic Limitations

- ☐ Slight
☐ Moderate
☒ Severe

Collapse Potential

- ☐ Not applicable
☐ Slight
☒ Moderate
☐ Severe

Topography

- ☒ < 4%
☐ 4% to 8%
☐ 8% to 15%
☐ > 15%

Landscape Position

- ☐ Broad uplands ☒ Floodplain
☐ Ridgetop ☐ Alluvial plain
☐ Hillslope ☐ Terrace
☐ Narrow ravine ☐ Sinkhole

Bedrock

The uppermost bedrock is high permeability, Ordovician-age Jefferson City-Cotter Dolomite.

Surficial Materials

Surficial material at the site consists of high permeability gravelly, sandy silt alluvium and colluvium.

Project ID Number **LWE15050**

Page 2

Recommended Construction Procedures

- ☐ Installation of clay pad ☐ Diversion of subsurface flow ☐ Rock excavation
☐ Compaction ☒ Artificial sealing ☐ Limit excavation depth

Required Geologic Exploration

(Missouri Clean Water Commission - 10 CSR 20 - 8.200 Wastewater Treatment Ponds)

Determine Overburden Properties

- ☐ Particle size analysis ☐ Standard Proctor density ☐ Permeability coefficient for undisturbed sample
☐ Atterburg limits ☐ Overburden thickness ☐ Permeability coefficient for remolded sample

Determine Hydrologic Conditions

- ☐ Groundwater elevation ☐ Direction of groundwater flow ☐ 25-year flood level ☐ 100-year flood level

Notify Geologist

- ☐ Before exploration ☐ During construction ☐ After construction ☒ Not necessary

Remarks

On January 28, 2015, a geologist with the Geological Survey Program conducted a geohydrologic evaluation for a proposed discharging wastewater treatment facility to replace the existing reed bed system for Lakeway Village Subdivision. The site is located approximately 0.5 mile west of Kisse Mill within the floodplain of an unnamed tributary to Bull Shoals Lake. The goal of this evaluation is to determine the geologic and hydrologic elements of the site as they pertain to facility construction and the potential for groundwater contamination.

The uppermost bedrock at the site is Ordovician-age Jefferson City-Cotter Dolomite. The bedrock unit in this area is a buff to light gray, medium crystalline dolomite. The Jefferson City-Cotter Dolomite generally exhibits high secondary permeability in an upper weathered zone, with low permeability at depth. There are several previously identified sinkholes within approximately 1 mile of the site, the nearest of which is within 0.5 mile to the east.

Surficial materials at the site consist of gravelly, sandy silt alluvium and colluvium. These materials are generally less than 5 feet thick and exhibit high permeability. There does not appear to be sufficient surficial material onsite for proper earthen facility liner construction. Due to the inadequate surficial materials, permeability of the bedrock and losing conditions underlying the site, a synthetic liner is highly recommended.

Surface water runoff is into an unnamed tributary to Bull Shoals Lake. The proposed replacement system will continue to utilize this unnamed tributary as the receiving stream; however, the new discharge point is proposed to be moved upstream of the current discharge point. Flow was observed in the unnamed tributary for approximately 300 feet downstream of the existing discharge point and is presumed to be effluent. No flow was observed upstream of the existing discharge point. The unnamed tributary has been previously classified as a losing stream for approximately 0.75 mile downstream of the existing discharge point to Lake Point Road. From the Lake Point Road to the lake boundary, it continues to exhibit losing characteristics such as poorly sorted alluvial material and solution-enlarged fractures as well as pools at irregular intervals. Based on these characteristics, the unnamed tributary is classified as losing from the discharge point to the lake boundary.

The outfall discharge appeared to be largely untreated effluent and the concrete settling apparatus was leaking in several places. For approximately 50 feet downstream of the discharge point, the alluvial material in the bed of the tributary is covered in a green sludge-like material and the water was a murky, bluish color with a surface sheen. An odor is present within approximately 10 feet of the discharge point.

Based on the permeability of the bedrock and surficial material, the site receives an overall geologic limitations rating of severe and a collapse potential rating of moderate. In the event of treatment failure, the local, shallow, and regional groundwater aquifer, as well as the surface waters of Bull Shoals Lake, may be adversely impacted.

This document is a preliminary report. It is not a permit. Additional data may be required by the Department of Natural Resources prior to the issuance of a permit. This report is valid only at the above location and becomes invalid one year after the report date below.

Report By: Jeremiah Jackson, R.G.

Report Date: 2/5/2015


CC WPP, SWRO



Appendix D: Antidegradation Review Summary Attachments

The attachments that follow contain summary information provided by the applicant, Lakeway WWTF. MDNR staff determined that changes must be made to the information contained within these attachments. The following were modified and can be found within the MDNR WQAR:

- 1) Attachment A: No changes needed.



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BRANCH
ANTIDEGRADATION REVIEW SUMMARY FOR PUBLIC NOTICE
ATTACHMENT A: TIER 2 – SIGNIFICANT DEGRADATION

1. FACILITY			
NAME Lakeway Village WWTF		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE	
ADDRESS (PHYSICAL)	CITY Kissee Mills	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 65680
2. OWNER			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Richard Scott/ Taneycomo Projects, Inc.			
ADDRESS P.O. Box 18	CITY Rockaway Beach	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 65740
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (417) 561-4641		E-MAIL ADDRESS	
3. CONTINUING AUTHORITY The regulatory requirement regarding continuing authority is found in 10 CSR 20-6.010(3) available at www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6a.pdf .			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Taney County Regional Sewer District			
ADDRESS P.O. Box 206	CITY Forsyth	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 65653
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (417) 546-7220		E-MAIL ADDRESS BAllbritton@tcrsd.org	
4. RECEIVING WATER BODY SEGMENT #1			
NAME Tributary to Bull Shoals Lake			
4.1 UPPER END OF SEGMENT (Location of discharge) UTM _____ OR Lat 36.68, Long -93.05			
4.2 LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
Per the Missouri Antidegradation Implementation Procedure, or AIP, the definition of a segment, "a segment is a section of water that is bound, at a minimum, by significant existing sources and confluences with other significant water bodies."			
5. WATER BODY SEGMENT #2 (IF APPLICABLE, Use another form if a third segment is needed)			
NAME			
5.1 UPPER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
5.2 LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
6. WET WEATHER ANTICIPATIONS			
If an applicant anticipates excessive inflow or infiltration and pursues approval from the department to bypass secondary treatment, a feasibility analysis is required. The feasibility analysis must comply with the criteria of all applicable state and federal regulations including 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4). Attach the feasibility analysis to the antidegradation review report.			
What is the Wet Weather Flow Peaking Factor in relation to design flow?			
Wet Weather Design Summary:			

7. EXISTING WATER QUALITY DATA OR MODEL SUMMARY

Obtaining Existing Water Quality is possible by three methods according to the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.A.1.: (1) using previously collected data with an appropriate Quality Assurance Project Plan, or QAPP (2) collecting water quality data approved by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources methodology or (3) using an appropriate water quality model. QAPPs must be submitted to the department for approval well in advance (six months) of the proposed activity. Provide all the appropriate corresponding data and reports which were approved by the department Watershed Protection Section. **Additional information needed with the EWQ data includes:** 1) Date existing water quality data was provided by the Watershed Protection Section, 2) Approval date by the Watershed Protection Section of the QAPP, project sampling plan, and data collected for all appropriate POCs.

Comments/Discussion:

8. SUMMARY OF THE POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN AND THE PROPOSED 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).

What are the proposed pollutants of concern and their respective effluent limits that the selected treatment option will comply with:

Pollutants of Concern*	Units	Wasteload Allocation	Average Monthly Limit	Daily Maximum Limit
BOD5	MG/L		10	15
TSS	MG/L		15	20
DISSOLVED OXYGEN	MG/L		None	None
AMMONIA	MG/L		1.4 S; 2.7 W	3.6 S; 7.5 W
BACTERIA (E. COLI)	CFUS		126	126

Proposed limits must not violate water quality standards, be protective of beneficial uses, and achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements.

*Assumed Tier 2.

9. IDENTIFYING ALTERNATIVES

Supply a summary of the alternatives considered and the level of treatment attainable with regards to the alternative. "For Discharges likely to cause significant degradation, an analysis of non-degrading and less-degrading alternatives must be provided," as stated in the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.1. Per 10 CSR 20-6.010(4)(D)1., the feasibility of a no-discharge system must be considered. Attach all supportive documentation in the Antidegradation Review report.

Applicants choosing to use a new wastewater technology that are considered an "unproven technology" in Missouri in their Tier 2 Reviews with alternative analysis must comply with the requirements set forth in the *New Technology Definitions and Requirements Factsheet* that can be found at: <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2453.pdf>.

Non-degrading alternatives: Land Application, Subsurface Irrigation, and Regional Sewer Collection/Treatment

Alternatives ranging from less-degrading to degrading including Preferred Alternative
(All treatment levels for POCs must at a minimum meet water quality standards):

Alternatives	Level of Treatment Attainable for each Pollutant of Concern				
	BOD5	TSS	AMMONIA AS N	E. Coli	
	(MG/L)	MG/L	MG/L	#/100 ML	
RSF with MBBR	10	15	<2.7/<1.4	126	
Schreiber CSR	10	15	<2.7/<1.4	126	
Extended Aeration with MBBR	10	15	<2.7/<1.4	126	
OVIVO Membrane Bioreactor	10	15	<2.7/<1.4	126	



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 28th 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 factor¹).
¹ 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:
$$(\text{Nitrate} + \text{nitrite nitrogen}) + (\text{organic nitrogen} \times 0.2) + (\text{ammonia nitrogen} \times \text{volatilization factor}^1).$$
¹ 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 ¹	Priority Pollutants ²
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

¹ 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.

² 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 19th 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
**APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF NAME OR ADDRESS
FOR YOUR MISSOURI STATE OPERATING PERMIT**

37311

FOR AGENCY USE ONLY	
APPLICATION ID NUMBER	DATE RECEIVED 7-28-21
CHECK NUMBER / JETPAY CONFIRMATION NUMBER 20024533	

READ THE ACCOMPANYING INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM

1. THIS APPLICATION IS FOR:

- ☒ Owner change of name or address
☐ Continuing Authority change of name or address
☐ Facility change of name or address

1.1 Is the appropriate fee included with the application? ☒ Yes ☐ No *made electronically see enclosure*
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. <https://magic.collectorsolutions.com/magic-ui/payments/mo-natural-resources/596/>

2. PERMIT

PERMIT NUMBER
#MO- 0138525

COUNTY
TANey

3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ANTICIPATED DATE OF NAME OR ADDRESS CHANGE
7-15-2021

4. INFORMATION TO CHANGE

PREVIOUS INFORMATION FOR OWNER

OWNER NAME
TANey County Regional Sewer

ADDRESS (MAILING)
P.O. Box 206

CITY
Forsyth

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65653

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 546 7221

REVISED INFORMATION FOR OWNER

OWNER NAME
TANey County Regional Sewer

ADDRESS (MAILING)
6733 E. St. Hwy 76

CITY
Kirbyville

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65679

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 544 0655

PREVIOUS INFORMATION FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITY

CONTINUING AUTHORITY NAME
↑

ADDRESS (MAILING)
Same

CITY
Forsyth

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65653

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE

REVISED INFORMATION FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITY

CONTINUING AUTHORITY NAME
↑

ADDRESS (MAILING)
Same

CITY
Kirbyville

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65679

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE

PREVIOUS INFORMATION FOR FACILITY

FACILITY NAME
TCRSD, LAKeway WASTE WWTf

ADDRESS (PHYSICAL LOCATION)
575 SALMON STREET

CITY
Kissee mills

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65680

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 544 7220

REVISED INFORMATION FOR FACILITY

FACILITY NAME
TCRSD, LAKeway WASTE WWTf

ADDRESS (PHYSICAL LOCATION)
575 SALMON STREET

CITY
Kissee mills

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65680

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 544 0655

5. FACILITY CONTACT

NAME
EDDIE COXIE

TITLE
OPERATIONS

EMAIL
ECoxie@TCRSD.ORG

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 544 0655

ADDRESS
6733 E. St. Hwy 76

CITY
Kirbyville

STATE
MO

ZIP CODE
65679

6. 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)
Jonathan Coxie

OFFICIAL TITLE
OPERATIONS

TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE
417 544 0655

SIGNATURE
[Signature]

DATE SIGNED
7-21-2021

RECEIVED
JUL 28 2021