

#### **SUMMARY PAGE**

Name of Facility: City of Albany – Joshua Street WPCP

NPDES Permit No.: GA0037222

This is a reissuance of the NPDES permit for the Joshua Street WPCP. Up to 32 MGD (monthly average) of treated domestic wastewater is discharged to the Flint River in the Flint River Basin.

The permit expired on June 30, 2019 and became administratively extended.

The permit was placed on public notice from XXXX to XXXXX.

# Please Note The Following Changes to the Proposed NPDES Permit From The Existing Permit:

#### Part I.B – Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements:

- Decreased seasonal monthly average five-day biochemical oxygen demand limits to a year-round monthly average limit of 20.0 mg/L to ensure year-round protection of water quality standards
- Decreased seasonal monthly average ammonia limits to a year-round monthly average limit of 10.0 mg/L to ensure year-round protection of water quality standards
- Increased seasonal daily minimum dissolved oxygen limits to a year-round daily minimum limit of 5.0 mg/L to ensure year-round protection of water quality standards
- Decreased daily maximum total residual chlorine limit from 0.24 mg/L to 0.19 mg/L based on updated 7Q10
- Decreased monitoring frequency for total phosphorus and orthophosphate from one day/week to one day/month in accordance with EPD monitoring requirement guidelines
- Added organic nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen monitoring requirements to determine nutrient speciation and to quantify nutrient loadings in the Flint River Basin

#### Part I.C – Monitoring and Reporting:

- Removed requirement for Long Term Biochemical Oxygen Demand testing, since the testing has been completed
- Removed requirements for additional effluent testing data and priority pollutant scans, since the testing has been completed
- Increased the instream wastewater concentration from 4.5% to 6% for whole effluent toxicity testing based on the updated 7Q10
- Updated Watershed Protection Plan language stating that the permittee must submit a revised WPP within two months of receipt of comment(s) by EPD until the WPP is approved

# Standard Conditions and Boilerplate Modifications:

The permit boilerplate includes modified language or added language consistent with current NPDES permits.

# Final Permit Determinations and Public Comments: Final issued permit did not change from the draft permit placed on public notice. Public comments were received during public notice period. Public hearing was held on Final permit includes changes from the draft permit placed on public notice. See attached permit revisions and/or permit fact sheet revisions.



# **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION**

Richard E. Dunn, Director

Watershed Protection Branch 2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive Suite 1152, East Tower Atlanta, Georgia 30334 404-463-1511

June 26, 2020

Ms. Sharon Subadan, City Manager City of Albany Post Office Box 447 Albany, GA 31702

RE: Draft Permit

Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant

NPDES Permit No. GA0037222 Dougherty County, Flint River Basin

Dear Ms. Subadan:

The Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has received your application for renewal of the above-referenced permit. We are processing your application and are considering the issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit in accordance with the Georgia Water Quality Control Act and the Federal Clean Water Act.

Before reissuing the permit, we require that you post a public notice for 30 days in a conspicuous location at City Hall and publish this notice for one day in one or more newspapers of general circulation in Dougherty County. When deciding whether to publish in one or more newspapers, please ensure that the notice will be published in all affected jurisdictions. The cost of publishing the public notice is the responsibility of the City. Within ten days of receiving this draft permit, please send a letter to our office stating where and what date the notice was posted and published. The letter should be signed by an authorized representative of the City. At the end of the 30-day public comment period, EPD will make a determination on the reissuance of the NPDES permit.

Enclosed are the draft permit and additional documents. We request that all the documents be reviewed carefully by appropriate personnel. If you have comments or questions, please contact Kelli-Ann Sottile of my staff at 404.463.4945 or kelli-ann.sottile@dnr.ga.gov.

Sincerely.

Benoît Causse, Manager Municipal Permitting Unit Wastewater Regulatory Program

BSC\kas

Attachments: Public Notice, Fact Sheet, Draft Permit cc: Jeffrey Hughes, City of Albany (jhughes@albanyga.gov)

Marzieh Shahbazaz, EPD Municipal Compliance Unit (marzieh.shahbazaz@dnr.ga.gov)



#### PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice of Application for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit to Discharge Treated Wastewater Into Waters of the State of Georgia.

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division has received a new NPDES permit application for the reissuance of an existing NPDES permit. Having reviewed such application, the Environmental Protection Division proposes to issue for a maximum term of five years the following permit subject to specific pollutant limitations and special conditions:

City of Albany, Post Office Box 447, Albany, GA 31702, NPDES Permit No. GA0037222, for the Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant located at 2726 Joshua Street, Albany, Georgia 31702. Up to 32 MGD of treated wastewater is being discharged to the Flint River in the Flint River Basin.

Persons wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed determinations are invited to submit same in writing to the EPD address below, or via e-mail at EPDcomments@dnr.ga.gov, no later than thirty (30) days after this notification. If you choose to e-mail your comments, please be sure to include the words "NPDES permit reissuance – Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant – GA0037222 (Dougherty County)" in the subject line to ensure that your comments will be forwarded to the correct staff. All comments received prior to or on that date will be considered in the formulation of final determinations regarding the application. A public hearing may be held where the EPD Director finds a significant degree of public interest in a proposed permit or group of permits. Additional information regarding public hearing procedures is available by writing the Environmental Protection Division.

A fact sheet or copy of the draft permit is available by writing the Environmental Protection Division. A copying charge of 10 cents per page will be assessed. The permit application, draft permit, comments received, and other information are available for review at 2 MLK, Jr. Dr., Suite 1152E, Atlanta, GA 30334, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. For additional information contact: Benoit Causse, Wastewater Regulatory Program, phone (404) 463-1511 or e-mail benoit.causse@dnr.ga.gov.



The Georgia Environmental Protection Division proposes to issue an NPDES permit to the applicant identified below. The draft permit places conditions on the discharge of pollutants from the wastewater treatment plant to waters of the State.

### **Technical Contact:**

Kelli-Ann Sottile, Environmental Engineer Kelli-ann.sottile@dnr.ga.gov 404-463-4945

#### Draft permit:

Ш	First issuance
	Reissuance with no or minor modifications from previous permi
X	Reissuance with substantial modifications from previous permit
	Modification of existing permit
$\times$	Requires EPA review

#### 1. FACILITY INFORMATION

1.1 NPDES Permit No.: GA0037222

### 1.2 Name and Address of Owner/Applicant

City of Albany Post Office Box 447 Albany, Georgia 31702

# 1.3 Name and Address of Facility

Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant 2726 Joshua Street Albany, Georgia 31702

# 1.4 Location and Description of the Discharge (as reported by applicant)

Outfall#	Latitude (°)	Longitude (°)	Receiving Waterbody
001	31.539601	-84.140606	Flint River

# 1.5 Permitted Design Capacity

**32 MGD** 

# 1.6 SIC Code and Description

SIC Code 4952 – Sewerage systems: Establishments primarily engaged in the collection and disposal of wastes conducted through a sewer system, including such treatment processes as may be provided.

# 1.7 Description of the Water Pollution Control Plant

Wastewater treatment:

The treatment process consists of screening, primary clarification, aeration basins, secondary clarification, chlorine disinfection, dechlorination, and post-aeration. Treated effluent is then discharged to the Flint River.

Solids processing:

Sludge is thickened in a DAFT and then treated in heated anaerobic digestors. Following the digesters, the thickened sludge is dewatered via a belt press. Biosolids are transported to Alabama by a third party for final disposal.

# 1.8 Type of Wastewater Discharge

	Process wastewater		Stormwater
$\times$	Domestic wastewater	$\times$	Combined (Describe)
	Other (Describe)		

The City of Albany's sewer system includes both separated and combined sewage basins. In accordance with their Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) permit, the City is required to maximize treatment of the flow collected in the combined system at the publicly owned treatment works (Joshua Street WPCP) prior to discharging from the Albany Combined Sewage Control Facility (CSCF) or the minor CSO structures.

Refer to the City of Albany's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) NPDES Permit No. GA0036854 for more information.

# 1.9 Characterization of Effluent Discharge (as reported by applicant)

#### Outfall No. 001:

Effluent Characteristics (as Reported by Applicant)	Maximum Daily Value	Average Daily Value
Flow (MGD)	68.83	15.17
Five-Day Biochemical Oxygen Demand (mg/L)	27	2.58
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	52	3.18
Fecal Coliform Bacteria (#/100mL)	5300	48
Ammonia, as N (mg/L)	7.4	0.61
Total Phosphorus, as P (mg/L)	3.3	0.46

### 2. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

### 2.1 State Regulations

Chapter 391-3-6 of the Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control

# 2.2 Federal Regulations

Source	Activity	Applicable Regulation	
		40 CFR 122	
	Municipal Effluent Discharge	40 CFR 125	
	-	40 CFR 133	
	No. December 1911 1	40 CFR 122	
Municipal	Non-Process Water Discharges	40 CFR 125	
-		40 CFR 122	
	Municipal Sludge Use and Disposal	40 CFR 257	
		40 CFR 501 & 503	

# 3. WATER QUALITY STANDARDS & RECEIVING WATERBODY INFORMATION

Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires the development of limitations in permits necessary to meet water quality standards. Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.4(d) require that conditions in NPDES permits ensure compliance with the water quality standards which are composed of use classifications, numeric and or narrative water quality criteria and an anti-degradation policy. The use classification system designates the beneficial uses that each waterbody is expected to achieve, such as drinking water, fishing, or recreation. The numeric and narrative water quality criteria are deemed necessary to support the beneficial use classification for each water body. The antidegradation policy represents an approach to maintain and to protect various levels of water quality and uses.

# 3.1 Receiving Waterbody Classification and Information – Flint River:

# Specific Water Quality Criteria for Classified Water Usage [391-3-6-.03(6)]:

Fishing: Propagation of Fish, Shellfish, Game and Other Aquatic Life; secondary contact recreation in and on the water; or for any other use requiring water of a lower quality.

- (i) Dissolved Oxygen: A daily average of 6.0 mg/L and no less than 5.0 mg/L at all times for water designated as trout streams by the Wildlife Resources Division. A daily average of 5.0 mg/L and no less than 4.0 mg/L at all times for waters supporting warm water species of fish.
- (ii) pH: Within the range of 6.0 8.5.

#### (iii) Bacteria:

- 1. For the months of May through October, when water contact recreation activities are expected to occur, fecal coliform not to exceed a geometric mean of 200 per 100 mL based on at least four samples collected from a given sampling site over a 30-day period at intervals not less than 24 hours. Should water quality and sanitary studies show fecal coliform levels from non-human sources exceed 200/100 mL (geometric mean) occasionally, then the allowable geometric mean fecal coliform shall not exceed 300 per 100 mL in lakes and reservoirs and 500 per 100 mL in free flowing freshwater streams. For the months of November through April, fecal coliform not to exceed a geometric mean of 1,000 per 100 mL based on at least four samples collected from a given sampling site over a 30-day period at intervals not less than 24 hours and not to exceed a maximum of 4,000 per 100 mL for any sample. The State does not encourage swimming in these surface waters since a number of factors which are beyond the control of any State regulatory agency contribute to elevated levels of bacteria.
- 2. For waters designated as shellfish growing areas by the Georgia DNR Coastal Resources Division, the requirements will be consistent with those established by the State and Federal agencies responsible for the National Shellfish Sanitation Program. The requirements are found in National Shellfish Sanitation Program Guide for the Control of Molluscan Shellfish, 2007 Revision (or most recent version), Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference, U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
- (iv) Temperature: Not to exceed 90°F. At no time is the temperature of the receiving waters to be increased more than 5°F above intake temperature except that in estuarine waters the increase will not be more than 1.5°F. In streams designated as primary trout or smallmouth bass waters by the Wildlife Resources Division, there shall be no elevation of natural stream temperatures. In streams designated as secondary trout waters, there shall be no elevation exceeding 2°F natural stream temperatures.

#### 3.2 Ambient Information

Outfall ID	30Q3 (cfs)	7Q10 (cfs)	1Q10 (cfs)	Annual Average Flow (cfs)	Hardness (mg CaCO <sub>3</sub> /L)	Upstream Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)
001	1366	790	655	4931	20 (1)	10 (2)

- (1) Not available. A conservative value of 20 mg/L will be used for the reasonable potential analysis calculations.
- (2) Not available. A conservative value of 10 mg/L will be used for the reasonable potential analysis calculations.

# 3.3 Georgia 305(b)/303(d) List Documents

First River	Muckafoonse Creek to	First	Supporting	23	1
GAR031300080101	Dougherty, Mitchell		10	Avtilla-s	

Flint River is listed on the 2018 305(b)/303(d) list as supporting its designated use (fishing).

# 3.5 Wasteload Allocation (WLA)

WLAs for reissuance was issued on February 26, 2019. Refer to Appendix A of the Fact Sheet for a copy of the WLAs.

#### 4. EFFLUENT LIMITS AND PERMIT CONDITIONS

### 4.1 Reasonable Potential Analysis (RP)

Title 40 of the Federal Code of Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d) requires delegated States to develop procedures for determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an instream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water. If such reasonable potential is determined to exist, the NPDES permit must contain pollutant effluent limits and/or effluent limits for whole effluent toxicity. Georgia's Reasonable Potential Procedures are based on Georgia's Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control (Rules), Chapter 391-3-6-.06(4)(d)5. The chemical specific and biomonitoring data and other pertinent information in EPD's files will be considered in accordance with the review procedures specified in the Rules in the evaluation of a permit application and in the evaluation of the reasonable potential for an effluent to cause an exceedance in the numeric or narrative criteria.

Refer to Section 4.2 for reasonable potential analysis on effluent toxicity.

Refer to Section 4.6 for reasonable potential analysis on toxic and manmade pollutants.

# 4.2 Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

Chronic WET test measures the effect of wastewater on indicator organisms' growth, reproduction and survival. Effluent toxicity is predicted when the No Observable Effect Concentrations (NOEC) for a test organism is less than the facility's Instream Wastewater Concentration (IWC). WET testing also requires a measure of test sensitivity known as the Percent Minimum Significant Difference (PMSD). See Table below from Section 10.2.8.3 (page 52) of EPA 821-R-02-013 Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, 4th Edition, 2002 for PMSD variability criteria.

TABLE 6. VARIABILITY CRITERIA (UPPER AND LOWER PMSD BOUNDS) FOR SUBLETHAL HYPOTHESIS TESTING ENDPOINTS SUBMITTED UNDER NPDES PERMITS. 1

Test Method	Endpoint	Lower PMSD Bound	Upper PMSD Bound
Method 1000.0, Fathead Minnow Larval Survival and Growth Test	growth	12	30
Method 1002.0, Ceriodaphnia dubia Survival and Reproduction Test	reproduction	13	47
Method 1003.0, Selenastrum capricornutum Growth Test	growth	9.1	29

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Lower and upper PMSD bounds were determined from the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, respectively, of PMSD data from EPA's WET Interiaboratory Variability Study (USEPA, 2001a; USEPA, 2001b).

PMSD must be calculated for each species tested as follows:

$$MSD = \frac{\text{Minimum Significant Data (MSD)}}{\text{Control Mean}} \times 100$$
 %

The effluent from the Joshua Street WPCP will not be considered toxic if the No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) is greater than or equal to the Instream Wastewater Concentration (IWC) of 6%. If results of the WET tests predict toxicity or are invalid, then the permittee may be required to perform additional WET tests or the permit may be modified to include chronic WET effluent limitations.

The permittee submitted the results of seven WET tests with the application. For all tests, the NOEC for the *Ceriodaphnia dubia* survival and reproduction and the *Pimephales promelas* survival and growth were greater than or equal to the IWC of 6%; therefore, effluent is not considered toxic. Refer to WET Test results summary in the table below.

PMSD values were calculated for each set of results and compared to EPA's Variability Criteria to ensure their validity. PMSD for *Ceriodaphnia dubia* reproduction and *Pimephales promelas* survival from the seven WET tests were lower or within EPA's Variability Criteria; therefore, the tests are considered valid. Refer to Appendix C for PSMD values.

		No	Observed Effect Cond	centration (NOE	C)	
Test	Sample Date	Ceriodaphnia dubia		Pimephales promelas		
		Survival (%)	Reproduction (%)	Survival (%)	Growth (%)	
1	07/14	18	18	18	18	
2	10/14	18	18	18	18	
3	02/15	18	18	18	18	
4	04/15	18	18	18	4.5 (1)	
5	03/16	18	18	18	18	
6	03/17	18	18	18	18	
7	03/18	18	18	18	18	
8	03/19	18	18	18	18	

<sup>(1)</sup> The results of the April 2015 test are considered inconclusive in determining toxicity, since a sample with a wastewater concentration of 6% was not evaluated.

EPD is including annual WET monitoring for all facilities with a permitted discharge of 1.0 MGD or greater; therefore, annual WET testing has been included in the draft permit.

EPD will evaluate the WET tests submitted to determine whether toxicity has been demonstrated. If the test results indicate effluent toxicity, the permittee may be required to perform additional WET tests or studies in accordance with Part I.C.5 of the permit and/or the permit may be modified to include a chronic WET limit.

### 4.3 Applicable Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

When drafting a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, a permit writer must consider the impact of the proposed discharge on the quality of the receiving water. Water quality goals for a waterbody are defined by state water quality standards. By analyzing the effect of a discharge on the receiving water, a permit writer could find that technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) alone will not achieve the applicable water quality standards. In such cases, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations require development of water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs). WQBELs help meet the CWA objective of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters and the goal of water quality that provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water (fishable/swimmable).

WQBELs are designed to protect water quality by ensuring that water quality standards are met in the receiving water and downstream uses are protected. On the basis of the requirements of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 125.3(a), additional or more stringent effluent limitations and conditions, such as WQBELs, are imposed when TBELs are not sufficient to protect water quality.

The term *pollutant* is defined in CWA section 502(6) and § 122.2. Pollutants are grouped into three categories under the NPDES program: conventional, toxic, and nonconventional. Conventional pollutants are those defined in CWA section 304(a)(4) and § 401.16 (BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease). Toxic (priority) pollutants are those defined in CWA section 307(a)(1) and include 126 metals and manmade organic compounds. Nonconventional pollutants are those that do not fall under either of the above categories (conventional or toxic pollutants) and include parameters such as chlorine, ammonia, nitrogen, phosphorus, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and whole effluent toxicity (WET).

# 4.4 Conventional Pollutants

Basis
The instream wastewater concentration (IWC) is 6%. When the IWC is less than 50%, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to violation of the instream Georgia Water Quality Standard; therefore, pH limits of 6.0-9.0 SU (daily minimum-daily maximum) were included in the draft permit.
The current permit includes seasonal limits for BOD <sub>5</sub> . A year-round monthly average limit of 20.0 mg/L has been included in the draft permit. A review of Discharge Monitoring Report data indicates that the facility can meet the monthly average limit year-round without process modification; therefore, a compliance schedule was not included in the draft permit.  According to the steady-state dissolved oxygen Georgia DOSAG model, the proposed monthly average BOD <sub>5</sub> limit of 20.0 mg/L, when combined with the ammonia and dissolved oxygen limits (Refer to Section 4.5 below), is protective of the instream Water Quality Standard for dissolved oxygen
described in Section 3.1 above.  The monthly average TSS limit of 30 mg/L is in accordance
with technology-based effluent limitations for POTWs (i.e., secondary standards).  The monthly average FCB limit of 200 #/100mL is in accordance with the instream Water Quality Standards in Section 3.1 above.

# 4.5 Nonconventional Pollutants

Pollutants of Concern	Basis
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	Chlorine is used for disinfection. The daily maximum TRC limit has been reduced from 0.24 mg/L to 0.19 mg/L. This limit has been determined using the US EPA's chronic TRC criterion of 11 µg/L in the receiving stream after dilution based on an updated 7Q10 for the receiving stream. Refer to Section 4.7.6 below for calculations.
	A review of Discharge Monitoring Report data indicates that the facility can meet the reduced limit without process modification; therefore, a compliance schedule was not included in the draft permit.
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	The current permit includes seasonal limits for DO. A year-round daily minimum limit of 5.0 mg/L has been included in the draft permit. A review of Discharge Monitoring Report data indicates that the facility can meet the daily minimum limit year-round without process modification; therefore, a compliance schedule was not included in the draft permit.
	According to the steady-state dissolved oxygen Georgia DOSAG model, a minimum effluent DO of 5.0 mg/L is protective of the instream Water Quality Standard for dissolved oxygen described in Section 3.1 above.
Total Phosphorus (TP)	Total phosphorus monitoring has been included in the draft permit in accordance with EPD's Strategy for Addressing Phosphorus in NPDES Permitting, 2011.
Orthophosphate, Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), Organic Nitrogen, Nitrate-Nitrite	Orthophosphate, TKN, organic nitrogen, and nitrate-nitrite monitoring has been included in the draft permit. The data will be used to determine nutrient speciation and to quantify nutrient loadings in the Flint River Basin.

The current permit includes seasonal limits for ammonia. A year-round monthly average limit of 10.0 mg/L has been included in the draft permit. A review of Discharge Monitoring Report data indicates that the facility can meet the monthly average limit year-round without process modification; therefore, a compliance schedule was not included in the draft permit.

#### Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>)

According to the steady-state dissolved oxygen Georgia DOSAG model, a monthly average ammonia limit of 10.0 mg/L, when combined with the monthly average BOD<sub>5</sub> limit (Refer to Section 4.4 above), is protective of the instream Water Quality Standard for dissolved oxygen described in Section 3.1 above.

A monthly average ammonia limit of 10.0 mg/L is also in accordance with EPD's NPDES Permitting Strategy for Addressing Ammonia Toxicity, 2017.

# 4.6 Toxics & Manmade Organic Compounds

The permittee submitted the results of three Priority Pollutant Scans (PPS) with the permit application. All pollutants were "non-detect" except for the following:

Pollutants of Concern	Basis
Total Recoverable Arsenic	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to <i>Appendix B</i> of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.
	In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, arsenic is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Total Recoverable	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to <i>Appendix B</i> of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.
Cadmium	In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cadmium is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.

# This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for Total Recoverable reasonable potential evaluations. Chromium In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, chromium is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required. This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations. Total Recoverable Copper In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, copper is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required. This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations. Total Recoverable Lead In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, lead is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required. This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for Total Recoverable reasonable potential evaluations. Mercury In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, mercury is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is

not required.

Total Recoverable Nickel	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, nickel is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Total Recoverable Zinc	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the acute and chronic instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, zinc is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Beryllium	Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for beryllium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition, the effluent did not exhibit any toxicity (Refer to Section 4.2 above); therefore, beryllium is not considered to be present at levels of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Antimony	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, antimony is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.

Selenium	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, selenium is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Silver	Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for silver. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition, the effluent did not exhibit any toxicity (Refer to Section 4.2 above); therefore, silver is not considered to be present at levels of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Thallium	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, thallium is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Bromodichloromethane	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, bromodichloromethane is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.

-	
Bromoform	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, bromoform is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
Chloroform	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, chloroform is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is
	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential
Dibromochloromethane	evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, dibromochloromethane is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.
1 DUIG	Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for d-BHC. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.
d-BHC	For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition, the effluent did not exhibit any toxicity (Refer to Section 4.2 above); therefore, d-BHC is not considered to be present at levels of concern and additional monitoring is not required.

This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, endosulfan is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, methylene chloride is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop	found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, endosulfan is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, methylene chloride is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-		
found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, methylene chloride is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-	found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, methylene chloride is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  Barium  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition,	Endosulfan	found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, endosulfan is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is
This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-	This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  Barium  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition,	Methylene Chloride	found to be less than 50% of the instream water quality standards. Refer to Appendix B of the Fact Sheet for reasonable potential evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, methylene
Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-	Cyanide  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is not considered a pollutant of concern and additional monitoring is not required.  Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  Barium  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition,		monitoring is not required.  This parameter was evaluated and its instream concentration was
Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-	Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-606(4)(d)5(iii), whole effluent biomonitoring will be used to develop either a site-specific criteria concentration or a whole effluent toxicity limit.  Barium  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition,	Cyanide	evaluations.  In accordance with EPD reasonable potential procedures, cyanide is
	Barium  For all samples, results were either non-detect or the reported value was between the detection limit and the practical limit. In addition,		Georgia Rules and Regulations do not have an instream criteria concentration for barium. Instead, according to Section 391-3-6-

### 4.7 Calculations for Effluent Limits

# 4.7.1 Instream Waste Concentration (IWC):

IWC = 
$$\frac{Q_{Effluent} (ft^3/sec)}{Q_{Effluent} (ft^3/sec) + 7Q10 (ft^3/sec)}$$
 %  
=  $\frac{49.5}{49.5 + 790}$   
= 6 %

 $= Q_{Monthly} (MGD) \times 1.25$ 

#### 4.7.2 Flow:

Q Weekly

Q = Flow

C = Concentration

M = Mass

$$= 32 \times 1.25$$

$$=40 MGD$$

# 4.7.3 Five-Day Biochemical Oxygen Demand:

• Weekly Average Concentration:

[C] weekly = [C] Monthly (mg/L) x 1.5  
= 
$$20 \times 1.5$$
  
=  $30 \text{ mg/L}$ 

Monthly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{Monthly} = \frac{Q_{Monthly} (MGD) \times [C]_{Monthly} (mg/L \text{ or ppm}) \times 8.34 \text{ (lbs/gal)}}{2.2 \text{ (lbs/Kg)}}$$

$$= \frac{32 \times 20 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$

$$= 2,426 \text{ kg/day}$$

• Weekly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{\text{Weekly}} = \frac{Q_{\text{Weekly}} (\text{MGD}) \times [\text{C}]_{\text{Monthly}} (\text{mg/L or ppm}) \times 8.34 (\text{lbs/gal})}{2.2 (\text{lbs/Kg})}$$

$$= \frac{40 \times 20 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$
$$= 3,033 \text{ kg/day}$$

# 4.7.4 Total Suspended Solids:

• Weekly Average Concentration:

[C] weekly = [C] Monthly (mg/L) x 1.5  
= 
$$30 \times 1.5$$
  
=  $45 \text{ mg/L}$ 

• Monthly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{Monthly} = \frac{Q_{Monthly} (MGD) \times [C]_{Monthly} (mg/L \text{ or ppm}) \times 8.34 \text{ (lbs/gal)}}{2.2 \text{ (lbs/Kg)}}$$

$$= \frac{32 \times 30 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$

$$= 3,639 \text{ kg/day}$$

• Weekly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{\text{Weekly}} = \frac{Q_{\text{Weekly}} (\text{MGD}) \times [\text{C}]_{\text{Monthly}} (\text{mg/L or ppm}) \times 8.34 (\text{lbs/gal})}{2.2 (\text{lbs/Kg})}$$

$$= \frac{40 \times 30 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$

$$= 4,549 \text{ kg/day}$$

### 4.7.5 Fecal Coliform Bacteria:

Weekly Average Concentration:

C Weekly = 
$$C_{Monthly}$$
 (#/100 mL) x 2  
= 200 x 2  
= 400 #/100 mL

# 4.7.6. Total Residual Chlorine (TRC):

• Daily Maximum Concentration:

$$[TRC]_{Effluent} = \frac{[Q_{Effluent} (ft^3/sec) + 7Q10 (ft^3/sec)] \times [TRC]_{Stream} (mg/L)}{Q_{Effluent} (ft^3/sec)}$$

$$= \frac{(49.5 + 790) \times 0.011}{49.5}$$

$$= 0.19 \text{ mg/L}$$

#### 4.7.7 Ammonia:

• Toxicity Analysis:

The chronic criterion based on Villosa iris (rainbow mussel) is determined as follows:

CCC = 
$$0.8876 \times (\frac{0.0278}{1+10^{7.688-pH}} + \frac{1.1994}{1+10^{pH-7.688}}) \times 2.126 \times 10^{0.028 \times (20-MAX(T,7))} \text{ mg/L}$$

Where: pH : pH of receiving stream and discharge

T : Temperature of receiving stream CCC : Chronic Continuous Concentration

The ammonia effluent limit (monthly average) is then calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\left(Q_{\text{Effluent}}\left(ft^{3}/\text{sec}\right)+30Q3\left(ft^{3}/\text{sec}\right)\right)\times CCC\left(mg/L\right)-30Q3\left(ft^{3}/\text{sec}\right)\times \left[NH_{3}\right]_{\text{Stream Background}}\left(mg/L\right)}{Q_{\text{Effluent}}\left(ft^{3}/\text{sec}\right)}$$

Refer to Appendix D for detailed calculations.

• Weekly Average Concentration:

[C] weekly = [C] Monthly (mg/L) x 1.5  
= 
$$10 \times 1.5$$
  
=  $15 \text{ mg/L}$ 

Monthly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{Monthly} = \frac{Q_{Monthly} (MGD) \times [C]_{Monthly} (mg/L \text{ or ppm}) \times 8.34 \text{ (lbs/gal)}}{2.2 \text{ (lbs/Kg)}}$$

$$= \frac{32 \times 10 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$
$$= 1,213 \text{ kg/day}$$

# Weekly Average Mass Loading:

$$M_{\text{Weekly}} = \frac{Q_{\text{Weekly}} (\text{MGD}) \times [\text{C}]_{\text{Monthly}} (\text{mg/L or ppm}) \times 8.34 (\text{lbs/gal})}{2.2 (\text{lbs/Kg})}$$

$$= \frac{40 \times 10 \times 8.34}{2.2}$$

$$= 1,516 \text{ kg/day}$$

#### 4.7.8 Metals

Refer to Appendix B for metal calculations.

# 4.8 Applicable Technology Based Effluent Limits (TBELS)

Technology-based effluent limitations aim to prevent pollution by requiring a minimum level of effluent quality that is attainable using demonstrated technologies for reducing discharges of pollutants or pollution into the waters of the United States. TBELs are developed independently of the potential impact of a discharge on the receiving water, which is addressed through water quality standards and water quality-based effluent limitations. The NPDES regulations at Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations 125.3(a) require NPDES permit writers to develop technology-based treatment requirements, consistent with CWA section 301(b), that represent the minimum level of control that must be imposed in a permit. The regulation also indicates that permit writers must include in permits additional or more stringent effluent limitations and conditions, including those necessary to protect water quality.

For pollutants not specifically regulated by Federal Effluent Limit Guidelines, the permit writer must identify any needed Technology-based effluent limitations and utilizes best professional judgment to establish technology-based limits or determine other appropriate means to control its discharge.

40 CFR Part §122.44(a)(1) requires that NPDES permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards, while regulations at § 125.3(a)(1) state that TBELs for publicly owned treatment works must be based on secondary treatment standards and the "equivalent to secondary treatment standards" (40 CFR Part 133). The regulation applies to all POTWs and identifies the technology-based performance standards achievable based on secondary treatment for five-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

The table below shows the secondary treatment standards:

Parameter	Secondary Treatment Standards			
	30-day Average	7-day Average		
BOD₅	30 mg/L	45 mg/L		
TSS	30 mg/L	45 mg/L		
BOD <sub>5</sub> and TSS removal (concentration)	≥ 85%			
pH (Daily Minimum - Daily Maximum)	6.0-9.0 S.U.			

# 4.9 Comparison & Summary of Water Quality vs. Technology Based Effluent Limits

After determining applicable technology-based effluent limitations and water quality-based effluent limitations, the most stringent limits are applied in the permit:

Parameter	WQBELS (1)	TBELS (1)
	Monthly Average	Monthly Average
Five-Day Biochemical Oxygen Demand (mg/L)	20.0	30.0
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	None	30
Ammonia (mg/L)	10.0	None
Fecal Coliform Bacteria (#/100 mL)	200	None
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L), Daily Minimum	5.0	None
Total Residual Chlorine (mg/L), Daily Maximum	0.19	None
pH (S.U.), Daily Minimum – Daily Maximum	6.0 – 9.0	6.0 – 9.0

Effluent limits in bold were included in the permit. Refer to Sections 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8 above for more information.

# 5. OTHER PERMIT REQUIREMENTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

# 5.1 Long-Term BOD (LTBOD) Test

For facilities with a capacity of 1.0 MGD or greater, EPD may include requirements for LTBOD tests in permits for when data is needed for water quality modeling. The permittee conducted a LTBOD test during the current permit cycle; therefore, requirements for LTBOD testing have not been included in the draft permit.

# 5.2 Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP)

The City of Albany has an approved IPP; therefore, language has been included in the draft permit to reflect the approved program.

# 5.3 Sludge Management Plan (SMP)

The City has an approved SMP to deliver sludge to a third party; therefore, language to reflect the approved plan has been included in the draft permit. According to the permit application, sewage sludge is transported by a third party to Alabama for final disposal.

# 5.4 Watershed Protection Plan (WPP)

The development and implementation of a Watershed Protection Program (WPP) is required for facilities with a design permitted flow greater or equal to 1.0 MGD. The permittee has prepared a Watershed Protection Plan (WPP) as required by the current permit and the document is currently under review by the Watershed Planning and Monitoring Program. The City will be required to submit a revised Plan within two months of EPD's comment letter(s), until a final document is approved.

## 5.5 Service Delivery Strategy

City of Albany is in compliance with the Department of Community Affairs approved Service Delivery Strategy for Dougherty County.

# 5.6 Compliance Schedules

Effluent limitations are applicable immediately upon the effective date of the permit.

### 5.7 Anti-Backsliding

The limits in this permit are in compliance with the 40 C.F.R. 122.44(l), which requires a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit.

#### 6. REPORTING

### 6.1 Compliance office

The facility has been assigned to the following EPD office for reporting, compliance and enforcement:

Georgia Environmental Protection Division Watershed Compliance Program 2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive Suite 1152 East Atlanta, Georgia 30334

# 6.2 E-Reporting

The permittee is required to electronically submit documents in accordance with 40 CFR Part 127.

### 7. REQUESTED VARIANCES OR ALTERNATIVES TO REQUIRED STANDARDS

Not applicable.

#### 8. PERMIT EXPIRATION

The permit will expire five years from the effective date.

#### 9. PROCEDURES FOR THE FORMULATION OF FINAL DETERMINATIONS

#### 9.1 Comment Period

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) proposes to issue a permit to this applicant subject to the effluent limitations and special conditions outlined above. These determinations are tentative.

The permit application, draft permit, and other information are available for review at 2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, Suite 1152 East, Atlanta, Georgia 30334, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. For additional information, you can contact 404-463-1511.

# 9.2 Public Comments

Persons wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed determinations are invited to submit same in writing to the EPD address above, or via e-mail at EPDcomments@dnr.ga.gov within 30 days of the initiation of the public comment period. All comments received prior to that date will be considered in the formulation of final determinations regarding the application. The permit number should be placed on the top of the first page of comments to ensure that your comments will be forwarded to the appropriate staff.

### 9.3 Public Hearing

Any applicant, affected state or interstate agency, the Regional Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or any other interested agency, person or group of persons may request a public hearing with respect to an NPDES permit application if such request is filed within thirty (30) days following the date of the public notice for such application. Such request must indicate the interest of the party filing the request, the reasons why a hearing is requested, and those specific portions of the application or other NPDES form or information to be considered at the public hearing.

The Director shall hold a hearing if he determines that there is sufficient public interest in holding such a hearing. If a public hearing is held, notice of same shall be provided at least thirty (30) days in advance of the hearing date.

In the event that a public hearing is held, both oral and written comments will be accepted; however, for the accuracy of the record, written comments are encouraged. The Director or a designee reserves the right to fix reasonable limits on the time allowed for oral statements and such other procedural requirements, as deemed appropriate.

Following a public hearing, the Director, unless it is decided to deny the permit, may make such modifications in the terms and conditions of the proposed permit as may be appropriate and shall issue the permit.

If no public hearing is held, and, after review of the written comments received, the Director determines that a permit should be issued and that the determinations as set forth in the proposed permit are substantially unchanged, the permit will be issued and will become final in the absence of a request for a contested hearing. Notice of issuance or denial will be made available to all interested persons and those persons that submitted written comments to the Director on the proposed permit.

If no public hearing is held, but the Director determines, after a review of the written comments received, that a permit should be issued but that substantial changes in the proposed permit are warranted, public notice of the revised determinations will be given and written comments accepted in the same manner as the initial notice of application was given and written comments accepted pursuant to EPD Rules, Water Quality Control, subparagraph 391-3-6-.06(7)(b). The Director shall provide an opportunity for public hearing on the revised determinations. Such opportunity for public hearing and the issuance or denial of a permit thereafter shall be in accordance with the procedures as are set forth above.

#### 9.4 Final Determination

At the time that any final permit decision is made, the Director shall issue a response to comments. The issued permit and responses to comments can be found at the following address:

http://epd.georgia.gov/watershed-protection-branch-permit-and-public-comments-clearinghouse-0

# 9.5 Contested Hearings

Any person who is aggrieved or adversely affected by the issuance or denial of a permit by the Director of EPD may petition the Director for a hearing if such petition is filed in the office of the Director within thirty (30) days from the date of notice of such permit issuance or denial. Such hearing shall be held in accordance with the EPD Rules, Water Quality Control, subparagraph 391-3-6-.01.

Petitions for a contested hearing must include the following:

- 1. The name and address of the petitioner;
- 2. The grounds under which petitioner alleges to be aggrieved or adversely affected by the issuance or denial of a permit;
- 3. The reason or reasons why petitioner takes issue with the action of the Director;
- 4. All other matters asserted by petitioner which are relevant to the action in question.

# Appendix A

City of Albany – Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant NPDES Permit No. GA0037222

Waste Load Allocation (WLA)

# National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Wasteload Allocation Form

The second secon		THE PERSON NAMED IN	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	
Part I: Background Information		بن کے کو جات	6 K	
WLA Request Type: Reissuance 🔯 Expans	sion 🔲 Relocation 🔲	Modification-Re	rating 🔲 New Disch	harge 🔲
Facility Name: Albany-JoshuaStreet Wi	PCP	County: Doug	herty	WQMU: 1193
NPDES Permit No.: GA0037222	Expiration Da	le: 6/30/2019	Outfall i	Number 61
Receiving Water: Flint River	River Bas			ait HUC: 0313000801
Discharge Type: Domestic & Industria		portion (D:t):	Flow(s) Requested	
Industrial Contributions Type(s):		portion (p.s).	Links Ladoseian	(moo). oz
Treatment Process Description. Screening, gri	it removal, primary clarif	Acation, activated	sludge, secondary clad	ffication, chlorination,
Additional Information (history, special conditions	n, post seration. Aerobic	digestion, sludge	dewatering and third p	earty disposal.
Requested by: Kellis-Ann Sottille	Title. EE		Program: WRP	
Leignhone 404-463-4945			Date 1/22/2019	
			CHARLEST ESTABLES	
Part II: ' Receiving Water Informatio				
Receiving Water Flint River	n <sub>ed</sub> , t		4 . 4	State of the second
	1 Owner El			hing
		Not Support:	Cnteria:	1
			WLA Complies with Th	MDL Yes 🔲 No 🖂
Discharge to segment on 2016 305(b)/303(d) lis	st as Supporting.			
				THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY.
		Number - America	STATE OF THE PERSON	PROPERTY AND ADDRESS.
Part III: - Water Quality Model Review		1 1 1 A		
	ated 🔲 Venfied 🗆	Cannol be Mor	ieled 🔲 Model Leng	ith (mi): 70,3
Field Data None Fair Good			1,345	
Model and Field Data Description Steady-state (	Georgia DOSAG model (I	Revised). Evaluation	n for mainline Flint Riv	er segment only
Critical Water Temperature (*C). 25 Drain	nage Area (mil): Approx	r. 5302 Mes	n annual streamflow at d	lischarge (cfs), 4931
7Q10 Yield (cfs/mi²) 0.15 / 0.45	The section is a supplied.	67-1.08	30Q3 streamflow at d	
Effluent Flow Rate (cfs): 49.5	7Q10 IWC (%): 8.9		7Q10 streamflow at d	
Slope (range - fpm); 0.65-3.6 K1; 0.06	K3: 0.3 K2 (ran	oe): 0.48-2.9	1Q10 streamflow at d	
	3.0 Escape Coef. (ft <sup>-1</sup>		1.C. I O STLESHLINGS ST C	lischarge (cfs): 655
The minimum dissolved oxygen concentration	5.0 Escape Cost. (II	): U.U5	atanana at this attent	
THE THURSDOW CHESCHARD CYTERIN CONCENSION	iot the woon is 5'n wor	., 35.5 miles down	stream of the discharge	e. The Natural D.O. 🕒
estimated at this location is 5.7 mg/l				
estimated at this location is 5.7 mg/t				
estimated at this location is 5.7 mg/L.				
estimated at this location is 5.7 mg/L.	itations and Conditi			
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Same as current Revision	red 🔯 New 🗋	ons (mg/L as a	monthly average	
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi	red 🔯 New 🗋	ons (mg/L as a	monthly average	
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Same as current Revis On Filint River, approximately 4.6	miles downstream from	ons (mg/L as s Kinchafoonee Cre	monthly average o	except as noted)
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Location Same as current Revis Con Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)  Recommended Permit Limi Revis Revis On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform	ons (mg/L as a	monthly average o	except as noted)  TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Location Same as current Revision Con Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD: NH <sub>3</sub> -N DO TO (MR) TO TO THE RIVER REVISION ROD: NH <sub>3</sub> -N DO TO (MR)	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Gre pH To (etcl units) Phos	monthly average of the property of the propert	except as noted)
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Same as current Revis Cocation On Filint River, approximately 4.6 ( Effluent Flow (MGD) 800, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (mm) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:	red New In miles downstream from RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)	Ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (etcl units) Phos 6.0 - 9.0 Mod	monthly average (sek junction. stal Orthophorus Phosphate sektor Monitor	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Same as current Revis Con Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)  32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, agustic toxici	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ty testing requirements.	Ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (etcl units) Phosi 8.0 - 9.0 Moi	monthly average (sek junction. stal Orthophorus Phosphate sektor Monitor	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision Conflint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MR) TO 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ty testing requirements.	Ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (etcl units) Phosi 8.0 - 9.0 Moi	monthly average (sek junction. stal Orthophorus Phosphate sektor Monitor	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current □ Revis Location On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)  BOD; NH₂-N DO (mm)  32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicior identified during review of permit application.	miles downstream from RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml) .19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (etd units) Phosi 6.0 - 9.0 Mod and other parame by WRP.	monthly average of the property of the propert	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limi Rationale Same as current Revis Location On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)  BOD: NH2-N DO (mm)  32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  ity testing requirements, on are to be determined but firste, and organic nitroes.	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (std unis) Phosi 6.0 - 9.0 Mod and other parame by WRP.	monthly average (see junction.  Ital Ortho Phosphate Altor Monitor  Iters required by category	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  Initial effluent guidelines
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limited Same as current Revisional Control Provided Permit Limited Revisional Revisional Control Provided Revisional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicing review of permit application or identified during review of permit application in the same efficient sample, Ortho-P is a control Priority page 12.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined by the component of TP and shooth	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (etd unis) Phosi 6.0 - 8.0 Mod and other parame by WRP. en is recommende	monthly average (  bk junction.  tal Ortho  phorus Phosphate  alter Monitor  bers required by catego  d. Total-P and Ortho-P  than or equal to TP. No	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  Initial effluent guidelines  Should be analyzed
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limiter Rationale Same as current Revisional Revision Re	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined by the component of TP and shown in the component of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Cre pH To (std unis) Phosi 6.0 - 9.0 Moi and other parame by WRP. en is recommende uild always be less should be calcular	monthly average of the property of the propert	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  srical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH3-N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicing or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-niferom the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a constituent of the same effluent same.  A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml) .19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined it  itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and sho mple. Organic Nitrogen is model. This ratio is con	Cons (mg/L as a second of the ph To (etd units) Phose 8.0 — 8.0 More and other parametry WRP.  The phose second of the parametry WRP.  The phose second of the parametry WRP.	ek junction.  Ital Ortho Phosphate P	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  wical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) 800, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicing or identified during review of permit application or identified during review of permit applications the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined by  Itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and sho mple. Organic Nitrogen:  3 model. This ratio is cor  EPD's Strategy for Addr	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Creph To (etci unts) Phosis 8.0 – 8.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  en is recommende uid always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphoraes and phosphoraes and phosphoraes and phosphoraes and phosphoraes and phosphoraes.	ek junction.  Ital Ortho Phosphate Inter Monitor  Monitor Monitor  Iters required by catego  d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3.  Ite for the level of treatr in NPDES Permitting	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  Initial effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents  ment of this facility.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) 800; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-nity from the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to  Itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown  Itrite, and organic Nitrogen  Itrite, and organ	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Crept To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 More and other parametry WRP.  In its recommender uit always be less should be calculated appropriates appropriates appropriate appr	imonthly average of the property of the proper	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines should be analyzed litrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Relissuance)
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MgD) 800; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (mm) To (mm) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit applications the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 Upon concentration when combined with the recommended w	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml).  Fecal Coliform (No /100ml).  Ty testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the completion of TP and showing the color of TP and showing the col	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (ett unts) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 More and other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates along Phosphora. The calculates are appropriated appropriates and the calculates are appropriated appropriates are appropriated appropriated appropriates are appropriated app	monthly average of the property of the propert	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  rical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a conshould be analyzed from the same effluent same. A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommens.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown in the itrite of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphory with the calculation of	monthly average of the property of the series required by categor d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3, the for the level of treatment of the series of th	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MgD) 800; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (mm) To (mm) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit applications the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 Upon concentration when combined with the recommended w	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown in the itrite of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphory with the calculation of	monthly average of the property of the series required by categor d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3, the for the level of treatment of the series of th	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a conshould be analyzed from the same effluent same. A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommens.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown in the itrite of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphory with the calculation of	monthly average of the property of the series required by categor d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3, the for the level of treatment of the series of th	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a conshould be analyzed from the same effluent same. A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommens.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown in the itrite of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphory with the calculation of	monthly average of the property of the series required by categor d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3, the for the level of treatment of the series of th	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a conshould be analyzed from the same effluent same. A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommens.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and shown in the itrite of	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates and phosphory with the calculation of	monthly average of the property of the series required by categor d. Total-P and Ortho-P than or equal to TP. Ni ad as TKN minus NH3, the for the level of treatment of the series of th	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) 800; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit applications in the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendations are supplied to the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendations are supplied to the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendations are supplied to the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration of the proposed ammonia limit m	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml).  Fecal Coliform (No /100ml).  Ty 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined to itrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the completion of TP and showing the color of TP and showin	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Crept To (etci unis) Phosis 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In its recommendeuld always be less should be calculated appropriates lines of the commendeuld always be less should be calculated appropriate sessing Phosphoromblent Water Qualifies Georgia's insidered decorgia's insidered at Albany Ga. and Using Commendeur Commendeu	imonthly average of the property of the proper	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a conshould be analyzed from the same effluent same. A f-ratio of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommens.	miles downstream from  RC Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined it  Itrite, and organic nitrogromoponent of TP and sho mple. Organic Nitrogen is model. This ratio is cor EPD's Strategy for Addrils EPA's Aquatic Life An mended BOD, ilmit satis atton indicates critical fits is 02382500 Flint River at	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Creph To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 More and other parametry WRP.  In its recommendered all always be less should be calculated appropriate sessing Phosphoromblent Water Qualifies Georgia's insidered appropriate sessing the sesting the sest	ek junction.  Ital Ortho Phosphate Inter Monitor  Monitor	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  stical effluent guidelines should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility, (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This indeeds,
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit application or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-niferom the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a constant of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. Ortho-P is a concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation w	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined bitrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the component of TP and sho	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee Creph To (etcl units) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 More and other parametry WRP.  In its recommendered all always be less should be calculated appropriate sessing Phosphoromblent Water Qualifies Georgia's insidered appropriate sessing the sesting the sest	imonthly average of the property of the proper	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit application or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-niferom the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a constant of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. Ortho-P is a concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation w	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined bitrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the component of TP and sho	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etd unta) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates ling Phosphorum Water Qualifies Georgia's instown is estimated at Albany Ga. and Use Reviewed by Jennich Crephorum Control of the Control of t	imonthly average of the property of the proper	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revisionation On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD)  Effluent Flow BOD; NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO (MGD)  32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0.  Additional Comments: Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxici or identified during review of permit application identified during review of permit application the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a construction of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. The monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 Utconcentration when combined with the recommendation when combined with the recom	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined bitrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the component of TP and sho	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etd unts) Phose 8.0 – 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriatesing Phosphorum Water Qualifies Georgia's instrument was and Using Canada Using Canada Using Canada Using Canada Using Canada C	monthly average of the property of the second of the secon	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit application or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-niferom the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a constant of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. Ortho-P is a concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation w	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined bitrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the component of TP and sho	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etd unta) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates ling Phosphorum Water Qualifies Georgia's instown is estimated at Albany Ga. and Use Reviewed by Jennich Crephorum Control of the Control of t	monthly average of the property of the second of the secon	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.
Part IV: Recommended Permit Limit Rationale Same as current Revision On Filint River, approximately 4.6 (MGD) ROD, NH <sub>2</sub> -N DO TO (MGD) 32 20.0 10.0 5.0 0 Additional Comments:  Priority pollutants permit limits, aquatic toxicity or identified during review of permit application or identified during review of permit application.  Effluent monitoring of Ortho-P, TKN, nitrate-niferom the same effluent sample. Ortho-P is a constant of 3.0 was used in the revised DOSAG. TP monitoring is maintained in accordance to The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. Ortho-P is a concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation of the same self-unit sample. The proposed ammonia limit meets the 2013 U concentration when combined with the recommendation w	miles downstream from Fecal Coliform (No /100ml)  19 200  Ity testing requirements, on are to be determined bitrite, and organic nitrogromponent of TP and showing the component of TP and sho	ons (mg/L as a Kinchafoonee CrepH To (etd unta) Phosp 8.0 - 9.0 Morand other parametry WRP.  In is recommended all always be less should be calculated appropriates ling Phosphorum Water Qualifies Georgia's instown is estimated at Albany Ga. and Use Reviewed by Jennich Crephorum Control of the Control of t	monthly average of the property of the second of the secon	TKN, Nitrite-Nitrate, Organic Nitrogen Monitor  strical effluent guidelines  should be analyzed itrogen constituents ment of this facility. (For Reissuance) a-Freshwater. This nederds. Calculated from the nt River at Newton Ga.

# Appendix B

# Joshua Street WPCP NPDES Permit No. GA0037222

# Stream Data (unstream of the discharge):

# Effluent Data:

TSS:	10	mg/L	TSS:	3.0	mg/L
<b>7</b> Q10:	790.00	$\Re^3/s$	Flow:	32,000,000	gal/day
1Q10:	655.00	ft <sup>3</sup> /s	Flow:	49.51	ft <sup>3</sup> /s
Mean flow:	4,931.00	ft <sup>3</sup> /s			

## Stream data (downstream of the discharge):

Hardness (at 7Q10):

TSS (at 7Q10):	9.59 mg/L		
Dilution factor (at average flow):	100.6	IWC (at average flow):	1
Dilution factor (at 7Q10):	10.00	IWC (at 7Q10):	6
Dilution factor (at 1Q10):	10.00	IWC (at 1Q10):	7

20.0 mg/L

# Acute Water Quality Criteria (WQC Acute) - Metals:

Metal	K <sub>PO</sub>	Œ	$f_D$	Maximum	Instream C <sub>D</sub>	WQCAcute	Action
	- 1			effluent C <sub>T</sub>	1 1		needed?
				(µg/L)	(μg/L)	(µg/L)	
Arsenic	4.80.E+05	-0.729	0.53	3.2	0.2	340.00	no
Cadmium	4.00.E+06	-1.131	0.251	0.2	0.0	0.42	no
Chromium III	3.36.E+06	-0.930	0.20	1.9	0.0	152.49	no
Chromium VI	3.36.E+06	-0.930	0.00	0.0	0.0	16.00	по
Copper	1.04,E+06	-0.744	0.35	5.0	0.18	2.95	no
Lead	2.80.E+06	-0.800	0.19	9.5	0.2	10.79	no
Mercury	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0020	0.0002	1.40	no
Nickel	4.90.E+05	-0.572	0.44	2.6	0.1	119.99	no
Zinc	1.25.E+06	-0.704	0.29	29.0	0.84	29.97	no

$$\mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{D}} = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{PO}} \times \mathrm{TSS}_{\mathrm{Instream}}(\mathbf{mg/L})^{(1+\alpha)} \times 10^{-6}} \qquad \text{Instream } \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{D}} = \frac{\mathrm{Effluent} \ \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{mg/L}) \times \mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{D}}}{\mathrm{DF}} \quad \mathrm{mg/L}$$

Dilution Factor = 
$$\frac{Q_{Stream}(ft^{3}/sec) + Q_{Effluent}(ft^{3}/sec)}{Q_{Effluent}(ft^{3}/sec)}$$

# Appendix B

# Joshua Street WPCP NPDES Permit No. GA0037222

# Chronic Water Quality Criteria (WQC Chronic) - Metals:

Metal	K <sub>PO</sub>	α	$\mathbf{f_D}$	Average	Instream C <sub>D</sub>	WQC <sub>Chronic</sub>	Action
				effluent C <sub>T</sub>			needed?
				(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	
Arsenic	4.80.E+05	-0.729	0.53	1.1	0.1	150.00	no
Cadmium	4.00.E+06	-1.131	0.251	0.1	0.0	0.08	no
Chromium III	3.36.E+06	-0.930	0.20	1.0	0.0	19.84	no
Chromium VI	3.36.E+06	-0.930	0.00	0.0	0.0	11.00	no
Соррег	1.04.E+06	-0.744	0.35	2.80	0.10	2.26	no
Lead	2.80.E+06	-0.800	0.19	5.4	0.1	0.42	no
Mercury	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00100	0.000100	0.012	no
Nickel	4.90.E+05	-0.572	0.44	0.9	0.0	13.33	no
Zinc	1.25.E+06	-0.704	0.29	25.7	0.75	30.21	no

$$\mathbf{f}_{D} = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{K}_{PO} \times TSS_{instream}(mg/L)} \quad \text{Instream } \mathbf{C}_{D} = \frac{Effluent \ \mathbf{C}_{T}(mg/L) \times \mathbf{f}_{D}}{DF} \quad mg/L$$

# Appendix B

# Joshua Street WPCP NPDES Permit No. GA0037222

# Water Quality Criteria (WQC) - Non Metals:

Pollutant	Effluent C <sub>T</sub>	Instream Concentration	WQC	WQC/2	Action needed?
	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	
Antimony	2.0	0.02	640.0	320.0	no
Beryllium	0.2	0.00	n/a	n/a	no
Selenium	3.9	0.04	5.00	2.5	no
Silver	0.2	0.00	n/a	n/a	no
Thallium	0.19	0.00	0.47	0.2	no
Bromo- dichloro- methane	4.5	0.04	17	8.5	no
Bromoform	5	0.05	140	70.0	no
Chloroform	1.9	0.02	470	235.0	no
Dibromo- chloro- methane	6.3	0.06	13	6.5	no
d-BHC	0.016	0.00	n/a	n/a	no
Endosulfan	0.076	0.00	89	44.5	no
Methylene chloride	3.5	0.03	590	295.0	no
Cyanide	0.005	0.00	5.2	2.6	ДО
Barium	17	0.17	n/a	n/a	no

#### NOTES:

- Water Quality Criteria (WQC) from State of Georgia Rules and Regulations 391-3-6-.03.
- If the calculated instream concentration is less than 50% of the instream water quality criteria, then the constinuent will be considered not to be present at levels of concern.
- If the calculated instream concentration is greater than 50% of the instream water quality criteria, then additional monitoring may be required or a permit limit for that constinuent may be included in the permit.

# Appendix C

# City of Albany - Joshua Street WPCP NPDES Permit No. GA0037222

# **WET Test PMSD Values:**

PMSD = Minimum Significant Data (MSD) / Control Mean x 100 %

WET Test #1		07/14			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	6.04	29.80	20.26	L
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.10	0.64	15.91	L
WET Test #2		10/14			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	5.39	24.30	22,2	W
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.07	0.56	11.8	Lo
WET Test #3		02/15			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	3.38	27.30	12.4	Lo
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.09	0.45	20.5	$\square$ w
WET Test #4		04/15			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	2.84	19.50	14.6	$\neg w$
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.05	0.45	11.1	Lo
WET Test #5		03/16			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	7.77	17.00	45.7	Wi
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.13	0.58	21.4	Wi
WET Test #6		03/17			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	3.82	20.80	18.4	Wi
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.08	0.61	13.4	Wi
WET Test #7		03/18			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	5.99	26.40	22.7	Wi
Fathead Minnow (P. promelas)	12-30	0.09	0.59	14.9	] Wi
WET Test #8		03/19			
Species	PMSD Bounds	MSD	Control Mean	PMSD	
Water Flea (C. dubia)	13-47	8.01	25.30	31.6	Wi

# Appendix D **Ammonia Toxicity Analysis** for **Wasteload Allocation Development**

Date: 1/31/19 Facility: Albany WPCP

NPDES Permit Number: GA0037222 Receiving Stream: Flint River

Engineer: William Wang Comments: Critical condition

#### Stream and Facility Data:

Background Stream pH (standard units 7.5

Effluent pH (standard units 9.0 Final Stream pH (standard units) 7.51 Stream Temperature (Celalus) 28.0 30Q3 Streamflow (cfs): 1366.00

Stream background concentration (Total NH3-N, mg/l 0.03

Facility Discharge (MGD/cfs): 32 49.52 Total Combined Flow (cfs): 1415.52

Effluent concentration (Total NH3-N, mg/L) :22.64

If 22.64 is greater than 17.4 mg/L, use 17.4 mg/L in WLA modeling.

#### Chronic Criterion based on Villosa iris (Rainbow mussel):

Instream CCC = criterion continuous concentration (chronic criterion):  $CCC = 0.8876 \times (0.0278 / (1 + f0^{688 - pH)}) + 1.1994 / (1 + 16^{H-7.888})) \times (2.126 \times 10^{0.028 \times (20 - MAX(T, T))})$ 

Allowable Instream concentration CCC (Total NH3-N, mg/l) = 0.82

Based on National Criterion For Ammonia in Fresh Water As Revised in Year 2013

Source: Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia - Freshwater 2013, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Office of Science Technology, EPA-822-R-13-001. April 2013. Washington, D.C.

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, Atlanta, Georgia

Permit No. GA0037222 Issuance Date:



#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

#### NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT

In accordance with the provisions of the Georgia Water Quality Control Act (Georgia Laws 1964, p. 416, as amended), hereinafter called the State Act; the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S. C. 1251 et seq.), hereinafter called the Federal Act; and the Rules and Regulations promulgated pursuant to each of these Acts,

City of Albany Post Office Box 447 Albany, Georgia 31702

is authorized to discharge from a facility located at

Joshua Street Water Pollution Control Plant 2726 Joshua Street Albany, Georgia 31702 (Dougherty County)

to receiving waters

Flint River (Flint River Basin)

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

This permit is issued in reliance upon the permit application signed on December 29, 2018, any other applications upon which this permit is based, supporting data entered therein or attached thereto, and any subsequent submittal of supporting data.

This permit shall become effective on XXXXXXX, 20XX.

This permit and the authorization to discharge shall expire at midnight, XXXXX XX, 20XX.



DRAFT

Director, Environmental Protection Division

#### PART I

EPD is the Environmental Protection Division of the Department of Natural Resources.

The Federal Act referred to is The Clean Water Act.

The State Act referred to is The Water Quality Control Act (Act No. 870).

The State Rules referred to are The Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control (Chapter 391-3-6).

#### A. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

#### 1. MONITORING

- a. The monthly average, other than for fecal coliform bacteria, is the arithmetic mean of values obtained for samples collected during a calendar month.
- b. The weekly average, other than for fecal coliform bacteria, is the arithmetic mean of values obtained for samples collected during a 7-day period. The week begins 12:00 midnight Saturday and ends at 12:00 midnight the following Saturday. To define a different starting time for the sampling period, the permittee must notify the EPD in writing. For reporting required by Part I.D.1. of this permit, a week that starts in one month and ends in another month shall be considered part of the second month. The permittee may calculate and report the weekly average as a 7-day moving average.
- c. Fecal coliform bacteria will be reported as the geometric mean of the values for the samples collected during the time periods in I.A.1.a. and I.A.1.b.
- d. Untreated wastewater influent samples required by I.B. shall be collected before any return or recycle flows. These flows include returned activated sludge, supernatants, centrates, filtrates, and backwash.
- e. Effluent samples required by I.B. of this permit shall be collected after the final treatment process and before discharge to receiving waters. Composite samples may be collected before disinfection with written EPD approval.
- f. A composite sample shall consist of a minimum of 13 subsamples collected at least once every 2 hours for at least 24 hours and shall be composited proportionately to flow.
- g. Flow measurements shall be conducted using the flow measuring device(s) in accordance with the approved design of the facility. If instantaneous measurements are required, then the permittee shall have a primary flow measuring device that is correctly installed and maintained. If continuous recording measurements are required, then flow measurements must be made using continuous recording equipment. Calibration shall be maintained of the continuous recording instrumentation to  $\pm$  10% of the actual flow.

Flow shall be measured manually to check the flow meter calibration at a frequency of once a month. If secondary flow instruments are in use and malfunction or fail to maintain calibration as required, the flow shall be computed from manual measurements or by other method(s) approved by EPD until such time as the secondary flow instrument is repaired. For facilities which utilize alternate technologies for measuring flow, the flow measurement device must be calibrated semi-annually by qualified personnel.

Records of the calibration checks shall be maintained.

- h. If secondary flow instruments malfunction or fail to maintain calibration as required in I.A.1.g., the flow shall be computed from manual measurements taken at the times specified for the collection of composite samples.
- i. Some parameters will be reported as "not detected" when they are below the detection limit and will then be considered in compliance with the effluent limit. The detection limit will also be reported.

## 2. SLUDGE DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Sludge shall be disposed of according to the regulations and guidelines established by the EPD and the Federal Act section 405(d) and (e), and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). In land applying nonhazardous municipal sewage sludge, the permittee shall comply with the general criteria outlined in the most current version of the EPD "Guidelines for Land Application of Sewage Sludge (Biosolids) at Agronomic Rates" and with the State Rules, Chapter 391-3-6-.17. Before disposing of municipal sewage sludge by land application or any method other than co-disposal in a permitted sanitary landfill, the permittee shall submit a sludge management plan to EPD for written approval. This plan will become a part of the NPDES Permit after approval and modification of the permit. The permittee shall notify the EPD of any changes planned in an approved sludge management plan.

If an applicable management practice or numerical limitation for pollutants in sewage sludge is promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Federal Act after approval of the plan, then the plan shall be modified to conform with the new regulations.

## 3. SLUDGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall develop and implement procedures to ensure adequate year-round sludge disposal. The permittee shall monitor and maintain records documenting the quantity of sludge removed from the facility. Records shall be maintained documenting that the quantity of solids removed from the facility equals the solids generated on an average day. The total quantity of sludge removed from the facility during the reporting period shall be reported each month with the Discharge Monitoring Reports as required under Part I.D.1. of this permit. The quantity shall be reported on a dry weight basis (dry tons).

# 4. INTRODUCTION OF POLLUTANTS INTO THE PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS (POTW)

The permittee must notify EPD of:

- a. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to Sections 301 or 306 of the Federal Act if the pollutants were directly discharged to a receiving stream; and
- b. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants from a source that existed when the permit was issued.

This notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of the indirect discharge introduced and any anticipated impact on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW.

## 5. EFFLUENT TOXICITY AND BIOMONITORING REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established by section 307(a) of the Federal Act and with Chapter 391-3-6-.03(5)(e) of the State Rules and may not discharge toxic pollutants in concentrations or combinations that are harmful to humans, animals, or aquatic life.

If toxicity is suspected in the effluent, the EPD may require the permittee to perform any of the following actions:

- a. Acute biomonitoring tests;
- b. Chronic biomonitoring tests;
- c. Stream studies;
- d. Priority pollutant analyses;
- e. Toxicity reduction evaluations (TRE); or
- f. Any other appropriate study.

The EPD will specify the requirements and methodologies for performing any of these tests or studies. Unless other concentrations are specified by the EPD, the critical concentration used to determine toxicity in biomonitoring tests will be the effluent instream wastewater concentration (IWC) based on the permitted monthly average flow of the facility and the critical low flow of the receiving stream (7Q10). The endpoints that will be reported are the effluent concentration that is lethal to 50% of the test organisms (LC50) if the test is for acute toxicity and the no observed effect concentration (NOEC) of effluent if the test is for chronic toxicity.

The permittee must eliminate effluent toxicity and supply the EPD with data and evidence to confirm toxicity elimination.

Page 5 of 25 DRAFT
Permit No. GA0037222

## B.1. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

## Discharge to Flint Rive - Outfall #001 (31.539601°, -84.140606°):

The discharge from the water pollution control plant shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

Parameters	Discharge limitations in mg/L (kg/day) unless otherwise specified		Monitoring Requirements		
	Monthly Average	Weekly Average	Measurement Frequency	Sample Type	Sample Location
Flow (MGD)	32.0	40.0	Seven Days/Week	Continuous Recording	Effluent
Five-Day Biochemical Oxygen Demand (1)	20.0 (2,426)	30.0 (3,033)	Five Days/Week	Composite	Influent & Effluent
Total Suspended Solids (1)	30 (3,639)	45 (4,549)	Five Days/Week	Composite	Influent & Effluent
Ammonia, as N <sup>(2)</sup>	10.0 (1,213)	15.0 (1,516)	Five Days/Week	Composite	Effluent
Fecal Coliform Bacteria (#/100 mL)	200	400	Three Days/Week	Grab	Effluent

<sup>(1)</sup> Numeric limits only apply to the effluent.

(Effluent limitations continued on the next page)

Ammonia, organic nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite, and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) must be analyzed or calculated from the same sample. Organic nitrogen, as N = TKN – ammonia, as N.

Page 6 of 25 DRAFT Permit No. GA0037222

## B.1. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

(CONTINUED)

## Discharge to Flint River- Outfall #001 (31,539601°, -84.140606°):

	Discharge limitations in mg/L unless otherwise specified	Monitoring Requirements		
Parameters		Measurement Frequency	Sample Type	Sample Location
Five-Day Biochemical Oxygen Demand Removal, Minimum (%) (1)	85	See Below	See Below	See Below
Total Suspended Solids Removal, Minimum (%) (1)	85	See Below	See Below	See Below
pH, Daily Minimum – Daily Maximum (Standard Unit)	6.0 – 9.0	Seven Days/Week	Grab	Effluent
Total Residual Chlorine, Daily Maximum	0.19	Seven Days/Week	Grab	Effluent
Dissolved Oxygen, Daily Minimum	5.0	Seven Days/Week	Grab	Effluent
Total Phosphorus (2)	Report	One Day/Month	Composite	Effluent
Orthophosphate, as P (2)	Report	One Day/Month	Composite	Effluent
Organic Nitrogen, as N (3)	Report	One Day/Month	Composite	Effluent
Nitrate-Nitrite, as N (3)	Report	One Day/Month	Composite	Effluent
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, as N <sup>(3)</sup>	Report	One Day/Month	Composite	Effluent
Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity (%) (4)	Report NOEC	Annually	Composite	Effluent

Percent removal shall be calculated from monthly average influent and effluent concentrations. Influent and effluent samples shall be collected at approximately the same time.

Total phosphorus and orthophosphate must be analyzed from the same sample.

Ammonia, organic nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite, and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) must be analyzed or calculated from the same sample. Organic nitrogen, as N = TKN – ammonia, as N

<sup>(4)</sup> Refer to Part I.C.9. CHRONIC WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY.

#### C. MONITORING AND REPORTING

#### 1. REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLING

Samples and measurements of the monitored waste shall represent the volume and nature of the waste stream. The permittee shall maintain a written sampling and monitoring schedule.

## 2. SAMPLING PERIOD

- a. Unless otherwise specified in this permit, quarterly samples shall be taken during the periods January-March, April-June, July-September, and October-December.
- b. Unless otherwise specified in this permit, semiannual samples shall be taken during the periods January-June and July-December.
- c. Unless otherwise specified in this permit, annual samples shall be taken during the period of January-December.

## 3. MONITORING PROCEDURES

All analytical methods, sample containers, sample preservation techniques, and sample holding times must be consistent with the techniques and methods listed in 40 CFR Part 136. The analytical method used shall be sufficiently sensitive. EPA-approved methods must be applicable to the concentration ranges of the NPDES permit samples.

## 4. RECORDING OF RESULTS

For each required parameter analyzed, the permittee shall record:

- a. The exact place, date, and time of sampling, and the person(s) collecting the sample. For flow proportioned composite samples, this shall include the instantaneous flow and the corresponding volume of each sample aliquot, and other information relevant to document flow proportioning of composite samples;
- b. The dates and times the analyses were performed;
- c. The person(s) who performed the analyses;
- d. The analytical procedures or methods used; and
- e. The results of all required analyses.

## 5. ADDITIONAL MONITORING BY PERMITTEE

If the permittee monitors required parameters at the locations designated in I.B. more frequently than required, the permittee shall analyze all samples using approved analytical methods specified in I.C.3. The results of this additional monitoring shall be included in calculating and reporting the values on the Discharge Monitoring Report forms. The permittee shall indicate the monitoring frequency on the report. The EPD may require in writing more frequent monitoring, or monitoring of other pollutants not specified in this permit.

#### 6. RECORDS RETENTION

The permittee shall retain records of:

- a. All laboratory analyses performed including sample data, quality control data, and standard curves;
- b. Calibration and maintenance records of laboratory instruments;
- c. Calibration and maintenance records and recordings from continuous recording instruments;
- d. Process control monitoring records;
- e. Facility operation and maintenance records:
- f. Copies of all reports required by this permit;
- g. All data and information used to complete the permit application; and
- h. All monitoring data related to sludge use and disposal.

These records shall be kept for at least three years. Sludge handling records must be kept for at least five years. Either period may be extended by EPD written notification.

## 7. PENALTIES

Both the Federal and State Acts provide that any person who falsifies or tampers with any monitoring device or method required under this permit, or who makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record submitted or required by this permit shall, if convicted, be punished by a fine or by imprisonment or by both. The Acts include procedures for imposing civil penalties for violations or for negligent or intentional failure or refusal to comply with any final or emergency order of the Director of the EPD.

#### 8. WATERSHED PROTECTION PLAN

The permittee has submitted a Watershed Protection Plan for review by EPD. Once approved, the Watershed Protection Plan shall be enforceable through this permit.

#### a. Watershed Protection Plan

The Watershed Protection Plan will provide for the following:

- i. The Watershed Protection Plan will apply to the Assessment Area as defined above. The plan will utilize the information generated in the permittee's watershed assessment to establish a baseline of watershed conditions and to provide ongoing long-term monitoring according to the approved plan to either verify that the plan is effective or to modify the plan such that water quality standards will be achieved.
- ii. The Watershed Protection Plan must include a schedule for correcting current water quality problems that are causing water quality standards violations. The permittee shall provide ongoing monitoring to verify that the actions taken to correct the water quality problems are effective.
- iii. The permittee shall develop and put in place best management practices (BMPs) to prevent future water quality standards violations.
- iv. The permittee shall provide ongoing monitoring to verify that the BMPs are working or to provide the information necessary to modify the BMPs to achieve water quality standards.

## b. Compliance Schedule

i. Submit a revised WPP within two months of any comment letter(s) provided by EPD, until such date that EPD provides approval of the WPP.

#### c. Annual Report

Once the Watershed Protection Plan is approved, each June 30<sup>th</sup> the permittee is to submit the following to EPD:

Each June 30th the permittee is to submit the following to EPD:

i. An annual certification statement documenting that the plan is being implemented as approved. The certification statement shall read as follows: "I certify, under penalty of law, that the Watershed Protection Plan is being implemented. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

- ii. All Watershed Plan data collected during the previous year in an electronic format. This data shall be archived using a digital format such as a spreadsheet developed in coordination with EPD. All archived records, data, and information pertaining to the Watershed Protection Plan shall be maintained permanently.
- iii. A progress report that provides a summary of the BMPs that have been implemented and documented water quality improvements. The progress report shall also include any necessary changes to the Watershed Protection Plan.

The report and other information shall be submitted to EPD at the address below:

Environmental Protection Division
Watershed Planning and Monitoring Program
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive SE
Suite 1152 East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

## 9. CHRONIC WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET)

The permittee must conduct annual chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) tests. The testing must be conducted in accordance with the most current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) chronic aquatic toxicity testing manuals. The referenced document is entitled Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, U.S. EPA, 821-R-02-013, October 2002. Definitive tests must be run on the same samples concurrently using both an invertebrate species (i.e., *Ceriodaphnia dubia*) and a vertebrate species (i.e., *Pimephales promelas*). The testing must include a dilution equal to the facility's instream wastewater concentration (IWC) of 6%.

EPD will evaluate the WET tests submitted to determine whether toxicity has been demonstrated. An effluent discharge will not be considered toxic if the No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) is greater than or equal to the Instream Wastewater Concentration (IWC) of 6%. If the test results indicate effluent toxicity, the permittee may be required to perform additional tests or studies in accordance with Part I.C.5 of the permit and/or the permit may be modified to include a chronic WET limit.

## D. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- 1. The permittee must electronically report the DMR, OMR and additional monitoring data using the web based electronic NetDMR reporting system, unless a waiver is granted by EPD.
  - The permittee must comply with the Federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Electronic Reporting regulations in 40 CFR §127. The permittee must electronically report the DMR, OMR, and additional monitoring data using the web based electronic NetDMR reporting system online at: <a href="https://netdmr.epa.gov/netdmr/public/home.htm">https://netdmr.epa.gov/netdmr/public/home.htm</a>
  - b. Monitoring results obtained during the calendar month shall be summarized for each month and reported on the DMR. The results of each sampling event shall be reported on the OMR and submitted as an attachment to the DMR.
  - c. The permittee shall submit the DMR, OMR and additional monitoring data no later than 11:59 p.m. on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the month following the sampling period.
  - d. All other reports required herein, unless otherwise stated, shall be submitted to the EPD Office listed on the permit issuance letter signed by the Director of EPD.
- 2. No later than December 21, 2020, the permittee must electronically report the following compliance monitoring data and reports using the online web based electronic system approved by EPD, unless a waiver is granted by EPD:
  - a. Sewage Sludge/Biosolids Annual Program Reports provided that the permittee has an approved Sewage Sludge (Biosolids) Plan;
  - b. Pretreatment Program Reports provided that the permittee has an approved Industrial Pretreatment Program in this permit;
  - c. Sewer Overflow/Bypass Event Reports;
  - d. Noncompliance Notification:
  - e. Other noncompliance; and
  - f. Bypass

## 3. OTHER REPORTS

All other reports required in this permit not listed above in Part I.D.2 or unless otherwise stated, shall be submitted to the EPD Office listed on the permit issuance letter signed by the Director of EPD.

#### 4. OTHER NONCOMPLIANCE

All instances of noncompliance not reported under Part I.B. and Part II. A. shall be reported to EPD at the time the monitoring report is submitted.

## 5. SIGNATORY REQUIREMENTS

All reports, certifications, data or information submitted in compliance with this permit or requested by EPD must be signed and certified as follows:

- a. Any State or NPDES Permit Application form submitted to the EPD shall be signed as follows in accordance with the Federal Regulations, 40 C.F.R. 122.22:
  - 1. For a corporation, by a responsible corporate officer. A responsible corporate officer means:
    - i. a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy- or decision making functions for the corporation, or
    - ii. the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities employing more than 250 persons or having gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding \$25 million (in second-quarter 1980 dollars), if authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures.
  - 2. For a partnership or sole proprietorship, by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or
  - 3. For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public facility, by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official.
- b. All other reports or requests for information required by the permit issuing authority shall be signed by a person designated in (a) above or a duly authorized representative of such person, if:
  - 1. The representative so authorized is responsible for the overall operation of the facility from which the discharge originates, e.g., a plant manager, superintendent or person of equivalent responsibility;
  - 2. The authorization is made in writing by the person designated under (a) above; and
  - 3. The written authorization is submitted to the Director.

- c. Any changes in written authorization submitted to the permitting authority under (b) above which occur after the issuance of a permit shall be reported to the permitting authority by submitting a copy of a new written authorization which meets the requirements of (b) and (b.1) and (b.2) above.
- d. Any person signing any document under (a) or (b) above shall make the following 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."

#### PART II

## A. MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

## 1. PROPER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The permittee shall properly maintain and operate efficiently all treatment or control facilities and related equipment installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with this permit. Efficient operation and maintenance include effective performance, adequate funding, adequate operator staffing and training, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. Back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems shall be operated only when necessary to achieve permit compliance.

## 2. PLANNED CHANGE

Any anticipated facility expansions, or process modifications which will result in new, different, or increased discharges of pollutants requires the submission of a new NPDES permit application. If the changes will not violate the permit effluent limitations, the permittee may notify EPD without submitting an application. The permit may then be modified to specify and limit any pollutants not previously limited.

## 3. TWENTY-FOUR HOUR REPORTING

If, for any reason the permittee does not comply with, or will be unable to comply with any effluent limitations specified in the permittee's NPDES permit, the permittee shall provide EPD with an oral report within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances followed by a written report within five (5) days of becoming aware of such condition. The written submission shall contain the following information:

- a. A description of the noncompliance and its cause; and
- b. The period of noncompliance, including the exact date and times; or, if not corrected, the anticipated time the noncompliance is expected to continue; and
- c. The steps taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncomplying discharge.

## 4. ANTICIPATED NONCOMPLIANCE NOTIFICATION

The permittee shall give written notice to the EPD at least 10 days before:

- a. Any planned changes in the permitted facility; or
- b. Any activity which may result in noncompliance with the permit.

## 5. OTHER NONCOMPLIANCE

The permittee must report all instances of noncompliance not reported under other specific reporting requirements, at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information required under conditions of twenty-four hour reporting.

## 6. OPERATOR CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The person responsible for the daily operation of the facility must be a Class I Certified Operator in compliance with the Georgia State Board of Examiners for Certification of Water and Wastewater Plant Operators and Laboratory Analysts Act, as amended, and as specified by Subparagraph 391-3-6-.12 of the Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control. All other operators must have the minimum certification required by this Act.

## 7. LABORATORY ANALYST CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Laboratory Analysts must be certified in compliance with the Georgia State Board of Examiners for Certification of Water and Wastewater Treatment Plant Operators and Laboratory Analysts Act, as amended.

#### 8. BYPASSING

Any diversion of wastewater from or bypassing of wastewater around the permitted treatment works is prohibited, except if:

- a. Bypassing is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;
- b. There are no feasible alternatives to bypassing; and
- c. The permittee notifies the EPD at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.

Feasible alternatives to bypassing include use of auxiliary treatment facilities and retention of untreated waste. The permittee must take all possible measures to prevent bypassing during routine preventative maintenance by installing adequate back-up equipment.

The permittee shall operate the facility and the sewer system to minimize discharge of pollutants from combined sewer overflows or bypasses and may be required by the EPD to submit a plan and schedule to reduce bypasses, overflows, and infiltration.

Any unplanned bypass must be reported following the requirements for noncompliance notification specified in II.A.3. The permittee may be liable for any water quality violations that occur as a result of bypassing the facility.

Page 16 of 25 DRAFT
Permit No. GA0037222

## 9. POWER FAILURES

If the primary source of power to this water pollution control facility is reduced or lost, the permittee shall use an alternative source of power to reduce or control all discharges to maintain permit compliance.

## 10. DUTY TO MITIGATE

The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge disposal which might adversely affect human health or the environment.

## 11. NOTICE CONCERNING ENDANGERING WATERS OF THE STATE

Whenever, because of an accident or otherwise, any toxic or taste and color producing substance, or any other substance which would endanger downstream users of the waters of the State or would damage property, is discharged into such waters, or is so placed that it might flow, be washed, or fall into them, it shall be the duty of the person in charge of such substances at the time to forthwith notify EPD in person or by telephone of the location and nature of the danger, and it shall be such person's further duty to immediately take all reasonable and necessary steps to prevent injury to property and downstream users of said water.

Spills and Major Spills:

A "spill" is any discharge of raw sewage by a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) to the waters of the State.

## A "major spill" means:

- 1. The discharge of pollutants into waters of the State by a POTW that exceeds the weekly average permitted effluent limit for biochemical oxygen demand (5-day) or total suspended solids by 50 percent or greater in one day, provided that the effluent discharge concentration is equal to or greater than 25 mg/L for biochemical oxygen demand or total suspended solids.
- 2. Any discharge of raw sewage that 1) exceeds 10,000 gallons or 2) results in water quality violations in the waters of the State.

"Consistently exceeding effluent limitation" means a POTW exceeding the 30 day average limit for biochemical oxygen demand or total suspended solids for at least five days out of each seven day period during a total period of 180 consecutive days.

The following specific requirements shall apply to POTW's. If a spill or major spill occurs, the owner of a POTW shall immediately:

a. Notify EPD, in person or by telephone, when a spill or major spill occurs in the system.

- b. Report the incident to the local health department(s) for the area affected by the incident. The report at a minimum shall include the following:
  - 1. Date of the spill or major spill;
  - 2. Location and cause of the spill or major spill;
  - 3. Estimated volume discharged and name of receiving waters; and
  - 4. Corrective action taken to mitigate or reduce the adverse effects of the spill or major spill.
- c. Post a notice as close as possible to where the spill or major spill occurred and where the spill entered State waters and also post additional notices along portions of the waterway affected by the incident (i.e. bridge crossings, boat ramps, recreational areas, and other points of public access to the affected waterway). The notice at a minimum shall include the same information required in 11(b)(1-4) above. These notices shall remain in place for a minimum of seven days after the spill or major spill has ceased.
- d. Within 24 hours of becoming aware of a spill or major spill, the owner of a POTW shall report the incident to the local media (television, radio, and print media). The report shall include the same information required in 11(b)(1-4) above.
- e. Within 5 days (of the date of the spill or major spill), the owner of a POTW shall submit to EPD a written report which includes the same information required in 11(b)(1-4) above.
- f. Within 7 days (after the date of a major spill), the owner of a POTW responsible for the major spill, shall publish a notice in the largest legal organ of the County where the incident occurred. The notice shall include the same information required in 11(b)(1-4) above.
- g. The owner of a POTW shall immediately establish a monitoring program of the receiving waters affected by a major spill or by consistently exceeding an effluent limit, with such monitoring being at the expense of the POTW for at least one year. The monitoring program shall include an upstream sampling point as well as sufficient downstream locations to accurately characterize the impact of the major spill or the consistent exceedence of effluent limitations described in the definition of "Consistently exceeding effluent limitation" above. As a minimum, the following parameters shall be monitored in the receiving stream:
  - 1. Dissolved Oxygen;
  - 2. Fecal Coliform Bacteria;
  - 3. pH;
  - 4. Temperature; and
  - 5. Other parameters required by the EPD.

The monitoring and reporting frequency as well as the need to monitor additional parameters, will be determined by EPD. The results of the monitoring will be provided by the POTW owner to EPD and all downstream public agencies using the affected waters as a source of a public water supply.

h. Within 24 hours of becoming aware of a major spill, the owner of a POTW shall provide notice of a major spill to every county, municipality, or other public agency whose public water supply is within a distance of 20 miles downstream and to any others which could be potentially affected by the major spill.

#### 12. UPSET PROVISION

Provision under 40 CFR 122.41(n)(1)-(4), regarding "Upset" shall be applicable to any civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding brought to enforce this permit.

#### B. RESPONSIBILITIES

#### 1. DUTY TO COMPLY

The permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance is a violation of the Federal Clean Water Act, State Act, and the State Rules, and is grounds for:

- a. Enforcement action;
- b. Permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or
- c. Denial of a permit renewal application.

## 2. NEED TO HALT OR REDUCE ACTIVITY NOT A DEFENSE

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

## 3. INSPECTION AND ENTRY

The permittee shall allow the Director of the EPD, the Regional Administrator of EPA, and their authorized representatives, agents, or employees after they present credentials to:

- a. Enter the permittee's premises where a regulated activity or facility is located, or where any records required by this permit are kept;
- b. Review and copy any records required by this permit;
- c. Inspect any facilities, equipment, practices, or operations regulated or required by this permit; and

d. Sample any substance or parameter at any location.

## 4. DUTY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION

The permittee shall furnish any information required by the EPD to determine whether cause exists to modify, revoke and reissue, or terminate this permit or to determine compliance with this permit. The permittee shall also furnish the EPD with requested copies of records required by this permit.

## TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP

A permit may be transferred to another person by a permittee if:

- a. The permittee notifies the Director in writing at least 30 days in advance of the proposed transfer;
- b. An agreement is written containing a specific date for transfer of permit responsibility including acknowledgment that the existing permittee is liable for violations up to that date, and that the new permittee is liable for violations from that date on. This agreement must be submitted to the Director at least 30 days in advance of the proposed transfer; and
- c. The Director does not notify the current permittee and the new permittee within 30 days of EPD intent to modify, revoke and reissue, or terminate the permit. The Director may require that a new application be filed instead of agreeing to the transfer of the permit.

## 6. AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS

Except for data determined to be confidential by the Director of EPD under O.C.G.A. 12-5-26 or by the Regional Administrator of EPA under the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 2, all reports prepared to comply with this permit shall be available for public inspection at an EPD office. Effluent data, permit applications, permittees' names and addresses, and permits shall not be considered confidential.

## 7. PERMIT ACTIONS

This permit may be modified, terminated, or revoked and reissued in whole or in part during its term for causes including, but not limited to:

- a. Permit violations;
- b. Obtaining this permit by misrepresentation or by failure to disclose all relevant facts;
- c. Changing any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the permitted discharge;

- d. Changes in effluent characteristics; and
- e. Violations of water quality standards.

The filing of a request by the permittee for permit modification, termination, revocation and reissuance, or notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not negate any permit condition.

## 8. CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Nothing in this permit shall be construed to relieve the permittee from civil or criminal penalties for noncompliance.

## 9. PROPERTY RIGHTS

The issuance of this permit does not convey any property rights of either real or personal property, or any exclusive privileges, nor does it authorize any injury to private property or any invasion of personal rights, or any infringement of Federal, State or local laws or regulations.

#### 10. DUTY TO REAPPLY

The permittee shall submit an application for permit reissuance at least 180 days before the expiration date of this permit. The permittee shall not discharge after the permit expiration date. To receive authorization to discharge beyond the expiration date, the permittee shall submit the information, forms, and fees required by the EPD no later than 180 days before the expiration date.

#### 11. CONTESTED HEARINGS

Any person aggrieved or adversely affected by any action of the Director of the EPD shall petition the Director for a hearing within 30 days of notice of the action.

## 12. SEVERABILITY

The provisions of this permit are severable. If any permit provision or the application of any permit provision to any circumstance is held invalid, the provision does not affect other circumstances or the remainder of this permit.

#### 13. 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 form to the Director, it shall promptly submit such facts or information.

# STATE OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

Page 21 of 25 **DRAFT**Permit No. GA0037222

## 14. PREVIOUS PERMITS

All previous State wastewater permits issued to this facility, whether for construction or operation, are hereby revoked on the effective date of this permit. This action is taken to assure compliance with the Georgia Water Quality Control Act, as amended, and the Federal Clean Water Act, as amended. Receipt of the permit constitutes notice of such action. The conditions, requirements, terms and provisions of this permit authorizing discharge under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System govern discharges from this facility.

#### PART III

- A. APPROVED INDUSTRIAL PRETREATMENT PROGRAM FOR PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS (POTWs)
  - 1. The permittee's approved pretreatment program shall be enforceable through this permit. The permittee shall also comply with the provisions of 40 CFR 403.
  - 2. The permittee shall administer the approved pretreatment program by:
    - a. Maintaining records identifying the character and volume of pollutants contributed by industrial users to the POTW.
    - b. Enforcing and obtaining appropriate remedies for noncompliance by any industrial user with any applicable pretreatment standard or requirement defined by Section 307(b) and (c) of the Federal Act, 40 CFR Part 403.5 and 403.6 or any State or local requirement, whichever is more stringent.
    - c. Revising the adopted local limits based on technical analyses to ensure that the local limits continue to prevent:
      - 1. Interference with the operation of the POTW;
      - 2. Pass-through of pollutants in violation of this permit;
      - 3. Municipal sludge contamination; and
      - 4. Toxicity to life in the receiving stream.

Within 180 days of the effective date of this permit issuance or reissuance (excluding permit modifications), the permittee shall review the local limits of the program and submit to EPD a written technical evaluation of the need to revise the local limits.

- d. Ensuring that industrial wastewater discharges from industrial users are regulated through discharge permits or equivalent individual control mechanisms. Compliance schedules will be required of each industrial user for the installation of control technologies to meet applicable pretreatment standards and the requirements of the approved program.
- e. Inspecting, surveying, and monitoring to determine if the industrial user is in compliance with the applicable pretreatment standards.
- f. Equitably maintaining and adjusting revenue levels to ensure adequate and continued pretreatment program implementation.
- g. Preparing a list of industrial users which, during the reporting period May 1 through April 30, have been in significant noncompliance with the pretreatment requirements enumerated in 40 CFR Part 403.8 (f)(2)(viii). This list will be published annually each December in the newspaper with the largest circulation in the service area.

## B. APPROVED PRETREATMENT PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT

- 1. Within one month of the close of the reporting period May 1 through April 30, the permittee shall submit a report to the EPD that includes:
  - a. An updated list of POTW industrial users;
  - b. The results of POTW sampling and analyses required by the EPD;
  - c. A summary of POTW industrial user inspections;
  - d. A summary of POTW operations including information on upsets, interferences, pass through events, or violations of the permit related to industrial user discharges;
  - e. A summary of all activities to involve and inform the public of pretreatment requirements;
  - f. A summary of the annual pretreatment program budget;
  - g. A descriptive summary of any compliance activities initiated, ongoing, or completed against industrial users which shall include the number of administrative orders, show cause hearings, penalties, civil actions, and fines:
  - h. A list of contributing industries using the treatment works, divided into Standard Industrial Classification Code (SIC) categories, which have been issued permits or similar enforceable individual control mechanisms, and a status of compliance for each industrial user. The list should also identify the industries that are categorical or significant industrial users;
  - i. The name and address of each industrial user that has received a conditionally revised discharge limit;
  - j. A list of all industrial users who were in significant noncompliance with applicable pretreatment standards and requirements;
  - k. A list of all industrial users showing the date that each was notified that a categorical pretreatment standard had been promulgated by EPA for their industrial category and the status of each industrial user in achieving compliance within the 3 year period allowed by the Federal Act; and
  - 1. A description of all substantial changes proposed for the program. All substantial changes must first be approved by the EPD before formal adoption by the POTW. Substantial changes shall include but not be limited to:
    - 1. Changes in legal authority;
    - 2. Changes in local limits;
    - 3. Changes in the control mechanisms;

- 4. Changes in the method for implementing categorical pretreatment standards.
- 5. A decrease in the frequency of self-monitoring or reporting required of industrial users;
- 6. A decrease in the frequency of industrial user inspections or sampling by the POTW;
- 7. Significant reductions in the program resources including personnel commitments, equipment, and funding levels;
- 8. Changes in confidentiality procedures; and
- 9. Changes in the POTW sludge disposal and management practices.
- 2. Reports submitted by an industrial user will be retained by the permittee for at least 3 years and shall be available to the EPD for inspection and copying. This period shall be extended during the course of any unresolved litigation concerning the discharge of pollutants by an industrial user or concerning the operations of the program or when requested by the Director.

## C. INDUSTRIAL PRETREATMENT STANDARDS

Effluent limitations for the permittee's discharge are listed in Part I. Other pollutants attributable to industrial users may also be present in the discharge. When sufficient information becomes available, this permit may be revised to specify effluent limitations for these pollutants based on best practicable technology or water quality standards. Once the specific nature of industrial contributions has been identified, data collection and reporting may be required for parameters not specified in Part I.

## D. REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS ON POLLUTANTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO INDUSTRIAL USERS

- 1. The permittee shall require all industrial dischargers to the POTW to meet State pretreatment regulations promulgated in response to Section 307(b) of the Federal Act. Other information about new industrial discharges may be required and will be requested from the permittee after the EPD has received notice of the discharge.
- 2. The permittee may be required to supplement the requirements of the State and Federal pretreatment regulations to ensure compliance with all applicable effluent limitations listed in Part I. Supplemental actions by the permittee concerning some or all of the industries discharging to the POTW may be necessary.

#### E. RETAINER

EPD may require the permittee to amend an approved pretreatment program to incorporate revisions in State Pretreatment Regulations or other EPD requirements. Any approved POTW pretreatment program identified by EPD that needs to modify its program to incorporate requirements that have resulted from revision to the Rules shall develop and submit those revisions to EPD no later than one (1) year of notification by EPD to modify the Program. Any modifications made to the approved pretreatment program must be incorporated into the permit and the program pursuant to Chapter 391-3-6-.09(7) of the State Rules. Implementation of any revision or amendments to the program shall be described in the subsequent annual report to the EPD.

Page 25 of 25 **DRAFT**Permit No. GA0037222

## **PART IV**

## APPROVED SLUDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- 1. The permittee's approved Sludge Management Plan allows for sewage sludge generated at the facility to be sent to an off-site preparer for further treatment and ultimate disposal.
- 2. The permittee will report on an annual basis the amount of sewage sludge sent to the off-site preparer during the most recent calendar year. The annual report shall be submitted to EPD no later than February 19 of the following year.
- 3. The permittee will maintain sludge handling records in accordance with Part I.C.6. of the Permit.
- 4. The permittee will notify EPD in writing of any planned changes to the permittee's sewage sludge use or disposal practices.