

STATE OF MISSOURI
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION



MISSOURI STATE OPERATING PERMIT

In compliance with the Missouri Clean Water Law, (Chapter 644 R.S. Mo. as amended, hereinafter, the Law), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 92-500, 92nd Congress) as amended,

Permit No. MO-0138177

Owner: Mary Rogers
Address: 2708 Sutton Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63143

Continuing Authority: Same as above
Address: Same as above

Facility Name: Sherwood Forest Camp WWTF
Facility Address: Highway 21 S., Lesterville, MO 63654

Legal Description: SE ¼, SW ¼, Sec. 6, T 32N, R 02W, Reynolds County
UTM Coordinates: X= 688188, Y= 4150102

Receiving Stream: Adams Hollow (C)
First Classified Stream and ID: Adams Hollow (C) (3960)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (11010007-0306)

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

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

Outfall #001 – Camp/ NON-POTW – SIC #7032
Extended aeration package plant / UV disinfection /sludge disposal by contract hauler.
Design population equivalent is 220 PE.
Design flow is 16,500 gallons per day.
Design sludge production is 6.2 dry tons/year.

This permit authorizes only wastewater discharges under the Missouri Clean Water Law and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; it does not apply to other regulated areas. This permit may be appealed in accordance with Section 621.250 RSMo, Section 640.013 RSMo and Section 644.051.6 of the Law.

November 1, 2015
Effective Date

Sara Parker Pauley, Director, Department of Natural Resources

June 30, 2020
Expiration Date

John Madros, Director, Water Protection Program

OUTFALL #001	TABLE A-1 FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	PAGE NUMBER 2 of 4
		PERMIT NUMBER MO-0138177

The permittee is authorized to discharge from outfall(s) with serial number(s) as specified in the application for this permit. The final effluent limitations shall become effective on **November 1, 2015** and remain in effect until expiration of the permit. Such discharges shall be controlled, limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
		DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
Flow	MGD	*		*	once/weekday***	24 hr. total
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅	mg/L		45	30	once/quarter****	composite**
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L		45	30	once/quarter****	composite**
<i>E. coli</i> (Note 1)	#/100mL	1030		206	once/quarter****	grab
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Sep 30) (Oct 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	3.7 7.5		1.4 2.9	once/quarter****	grab
Oil & Grease	mg/L	15		10	once/quarter****	grab

MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE JANUARY 28, 2016. THERE SHALL BE NO DISCHARGE OF FLOATING SOLIDS OR VISIBLE FOAM IN OTHER THAN TRACE AMOUNTS.

EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	MINIMUM		MAXIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
pH – Units *****	SU	6.5		9.0	once/quarter****	grab

MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE JANUARY 28, 2016.

EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	DAILY MINIMUM		MONTHLY AVERAGE MINIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter****	grab

MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE JANUARY 28, 2016.

- * Monitoring requirement only.
- ** A composite sample made up from a minimum of four grab samples collected within a 24 hour period with a minimum of two hours between each grab sample.
- *** Once each weekday means: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.
- **** See table below for quarterly sampling.
- ***** pH is measured in pH units and is not to be averaged.

Minimum Sampling Requirements				
Quarter	Months	<i>E. coli</i> and Dissolved Oxygen	All Other Parameters	Report is Due
First	January, February, March	Not required to sample.	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	April 28 th
Second	April, May, June	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	July 28 th
Third	July, August, September	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	October 28 th
Fourth	October, November, December	Sample once during October; no sample required in either November or December	Sample at least once during any month of the quarter	January 28 th

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

B. STANDARD CONDITIONS

In addition to specified conditions stated herein, this permit is subject to the attached Parts I & III standard conditions dated August 1, 2014 and March 1, 2015, and hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.

C. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. This permit establishes final ammonia limitations based on Missouri's current Water Quality Standard. On August 22, 2013, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a notice in the Federal Register announcing of the final national recommended ambient water quality criteria for protection of aquatic life from the effects of ammonia in freshwater. The EPA's guidance, Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Fresh Water 2013, is not a rule, nor automatically part of a state's water quality standards. States must adopt new ammonia criteria consistent with EPA's published ammonia criteria into their water quality standards that protect the designated uses of the water bodies. The Department of Natural Resources has initiated stakeholder discussions on how to best incorporate these new criteria into the State's rules. A date for when this rule change will occur has not been determined. Also, refer to Section VI of this permit's factsheet for further information including estimated future effluent limits for this facility. It is recommended the permittee view the Department's 2013 EPA criteria Factsheet located at <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2481.htm>.
2. This permit may be reopened and modified, or alternatively revoked and reissued, to:
 - (a) Comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under Sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a) (2) of the Clean Water Act, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
 - (1) contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the permit; or
 - (2) controls any pollutant not limited in the permit.
 - (b) Incorporate new or modified effluent limitations or other conditions, if the result of a waste load allocation study, toxicity test or other information indicates changes are necessary to assure compliance with Missouri's Water Quality Standards.
 - (c) Incorporate new or modified effluent limitations or other conditions if, as the result of a watershed analysis, a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) limitation is developed for the receiving waters which are currently included in Missouri's list of waters of the state not fully achieving the state's water quality standards, also called the 303(d) list.
 - (d) Incorporate the requirement to develop a pretreatment program pursuant to 40 CFR 403.8(a) when the Director of the Water Protection Program determines that a pretreatment program is necessary due to any new introduction of pollutants into the Publicly Owned Treatment Works or any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced. The permit as modified or reissued under this paragraph shall also contain any other requirements of the Clean Water Act then applicable.
3. All outfalls must be clearly marked in the field.
4. Permittee will cease discharge by connection to a facility with an area-wide management plan per 10 CSR 20-6.010(3)(B) within 90 days of notice of its availability.
5. Water Quality Standards
 - (a) To the extent required by law, discharges to waters of the state shall not cause a violation of water quality standards rule under 10 CSR 20-7.031, including both specific and general criteria.
 - (b) General Criteria. The following general water quality criteria shall be applicable to all waters of the state at all times including mixing zones. No water contaminant, by itself or in combination with other substances, shall prevent the waters of the state from meeting the following conditions:
 - (1) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause the formation of putrescent, unsightly or harmful bottom deposits or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses;
 - (2) Waters shall be free from oil, scum and floating debris in sufficient amounts to be unsightly or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses;
 - (3) Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause unsightly color or turbidity, offensive odor or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses;
 - (4) Waters shall be free from substances or conditions in sufficient amounts to result in toxicity to human, animal or aquatic life;
 - (5) There shall be no significant human health hazard from incidental contact with the water;
 - (6) There shall be no acute toxicity to livestock or wildlife watering;
 - (7) Waters shall be free from physical, chemical or hydrologic changes that would impair the natural biological community;
 - (8) Waters shall be free from used tires, car bodies, appliances, demolition debris, used vehicles or equipment and solid waste as defined in Missouri's Solid Waste Law, section 260.200, RSMo, except as the use of such materials is specifically permitted pursuant to section 260.200-260.247.

C. STANDARD CONDITIONS (Continued)

7. Report as No Discharge when a discharge does not occur during the report period.
8. Reporting of Non-Detects:
 - (a) An analysis conducted by the permittee or their contracted laboratory shall be conducted in such a way that the precision and accuracy of the analyzed result can be enumerated.
 - (b) The permittee shall not report a sample result as "Non-Detect" without also reporting the detection limit of the test. Reporting as "Non Detect" without also including the detection limit will be considered failure to report, which is a violation of this permit.
 - (c) The permittee shall provide the "Non-Detect" sample result using the less than sign and the minimum detection limit (e.g. <10).
 - (d) The permittee shall use one-half of the detection limit for the non-detect result when calculating monthly averages.
 - (e) See Standard Conditions Part I, Section A, #4 regarding proper detection limits used for sample analysis.
9. It is a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law to fail to pay fees associated with this permit (644.055 RSMo).
10. Bypasses are not authorized at this facility unless they meet the criteria in 40 CFR 122.41(m). If a bypass occurs, the permittee shall report in accordance to 40 CFR 122.41(m)(3), and with Standard Condition Part I, Section B, subsection 2.b. Bypasses are to be reported to the Southeast Regional Office during normal business hours or the Environmental Emergency Response hotline at 573-634-2436 outside of normal business hours. Blending, which is the practice of combining a partially-treated wastewater process stream with a fully-treated wastewater process stream prior to discharge, is not considered a form of bypass. If the permittee wishes to utilize blending, the permittee shall file an application to modify this permit to facilitate the inclusion of appropriate monitoring conditions.
11. The facility must be sufficiently secured to restrict entry by children, livestock and unauthorized persons as well as to protect the facility from vandalism.
12. At least one gate must be provided to access the wastewater treatment facility and provide for maintenance and mowing. The gate shall remain locked except when opened by the permittee to perform operational monitoring, sampling, maintenance, mowing, or for inspections by the Department.
13. At least one (1) warning sign shall be placed on each side of the facility enclosure in such positions as to be clearly visible from all directions of approach. There shall also be one (1) sign placed for every five hundred feet (500') (150 m) of the perimeter fence. A sign shall also be placed on each gate. Minimum wording shall be SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY—KEEP OUT. Signs shall be made of durable materials with characters at least two inches (2") high and shall be securely fastened to the fence, equipment or other suitable locations.
14. An Operation and Maintenance (O & M) manual shall be maintained by the permittee and made available to the operator. The O & M manual shall include key operating procedures and a brief summary of the operation of the facility.
15. An all-weather access road shall be provided to the treatment facility.
16. The discharge from the wastewater treatment facility shall be conveyed to the receiving stream via a closed pipe or a paved or rip-rapped open channel. Sheet or meandering drainage is not acceptable. The outfall sewer shall be protected against the effects of floodwater, ice or other hazards as to reasonably insure its structural stability and freedom from stoppage. The outfall shall be maintained so that a sample of the effluent can be obtained at a point after the final treatment process and before the discharge mixes with the receiving waters.

**MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
FACT SHEET
FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPGRADE
OF
MO-0138177
SHERWOOD FOREST CAMP WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY**

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

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

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

This Factsheet is for a Minor.

Part I – Facility Information

Facility Type: NON-POTW – Camp SIC #7032

Facility Description:

Extended aeration page plant / UV disinfection /sludge disposal by contract hauler.

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

- No

Application Date: 07/16/15

Expiration Date: mm/dd/yy

OUTFALL(S) TABLE:

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	EFFLUENT TYPE
#001	0.026	Secondary	Domestic

Facility Performance History:

The camp has an existing single cell, unpermitted lagoon which was built when the original camp was constructed in 1958. The camp has several septic systems which are overloaded and all are now connected to the lagoon. The camp constructed a new wastewater treatment plant which is the extended aeration package plant with UV disinfection. In 2013, a new 8" PVC gravity main was installed in the camp bringing all sanitary flow to the treatment plant. All septic tanks and the lagoon will eventually be properly closed after the treatment plant is in service.

Part II – Operator Certification Requirements

- This facility is not required to have a certified operator.

Part III– Operational Monitoring

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

Part IV – Receiving Stream Information

10 CSR 20-7.031 Missouri Water Quality Standards, the Department defines the Clean Water Commission water quality objectives in terms of "water uses to be maintained and the criteria to protect those uses." The receiving stream and/or 1st classified receiving stream's beneficial water uses to be maintained, are located in the Receiving Stream Table located below in accordance with [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)].

RECEIVING STREAM(S) TABLE: OUTFALL #001

WATER-BODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	DESIGNATED USES*	12-DIGIT HUC	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
Adams Hollow	C	3960	LWW,AQL,WBC(B), HHP,IRR, General Criteria	110100070306	0.0

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

RECEIVING STREAM(S) LOW-FLOW VALUES:

RECEIVING STREAM (C, E, P, P1)	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)		
	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
Adams Hollow (C)	0.0	0.0	0.0

MIXING CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

RECEIVING STREAM MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:

No receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time.

Receiving Water Body's Water Quality

Several years ago, the Southeast Regional Office discovered that this lagoon facility was discharging unpermitted, poorly treated effluent. Because this is an unpermitted, discharging lagoon whose discharge will be improved by this new facility, the receiving stream water quality will be improved.

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

ALTERNATIVE EVALUATIONS FOR NEW FACILITIES:

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

- The facility does not discharge to a Losing Stream as defined by [10 CSR 20-2.010(36)] & [10 CSR 20-7.031(1)(N)].

ANTI-BACKSLIDING:

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

- This is a new facility, backsliding does not apply.

ANTIDegradation:

In accordance with Missouri's Water Quality Standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)], the Department is to document by means of Antidegradation Review that the use of a water body's available assimilative capacity is justified. Degradation is justified by documenting the socio-economic importance of a discharging activity after determining the necessity of the discharge.

- This permit contains new discharge; please see **APPENDIX FOR ANTIDegradation ANALYSIS**.

AREA-WIDE WASTE TREATMENT MANAGEMENT & CONTINUING AUTHORITY:

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(3)(B)], ...An applicant may utilize a lower preference continuing authority by submitting, as part of the application, a statement waiving preferential status from each existing higher preference authority, providing the waiver does not conflict with any area-wide management plan approved under section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act or any other regional sewage service and treatment plan approved for higher preference authority by the Department.

BIOSOLIDS & SEWAGE SLUDGE:

Biosolids are solid materials resulting from domestic wastewater treatment that meet federal and state criteria for beneficial uses (i.e. fertilizer). Sewage sludge is solids, semi-solids, or liquid residue generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works; including but not limited to, domestic septage; scum or solids removed in primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment process; and a material derived from sewage sludge. Sewage sludge does not include ash generated during the firing of sewage sludge in a sewage sludge incinerator or grit and screening generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works. Additional information regarding biosolids and sludge is located at the following web address: <http://extension.missouri.edu/main/DisplayCategory.aspx?C=74>, items WQ422 through WQ449.

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

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT:

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

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

DISCHARGE MONITORING REPORTS:

On July 30, 2013, EPA proposed the Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Electronic Reporting Rule, which requires electronic reporting of NPDES information rather than the currently-required paper-based reports from permitted facilities. To comply with the upcoming federal rule, the Department is asking all permittees to begin submitting discharge monitoring data online. For permittees already using the Department's eDMR data reporting system, those permittees will be required to exclusively use the eDMR data reporting system.

- The permittee/facility is not currently using the eDMR data reporting system. To sign up for the eDMR system, visit the Department's eDMR page at <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/edmr.htm>.

PRETREATMENT PROGRAM:

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

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

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

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS (RPA):

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

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

- A RPA was not conducted for this facility.

REMOVAL EFFICIENCY:

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

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

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

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are defined as untreated sewage releases and are considered bypassing under state regulation [10 CSR 20-2.010(11)] and should not be confused with the federal definition of bypass. SSOs result from a variety of causes including blockages, line breaks, and sewer defects that can either allow wastewater to backup within the collection system during dry weather conditions or allow excess stormwater and groundwater to enter and overload the collection system during wet weather conditions. SSOs can also result from lapses in sewer system operation and maintenance, inadequate sewer design and construction, power failures, and vandalism. SSOs include overflows out of manholes, cleanouts, broken pipes, and other into waters of the state and onto city streets, sidewalks, and other terrestrial locations.

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

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

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

SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE (SOC):

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

- This permit does not contain a SOC.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP):

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

In accordance with the EPA's *Developing Your Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, A Guide for Industrial Operators*, (Document number EPA 833-B-09-002) [published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in February 2009], BMPs are measures or practices used to reduce the amount of pollution entering (regarding this operating permit) waters of the state. BMPs may take the form of a process, activity, or physical structure.

Additionally in accordance with the Stormwater Management, a SWPPP is a series of steps and activities to (1) identify sources of pollution or contamination, and (2) select and carry out actions which prevent or control the pollution of stormwater discharges.

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

VARIANCE:

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

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

WASTELOAD ALLOCATIONS (WLA) FOR LIMITS:

As per [10 CSR 20-2.010(78)], the amount of pollutant each discharger is allowed by the Department to release into a given stream after the Department has determined total amount of pollutant that may be discharged into that stream without endangering its water quality.

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

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

Where C = downstream concentration
Cs = upstream concentration
Qs = upstream flow
Ce = effluent concentration
Qe = effluent flow

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

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

Number of Samples “n”:

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

WLA MODELING:

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

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

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS:

Per [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)], General Criteria shall be applicable to all waters of the state at all times including mixing zones. Additionally, [40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)] directs the Department to establish in each NPDES permit to include conditions to achieve water quality established under Section 303 of the Clean Water Act, including State narrative criteria for water quality.

WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET) TEST:

- At this time, the permittee is not required to conduct WET test for this facility.

40 CFR 122.41(M) - BYPASSES:

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

- This facility does not anticipate bypassing.

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

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

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

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

Part VI –2013 Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia

Upcoming changes to the Water Quality Standard for ammonia may require significant upgrades to wastewater treatment facilities.

On August 22, 2013, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) finalized new water quality criteria for ammonia, based on toxicity studies of mussels and gill breathing snails. Missouri's current ammonia criteria are based on toxicity testing of several species, but did not include data from mussels or gill breathing snails. Missouri is home to 69 of North America's mussel species, which are spread across the state. According to the Missouri Department of Conservation nearly two-thirds of the mussel species in Missouri are considered to be "of conservation concern". Nine species are listed as federally endangered, with an additional species currently proposed as endangered and another species proposed as threatened.

The adult forms of mussels that are seen in rivers, lakes, and streams are sensitive to pollutants because they are sedentary filter feeders. They vacuum up many pollutants with the food they bring in and cannot escape to new habitats, so they can accumulate toxins in their bodies and die. But very young mussels, called glochidia, are exceptionally sensitive to ammonia in water. As a result of a citizen suit, the EPA was compelled to conduct toxicity testing and develop ammonia water quality criteria that would be protective if young mussels may be present in a waterbody. These new criteria will apply to any discharge with ammonia levels that may pose a reasonable potential to violate the standards. Nearly all discharging domestic wastewater treatment facilities (cities, subdivisions, mobile home parks, etc.), as well as certain industrial and stormwater dischargers with ammonia in their effluent, will be affected by this change in the regulations.

When new water quality criteria are established by the EPA, states must adopt them into their regulations in order to keep their authorization to issue permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). States are required to review their water quality standards every three years, and if new criteria have been developed they must be adopted. States may be more protective than the Federal requirements, but not less protective. Missouri does not have the resources to conduct the studies necessary for developing new water quality standards, and therefore our standards mirror those developed by the EPA; however, we will utilize any available flexibility based on actual species of mussels that are native to Missouri and their sensitivity to ammonia.

Many treatment facilities in Missouri are currently scheduled to be upgraded to comply with the current water quality standards. But these new ammonia standards may require a different treatment technology than the one being considered by the permittee. It is important that permittees discuss any new and upcoming requirements with their consulting engineers to ensure that their treatment systems are capable of complying with the new requirements. The Department encourages permittees to construct treatment technologies that can attain effluent quality that supports the EPA ammonia criteria.

Ammonia toxicity varies by temperature and by pH of the water. Assuming a stable pH value, but taking into account winter and summer temperatures, Missouri includes two seasons of ammonia effluent limitations. Current effluent limitations in this permit are:

Summer – 3.7 mg/L daily maximum, 1.4 mg/L monthly average.
Winter – 7.5 mg/L daily maximum, 2.9 mg/L monthly average.

Under the new EPA criteria, where mussels of the family Unionidae are present or expected to be present, the estimated effluent limitations for a facility in a location such as this that discharges to a receiving stream with no mixing consideration listed in Part IV of the Fact Sheet will be:

Season	Temp (°C)	pH (SU)	Total Ammonia Nitrogen CCC (mg/L)	Total Ammonia Nitrogen CMC (mg/L)
Summer	26	7.8	0.7	3.4
Winter	6	7.8	2.3	13

Summer: April 1 – September 30

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)0.7 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 0.7 \text{ mg/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)3.4 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 3.4 \text{ mg/L}$

$LTA_c = 0.7 \text{ mg/L} (0.780) = 0.55 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]

$LTA_a = 3.4 \text{ mg/L} (0.321) = 1.09 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

Use most protective number of LTA_c or LTA_a .

$MDL = 0.55 \text{ mg/L} (3.11) = 1.7 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$AML = 0.55 \text{ mg/L} (1.19) = 0.6 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n=30]

Winter: October 1 – March 31

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)2.3 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 2.3 \text{ mg/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)13 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 13 \text{ mg/L}$

$LTA_c = 2.3 \text{ mg/L} (0.780) = 1.79 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]

$LTA_a = 13 \text{ mg/L} (0.321) = 4.17 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

Use most protective number of LTA_c or LTA_a .

$MDL = 1.79 \text{ mg/L} (3.11) = 5.6 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$AML = 1.79 \text{ mg/L} (1.19) = 2.1 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n=30]

Summer – 1.7 mg/L daily maximum, 0.6 mg/L monthly average.

Winter – 5.6 mg/L daily maximum, 2.1 mg/L monthly average.

These estimated limits above are based in part on the actual performance of the plant at the time of the drafting of this permit and should not be construed as future effluent limitations. Future effluent limits, based on the EPA's 2013 water quality criteria for ammonia, will depend in part on the actual performance of the facility at the time the permit is renewed.

Operating permits for facilities in Missouri must be written based on current statutes and regulations. Therefore permits will be written with the existing effluent limitations until the new standards are adopted. To aid permittees in decision making, an advisory will be added to permit Fact Sheets notifying permittees of the expected effluent limitations for ammonia. When setting schedules of compliance for ammonia effluent limitations, consideration will be given to facilities that have recently constructed upgraded facilities to meet the current ammonia limitations.

For more information on this topic feel free to contact the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Water Protection Program, Water Pollution Control Branch, Operating Permits Section at (573) 751-1300.

Part VII – Effluent Limits Determination

APPLICABLE DESIGNATIONS OF WATERS OF THE STATE:

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

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

OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL

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

EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS TABLE:

PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	Monthly Average	Modified	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type ***
Flow	MGD	1	*		*	N/A	N/A	1/week-days	quarterly	M
BOD ₅	mg/L	1		45	30	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	C
TSS	mg/L	1		45	30	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	C
Ammonia as N (Apr 1 – Sep 30)	mg/L	2, 3	3.7		1.4	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Ammonia as N (Oct 1 – Mar 31)	mg/L	2, 3	7.5		2.9	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G
<i>Escherichia coli</i> **	#/100mL	1, 3	1030		206	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G
Oil & Grease	mg/L	1, 3	15		10	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Minimum		Maximum	Modified	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
pH	SU	1	6.5		9.0	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G
PARAMETER	Unit	Basis for Limits	Daily Minimum		Monthly Avg Min	Modified	Previous Permit Limit	Sampling Frequency	Reporting Frequency	Sample Type
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	mg/L	3, 7	*		*	N/A	N/A	1/quarter	quarterly	G

* - Monitoring requirement only.

** - #/100mL; the Monthly Average for *E. coli* is a geometric mean.

***- C = 24-hour composite

G = Grab

M = Total Measured / Measured

Basis for Limitations Codes:

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

OUTFALL #001 – DERIVATION AND DISCUSSION OF LIMITS:

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

- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅).**

BOD₅ limits of 30 mg/L monthly average, 45 mg/L average weekly limits were proposed.

To protect beneficial uses within the Adams Hollow, the consultant used 25 mg/L CBOD₅ as input to the Streeter Phelps analysis (Appendix B). A DO of 5 mg/L must be met at the outfall. In Appendix B, Streeter Phelps modeling simulated using the proposed design flow and an effluent DO of 2 and 5 mg/L indicated a 2.89 and 5.09 mg/L dissolved oxygen (DO) deficit, respectively, below the calculated dissolved oxygen saturation value. This modeled difference is significant, i.e., >10% of the upstream DO concentration; however no data is available for the upstream dissolved oxygen. The upstream dissolved oxygen value of 5.0 mg/L was assumed. A higher upstream DO concentration does not change the deficit below 10%. The modeled lowest dissolved oxygen or critical dissolved oxygen sag was 2.8 mg/L when discharging effluent DO of 2 mg/L; however, the DO concentration recovered to 5 mg/L within 1000 feet from the discharge.

As a result of this analysis, MDNR staff concludes that the above mentioned effluent limits may be protective of beneficial uses and existing water quality. The need for additional aeration prior to discharge needs to be evaluated for this facility and many other facilities that are discharging to newly classified streams as a result of EPA approval of the Missouri Water Quality Standards. Monitoring of dissolved oxygen in the discharge will help determine the need for aeration prior to discharge. A cascading outfall will add oxygen before the effluent actually reaches the receiving stream. The added oxygen will aid in the BOD decay that will continue in the receiving stream.

- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).**

TSS limits of 30 mg/L monthly average, 45 mg/L average weekly limits were proposed.

According to EPA, because TSS and BOD are closely correlated, the same limits were applied for TSS as BOD.

- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Early Life Stages Present Total Ammonia Nitrogen criteria apply [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(B)7.C. & Table B3]. Background total ammonia nitrogen = 0.01 mg/L. No mixing considerations allowed; therefore, WLA = appropriate criterion.

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

Summer: April 1 – September 30

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)1.5 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 1.5 \text{ mg/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$

$LTA_c = 1.5 \text{ mg/L} (0.780) = 1.17 \text{ mg/L}$
 $LTA_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L} (0.321) = 3.89 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]
 [CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

Use most protective number of LTA_c or LTA_a .

$MDL = 1.17 \text{ mg/L} (3.11) = 3.6 \text{ mg/L}$
 $AML = 1.17 \text{ mg/L} (1.19) = 1.4 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]
 [CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n=30]

Winter: October 1 – March 31

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)3.1 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 3.1 \text{ mg/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0 * 0.01))/0.026$
 $C_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$

$LTA_c = 3.1 \text{ mg/L} (0.780) = 2.42 \text{ mg/L}$
 $LTA_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L} (0.321) = 3.89 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]
 [CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

Use most protective number of LTA_c or LTA_a .

$MDL = 2.42 \text{ mg/L} (3.11) = 7.5 \text{ mg/L}$
 $AML = 2.42 \text{ mg/L} (1.19) = 2.9 \text{ mg/L}$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]
 [CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n=30]

- **Escherichia coli (E. coli).** Monthly average of 206 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Daily Maximum of 1030 per 100 mL during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), to protect Whole Body Contact Recreation (B) designated use of the receiving stream, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C). An effluent limit for both monthly average and daily maximum is required by 40 CFR 122.45(d). The Geometric Mean is calculated by multiplying all of the data points and then taking the nth root of this product, where n = # of samples collected. For example: Five E. coli samples were collected with results of 1, 4, 6, 10, and 5 (#/100mL). Geometric Mean = 5th root of (1)(4)(6)(10)(5) = 5th root of 1,200 = 4.1 #/100mL.

- **Oil & Grease.** Conventional pollutant, effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.

- **pH.** – The Water Quality Standards (WQS) states that water contaminants shall not cause pH to be outside the range of 6.5-9.0 SU. Technology based effluent limitations of 6.0-9.0 SU [10 CSR 20-7.015] will cause degradation. Mixing zone is not allowed due to the classification of the receiving stream; however, WQS will be protected.

- **Dissolved Oxygen.** Monitoring only. Results of the Streeter-Phelps Model indicate that dissolved oxygen may need to be above 5 mg/L in the receiving stream. See Appendix B and BOD discussion above.

Sampling Frequency Justification:

This facility is a new facility and quarterly sampling is required to determine if the facility will be in compliance with the operating permit in accordance with Appendix U of Missouri's Water Pollution Control Permit Manual

Sampling Type Justification

As per 10 CSR 20-7.015, BOD₅ and TSS samples collected for mechanical plants shall be a 24 hour modified composite sample. Due to the small size of this facility this composite sample shall be made up from a minimum of four grab samples collected within a 24-hour period with a minimum of two hours between each grab sample. Grab samples, however, must be collected for pH, Ammonia as N, *E. coli*, and Oil & Grease. This is due to the holding time restriction for *E. coli*, the volatility of Ammonia, and the fact that pH and DO cannot be preserved and must be sampled in the field. As Ammonia and Oil & Grease samples must be immediately preserved with acid, these samples are to be collected as a grab.

Part VIII – Cost Analysis for Compliance

Pursuant to Section 644.145, RSMo., the Department is required to determine whether a permit or decision is affordable and makes a "finding of affordability" for certain permitting and enforcement decisions. This requirement applies to discharges from combined or separate sanitary sewer systems or publically-owned treatment works.

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

Part IX – Administrative Requirements

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

PUBLIC NOTICE:

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

The Public Notice period for this operating permit was from September 4, 2015 to October 5, 2015. No responses received.

DATE OF FACT SHEET: JULY 22, 2015

COMPLETED BY:

LEI HOU, PE, ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM
ENGINEERING SECTION – CONSTRUCTION PERMIT UNIT
(314) 416-2458
lei.hou@dnr.mo.gov

Water Quality and Antidegradation Review

*For the Protection of Water Quality
and Determination of Effluent Limits for Discharge to Adams Hollow*

by

Sherwood Forest Camp Wastewater Treatment Facility



April 2015

Table of Contents

1. Facility Information	14
2. Water Quality Information.....	14
2.1. Water Quality History:.....	14
3. Receiving Waterbody Information	14
4. General Comments.....	15
5. Antidegradation Review Information	15
5.1. Tier Determination.....	15
Table 1. Pollutants of Concern and Tier Determination.....	16
5.2. Existing Water Quality	16
5.3. Demonstration of Necessity and Social and Economic Importance.....	16
Table 2: Economic Efficiency Comparison of Treatment Alternatives with Effluent Concentrations as average treatment capacity	17
5.3.1. Regionalization Alternative.....	17
5.3.2. Losing Stream Alternative Discharge Location.....	17
5.3.3. Social and Economic Importance Evaluation	18
6. General Assumptions of the Water Quality and Antidegradation Review	18
7. Mixing Considerations.....	18
8. Permit Limits and Monitoring Information	18
Table 3. Effluent Limits Outfall #001.....	19
9. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements	19
10. Derivation and Discussion of Limits	19
10.1. Outfall #001 – Main Facility Outfall	20
10.2. Limit Derivation.....	20
11. Antidegradation Review Preliminary Determination	22
Appendix A: Map of Discharge Location.....	23
Appendix B: Streeter Phelps Model Results - Proposed Design Flow 0.026 CFS.....	24
Appendix C: Antidegradation Review Summary Attachments.....	26

1. Facility Information

FACILITY NAME: Sherwood Forest Camp Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) NPDES #: NEW

FACILITY TYPE: NON-POTW — SIC #7032

FACILITY DESCRIPTION: The camp has an existing single cell, unpermitted lagoon which was built when the original camp was constructed in 1958. The camp has several septic systems which are overloaded and all are now connected to the lagoon. In 2013, a new 8" PVC gravity main was installed in the camp bringing all sanitary flow to the treatment plant. All septic tanks and the lagoon will eventually be properly closed after the treatment plant is in service. As a result of the submitted alternative analysis, the applicant's preferred alternative is the extended aeration package plant/UV disinfection. The package plant has already been purchased so this analysis will exclude the cost of extended aeration plant from the total present worth cost. According to the antidegradation review report, the waste water treatment facility will serve a seasonal maximum of 300 campers at 50 gallons per day (gpd), and two residences at 375 gpd. Total flow – 15,750 gpd. Therefore, according to the antidegradation review report, the design flow for the WWTF will be 0.0165 MGD.

COUNTY: Reynolds UTM COORDINATES: X= 688188 / Y= 4150102
 12-DIGIT HUC: 110100070306 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: SE ¼, SW ¼ Section 6, T 32N, R, 02E
 EDU*: Ozark/Black/Current COREGION: Ozark

* - Ecological Drainage Unit

2. Water Quality Information

In accordance with Missouri's Water Quality Standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)] and federal antidegradation policy at Title 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Section 131.12 (a), the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) developed a statewide antidegradation policy and corresponding procedures to implement the policy. A proposed discharge to a water body will be required to undergo a level of Antidegradation Review which documents that the use of a water body's available assimilative capacity is justified. Effective August 30, 2008, and revised May 2, 2012, a facility is required to use *Missouri's Antidegradation Implementation Procedure (AIP)* for new and expanded wastewater discharges.

2.1. Water Quality History:

None available. Several years ago, the Southeast Regional Office discovered that this lagoon facility was discharging unpermitted, poorly treated effluent. Because this is an unpermitted discharging lagoon whose discharge will be improved by this new facility, receiving stream water quality will be improved. See Appendix A. Map of Discharge Location.

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	RECEIVING WATERBODY	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
001	0.026	Secondary	Adams Hollow	0.0

3. Receiving Waterbody Information

WATERBODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)			DESIGNATED USES**
			1Q10	7Q10	30Q10	
Adams Hollow	C	3960	-	-	-	LWW, AQL, WBC(B), HHP, IRR, General Criteria

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

RECEIVING WATER BODY SEGMENT #1: Outfall in Adams Hollow to Middle Fork Black next trib.

Upper end segment* UTM coordinates: X=688188/ Y=4150102 (Outfall)

Lower end segment* UTM coordinates: X=- 689007 / Y= 4148387 (mixed with Middle Fork Black River.)

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

4. General Comments

Engineers Without Borders prepared, on behalf of Sherwood Forest Camp, the *Antidegradation Review Report, Sherwood Forest Camp, Inc., New Construction of a Package Plant Wastewater Treatment Facility* dated February 19, 2015 and revised April 3, 2015, to include an antidegradation review for the proposed facility. Applicant elected to assume that all pollutants of concern (POC) are significantly degrading the receiving stream in the absence of existing water quality. An alternative analysis was conducted to fulfill the requirements of the AIP.

According to the antidegradation review report, Sherwood Forest Camp recently installed new sewer lines to serve the camp. This sewer system currently discharges to the unpermitted lagoon. Sherwood Forest Camp, Inc. also installed an extended aeration package without a construction permit which is in violation with Missouri Clean Water Statute. Operating, using, or maintaining a water contaminant source which discharges to waters of the state without a valid Missouri State Operating Permit is a violation of Missouri Clean Water Law Sections 644.051.2 and 644.076.1, RSMo and Missouri Clean Water Commission Regulations 10 CSR 20-6.010(A) and (5)(A). The new facility is currently not discharging and wastewater from the camp is sent to the lagoon. In October 2014, the Southeast Regional Office visited the construction site to provide compliance assistance. Prior to the visit, steps to comply with applicable Missouri Statutes and Regulations were underway and continue today.

The unpermitted lagoon must be properly closed according to the Standard Conditions for NPDES Permit Part III, Revised March 1, 2015. The issued permit for the new facility will have this condition attached which will explain the required closure process. The closure plan is approved by the regional office. For health and safety reasons, septic tanks should be properly closed.

Dissolved oxygen modeling (Appendix B) analysis was submitted for review. Staff believes that the results of the model are protective of the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen.

Information that was provided by the applicant in the submitted report and summary forms in Appendix C was used to develop this review document.

Geohydrological Evaluation was submitted with the request and the receiving stream is gaining for discharge purposes (Appendix A: Map).

A Missouri Department of Conservation Natural Heritage Review was obtained by the applicant; and no records of endangered species were found for the project area.

5. Antidegradation Review Information

The following is a review of the *Antidegradation Review Report, Sherwood Forest Camp, Inc., New Construction of a Package Plant Wastewater Treatment Facility* dated February 19, 2015 and revised April 3, 2015.

5.1. TIER DETERMINATION

Below is a list of pollutants of concern reasonably expected to be in the discharge (see Appendix C: Attachment A). Pollutants of concern are defined as those pollutants "proposed for discharge that affects beneficial use(s) in waters of the state. POCs include pollutants that create conditions unfavorable to beneficial uses in the water body receiving the discharge or proposed to receive the discharge." (AIP, Page 7). Tier 2 was assumed for all POCs (see Appendix C).

Table 1. Pollutants of Concern and Tier Determination

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

* Tier assumed. Tier determination not possible: ** No in-stream standards for these parameters.

*** Standards for these parameters are ranges

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

For pollutants of concern, the attachments are:

Attachment A, Tier 2 with significant degradation.

5.2. EXISTING WATER QUALITY

All POCs were considered to be Tier 2 degrading in the absence of existing water quality.

5.3. DEMONSTRATION OF NECESSITY AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE

Missouri's antidegradation implementation procedures specify that if the proposed activity does result in significant degradation then a demonstration of necessity (i.e., alternatives analysis) and a determination of social and economic importance are required. Seven alternatives from non-degrading to less degrading to degrading alternatives were evaluated.

Alternative #1 and #2, non-degrading land application system and subsurface irrigation, were eliminated as impracticable due to the available lagoon for treatment and water-holding which would require redesigning for BOD loading, number of days of water storage and the addition of another cell for storage. The land application and subsurface irrigation land area needed is approximately 9.2 and 5.5 acres, respectively. An additional complication for no discharge systems is the soils which consists of a rocky, silty-clay residuum and offers moderate permeability. The upper bedrock additionally offers low permeability. The available acreage is near the property line which further makes this option impracticable. Alternative #3, non-degrading discharge to centralized facility, is not viable because the Town of Lesterville is 2.5 miles away and has no treatment plant. There are no sanitary systems in proximity to the camp which makes this option impracticable. Alternative #4, the upgrade of the existing Lagoon was considered but eliminated as impracticable due to design constraints and its inability to meeting current and future ammonia limitations.

Only those alternatives that were considered practicable were included in the economic efficiency analysis. The remaining alternatives were considered practicable and were evaluated in the economic efficiency analysis (see Table 2). Alternative #5, recirculating sand filter, consists of septic tank, sand filter, centralized recirculation tank, and UV disinfection. This option was economically efficient in comparison to the base case; however, these existing septic tanks would need to be replaced and collection system would need to be modified to accommodate and redirect the flow to the sand filter. Alternative #5 was eliminated due to the collection system constraints. Alternative #6 is the Amphidrome® System and UV disinfection, or the Submerged Attached Growth Bioreactor. This option was not economically efficient in comparison to the base case.

Alternative #7 is the base case alternative. The Extended Aeration Package Plant or Water, Inc. of GA system, Alternative #7, consists of an aeration tank, aeration blower, one final clarifier, one sludge holding tank, and Trojan UV3000 system for disinfection. Alternative #7 was the preferred alternative based on this analysis (see Table 2). The extended aeration package plant is already purchased and installed; therefore, Table 2 present worth cost comparisons did not include the initial capital cost of construction for this facility (see Table 2, Note 1). In comparison to the other alternatives, the exclusion of this upfront cost made this alternative more desirable and economically efficient.

Table 2: Economic Efficiency Comparison of Treatment Alternatives with Effluent Concentrations as average treatment capacity

Parameter	Recirculating Sand Filter	Amphidrome	Extended Aeration Treatment Plant
BOD5 (mg/L)	<20	<30	<30
TSS (mg/L)	<20	<30	<30
DO (mg/L) Minimum	5	5	5
Ammonia (mg/L)	2.9/1.4	<1.0 2.9/1.4	2.9/1.4
E. coli (col/100 mL)	206	206	206
Practicability	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Present Worth*	\$ 207,533	\$ 302,666	\$ 187,957
Total Annual Costs	\$ 14,935	\$ 21,780	\$ 24,968
Base-to-Alternative Cost Ratio	1.10	1.61	1.00
Economic Efficiency	Economically Efficient	Not Economically Efficient	Economically Efficient
			Note 1

* 20 year design life and 3.75% interest Rate. Will meet ammonia water quality standards in receiving stream.

Note 1 = Because this facility is already constructed and installed, the initial capital cost of construction and installation of the package plant have been removed from the Total PWV.

Present Worth Factor = 13.90

Note: The above cost information and expected treatment capacity per parameter was provided by the consulting engineers for Sherwood Forest Camp. Water Pollution Control Program Staff assisted in the development of this economic efficiency table. The contents of the table were reviewed and agreed upon by the consulting engineers.

5.3.1. REGIONALIZATION ALTERNATIVE

Within Section II B 1. of the AIP, discussion of the potential for discharge to a regional waste water collection system is mentioned. The applicant provided discussion of this alternative. The alternative analysis mentions the Town of Lesterville as the closest municipality; however, the town does not have a centralized treatment system. This option was not viable because the closest available waste water treatment facility many miles away.

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

5.3.2. LOSING STREAM ALTERNATIVE DISCHARGE LOCATION

Under 10 CSR 20-7.015(4) (A), discharges to losing stream shall be permitted only after other alternatives including land application, discharge to gaining stream and connection to a regional facility have been evaluated and determined to be unacceptable for environmental and/or economic reasons. The proposed facility discharge does not discharge to a losing stream segment or will not discharge with 2 miles of a losing stream segment.

5.3.3. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE EVALUATION

The applicant first identified the community that will be affected by the proposed degradation of water quality. The affected community likely consists of rural residents near the camp; however there are few people in this remote area. The improved treatment system will be a benefit to the surrounding area by discharging a higher quality effluent than the previously unpermitted lagoon. The higher quality effluent and disinfection will have ecological and human health benefits to those who use the camp and the surrounding rural residents. The new facility will allow the camp to grow and at the same time provide safe outdoor recreational opportunities for disadvantaged children in the St. Louis area. Appendix C, Attachment A: Tier 2 with Significant Degradation form contains a summary of this information.

6. General Assumptions of the Water Quality and Antidegradation Review

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

7. Mixing Considerations

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

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

8. Permit Limits and Monitoring Information

WASTELOAD
ALLOCATION
STUDY CONDUCTED (Y
OR N):

USE ATTAINABILITY
ANALYSIS CONDUCTED (Y
OR N):

WHOLE BODY
CONTACT
USE RETAINED (Y OR
N):

OUTFALL #001

WET TEST (Y OR N): N

FREQUENCY: NA AEC: NA METHOD: NA

Table 3. Effluent Limits Outfall #001

PARAMETER	UNITS	DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	BASIS FOR LIMIT (NOTE 2)	MONITORING FREQUENCY
FLOW	MGD	*		*		
BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND ₅	MG/L		45	30	FSR/PEL	ONCE/QUARTER
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	MG/L		45	30	FSR/PEL	ONCE/QUARTER
PH	SU	6.5–9.0		6.5–9.0	FSR	ONCE/QUARTER
AMMONIA AS N (APR 1 – SEPT 30)	MG/L	3.7		1.4	FSR/PEL	ONCE/QUARTER
AMMONIA AS N (OCT 1 – MAR 31)	MG/L	7.5		2.9	FSR/PEL	ONCE/QUARTER
<i>ESCHERICHIA COLIFORM (E. COLI)</i>	NOTE 1	1030**		206**	FSR	ONCE/QUARTER
DISSOLVED OXYGEN	MG/L	*		*	FSR	Once/quarter
OIL & GREASE	MG/L	15		10	FSR	Once/Quarter

NOTE 1 – COLONIES/100 ML

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

* Monitoring requirements only.

** The Monthly and Weekly Average for *E. coli* shall be reported as a Geometric Mean. The Weekly Average for *E. coli* will be expressed as a geometric mean if more than one (1) sample is collected during a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday).

9. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

No receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time.

10. Derivation and Discussion of Limits

Wasteload allocations and limits were calculated using two methods:

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

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

Where C = downstream concentration

C_s = upstream concentration

Q_s = upstream flow

C_e = effluent concentration

Q_e = effluent flow

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

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

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

Note: Significantly-degrading effluent limits have been based on the authority included in Section III. Permit Consideration of the AIP. Also under 40 CFR 133.105, permitting authorities shall require more stringent limitations than equivalent to secondary treatment limitations for 1) existing facilities if the permitting authority determines that the 30-day average and 7-day average BOD₅ and TSS effluent values that could be achievable through proper operation and maintenance of the treatment works, and 2) new facilities if the permitting authority determines that the 30-day average and 7-day average BOD₅ and TSS effluent values that could be achievable through proper operation and maintenance of the treatment works, considering the design capability of the treatment process.

10.1. OUTFALL #001 – MAIN FACILITY OUTFALL

10.2. LIMIT DERIVATION

- **Flow.** In accordance with [40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(1)(ii)] the volume of effluent discharged from each outfall is needed to assure compliance with permitted effluent limitations. If the permittee is unable to obtain effluent flow, then it is the responsibility of the permittee to inform the department, which may require the submittal of an operating permit modification.
- **Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD₅).** BOD₅ limits of 30 mg/L monthly average, 45 mg/L average weekly limits were proposed.

To protect beneficial uses within the Adams Hollow, the consultant used 25 mg/L CBOD₅ as input to the Streeter Phelps analysis (Appendix B). A DO of 5 mg/L must be met at the outfall. In Appendix B, Streeter Phelps modeling simulated using the proposed design flow and an effluent DO of 2 and 5 mg/L indicated a 2.89 and 5.09 mg/L dissolved oxygen (DO) deficit, respectively, below the calculated dissolved oxygen saturation value. This modeled difference is significant, i.e., >10% of the upstream DO concentration; however no data is available for the upstream dissolved oxygen. The upstream dissolved oxygen value of 5.0 mg/L was assumed. A higher upstream DO concentration does not change the deficit below 10%. The modeled lowest dissolved oxygen or critical dissolved oxygen sag was 2.8 mg/L when discharging effluent DO of 2 mg/L; however, the DO concentration recovered to 5 mg/L within 1000 feet from the discharge.

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

The need for additional aeration prior to discharge needs to be evaluated for this facility and many other facilities that are discharging to newly classified streams as a result of EPA approval of the Missouri Water Quality Standards. Monitoring of dissolved oxygen in the discharge will help determine the need for aeration prior to discharge. A cascading outfall will add oxygen before the effluent actually reaches the receiving stream. The added oxygen will aide in the BOD decay that will continue in the receiving stream.

- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** 30 mg/L monthly average, 45 mg/L average weekly limit. According to EPA, because TSS and BOD are closely correlated, we apply the same limits for TSS as BOD.

- **pH.** –The Water Quality Standards (WQS) states that water contaminants shall not cause pH to be outside the range of 6.5-9.0 SU. Technology based effluent limitations of 6.0-9.0 SU [10 CSR 20-7.015] will cause degradation. Mixing zone is not allowed due to the classification of the receiving stream; however, WQS will be protected.

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

The Water Protection Program (WPP) is providing this notice to inform permittees that EPA's published ammonia criteria for aquatic life protection is lower than the current Missouri criteria. The Department has begun discussions about how these new criteria will be implemented. WPP is suggesting that all permittees consider the lower ammonia criteria and proposed alternative's treatment design, if they so choose. Consideration of the future ammonia criteria at this time could avoid a near-future upgrade. More information about the new ammonia criteria for aquatic life protection may be found at: <http://dnr.mo.gov/pubs/pub2481.htm>

- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Early Life Stages Present Total Ammonia Nitrogen criteria apply [10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(B)7.C. & Table B3]. Background total ammonia nitrogen = 0.01 mg/L

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

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

Summer

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)1.5 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / 0.026$

$$C_e = 1.5 \text{ mg/L}$$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / 0.026$

$$C_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$LTA_c = 1.5 \text{ mg/L (0.780)} = \mathbf{1.2 \text{ mg/L}}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]

$$LTA_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L (0.321)} = 3.88 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$$MDL = 1.2 \text{ mg/L (3.11)} = 3.7 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$$AML = 1.2 \text{ mg/L (1.19)} = 1.4 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n = 30]

Winter

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)3.1 - (0.0 * 0.01)) / 0.026$

$$C_e = 3.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((0.026 + 0.0)12.1 - (0.0025 * 0.01)) / 0.026$

$$C_e = 12.1 \text{ mg/L}$$

$$LTA_c = 3.1 \text{ mg/L (0.780)} = \mathbf{2.4 \text{ mg/L}}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile, 30 day avg.]

$$LTA_a = 12.1 \text{ mg/L (0.321)} = 3.9 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$$MDL = 2.4 \text{ mg/L (3.11)} = 7.5 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 99th Percentile]

$$AML = 2.4 \text{ mg/L (1.19)} = 2.9 \text{ mg/L}$$

[CV = 0.6, 95th Percentile, n =

30]

Season	Maximum Daily Limit (mg/l)	Average Monthly Limit (mg/l)
Summer	3.7	1.4
Winter	7.5	2.9

- ***Escherichia coli (E. coli)***. Monthly average of 206 per 100 mL as a geometric mean and Daily Maximum of 1030 per 100 mL during the recreational season (April 1 – October 31), to protect Whole Body Contact Recreation (A) designated use of the receiving stream, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(5)(C). An effluent limit for both monthly average and daily maximum is required by 40 CFR 122.45(d).
- **Dissolved Oxygen**. Monitoring only. Results of the Streeter-Phelps Model indicate that dissolved oxygen may need to be above 5 mg/L in the receiving stream. See Appendix B and BOD discussion above.
- **Oil & Grease**. Conventional pollutant, [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]. Effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.

11. Antidegradation Review Preliminary Determination

The proposed new facility discharge, Sherwood Forest Camp WWTF, 0.0165 MGD will result in significant degradation of the segment identified in this review. Alternative #7, extended aeration package plant, was determined to be the base case technology (lowest cost alternative that meets technology and water quality based effluent limitations). The cost effectiveness of the other technologies was evaluated, and the renovation of the existing facility was found to be cost effective and was determined to be the preferred alternative.

It has also been determined that the other treatment options presented also be considered reasonable alternatives provided they are designed to be capable of meeting the effluent limitations developed based on the preferred alternative. If any of these options are selected, you may proceed with the appropriate facility plan, construction permit application, or other future submittals without the need to modify this Antidegradation review document.

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


Reviewer: Todd Blanc, ES

Date: 04/06/2015

Unit Chief: John Rustige, P.E.

Appendix A: Map of Discharge Location

Sherwood Forest Camp WWTF





Approximate Location of Discharge.



Disclaimer: Although this map has been compiled by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made by the department as to the accuracy of the data and related materials. The act of distribution shall not constitute any such warranty, and no responsibility is assumed by the department in the use of these data or related materials.

Appendix B: Streeter Phelps Model Results - Proposed Design Flow 0.026 CFS.



Below are the model inputs and results for the effluent discharge.

Streeter-Phelps analysis of critical dissolved oxygen sag.

Based on Lotus File DOSAG2.WK1 Revised 19-Oct-93

INPUT

1. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS				
Discharge (cfs):				0.026
CBOD5 (mg/L):				25
NBOD (mg/L):				5
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):				2
Temperature (deg C):				26
2. RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERISTICS				
Upstream Discharge (cfs):				0.01
Upstream CBOD5 (mg/L):				1.0
Upstream NBOD (mg/L):				1
Upstream Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):				5
Upstream Temperature (deg C):				26
Elevation (ft NGVD):				772
Downstream Average Channel Slope (ft/ft):				0.008
Downstream Average Channel Depth (ft):				0.5
Downstream Average Channel Velocity (fps):				3.3
3. REAERATION RATE (Base e) AT 20 deg C (day⁻¹):				
	Reference	Applic. Vel (fps)	Applic. Dep (ft)	Suggested Values
	Churchill	1.5 - 6	2 - 50	117.63
	O'Connor and Dobbins	.1 - 1.5	2 - 50	66.59
	Owens	.1 - 6	1 - 2	173.29
	Tsvoglou-Wallace	.1 - 6	.1 - 2	182.33
4. BOD DECAY RATE (Base e) AT 20 deg C (day⁻¹):				
	Reference			Suggested Value
	Wright and McDonnell, 1979			1.00

Modeled at 2 and 5 mg/L DO.

OUTPUT

1. INITIAL MIXED RIVER CONDITION	
CBOD5 (mg/L):	18.3
NBOD (mg/L):	3.9
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):	2.8
Temperature (deg C):	26.0
2. TEMPERATURE ADJUSTED RATE CONSTANTS (Base e)	
Reaeration (day ⁻¹):	210.21
BOD Decay (day ⁻¹):	1.32
3. CALCULATED INITIAL ULTIMATE CBODU AND TOTAL BODU	
Initial Mixed CBODU (mg/L):	27.0
Initial Mixed Total BODU (CBODU + NBOD, mg/L):	30.8
4. INITIAL DISSOLVED OXYGEN DEFICIT	
Saturation Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):	7.891
Initial Deficit (mg/L):	5.06
5. TRAVEL TIME TO CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (days):	
	0.000000
6. DISTANCE TO CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (feet):	
	0.00
7. CRITICAL DO DEFICIT (mg/L):	
	5.06
8. CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (mg/L):	
	2.83

OUTPUT

1. INITIAL MIXED RIVER CONDITION	
CBOD5 (mg/L):	18.3
NBOD (mg/L):	3.9
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):	5.0
Temperature (deg C):	26.0
2. TEMPERATURE ADJUSTED RATE CONSTANTS (Base e)	
Reaeration (day ⁻¹):	210.21
BOD Decay (day ⁻¹):	1.32
3. CALCULATED INITIAL ULTIMATE CBODU AND TOTAL BODU	
Initial Mixed CBODU (mg/L):	27.0
Initial Mixed Total BODU (CBODU + NBOD, mg/L):	30.8
4. INITIAL DISSOLVED OXYGEN DEFICIT	
Saturation Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L):	7.891
Initial Deficit (mg/L):	2.89
5. TRAVEL TIME TO CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (days):	
	0.000000
6. DISTANCE TO CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (feet):	
	0.00
7. CRITICAL DO DEFICIT (mg/L):	
	2.89
8. CRITICAL DO CONCENTRATION (mg/L):	
	5.00

Appendix C: Antidegradation Review Summary Attachments

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

- 1) Attachment A-
 - a. Section 8. List of proposed effluent limitation incorrectly lists 2.0 mg/L for dissolved oxygen. Monitoring only is proposed as effluent limitations for this discharge.
 - b. Section 9. The New Technology Factsheet weblink has been removed and will be replaced in the future.



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

1. FACILITY			
NAME Sherwood Forest Camp		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (314) 644-3322	
ADDRESS (PHYSICAL) Highway 21 S	CITY Lesterville	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 63654
2. OWNER			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Mary Rodgers (Executive Director of Sherwood Camp)			
ADDRESS 2708 Sutton Blvd.	CITY St. Louis	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 63143
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (314) 644-3322	E-MAIL ADDRESS MaryR@sherwoodforeststl.org		
3. CONTINUING AUTHORITY The regulatory requirement regarding continuing authority is found in 10 CSR 20-6.010(3) available at www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/10csr/10c20-6a.pdf .			
NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLES Sherwood Forest Camp, Inc			
ADDRESS 2708 Sutton Blvd.	CITY St. Louis	STATE MO	ZIP CODE 63143
TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE (314) 644-3322	E-MAIL ADDRESS MaryR@sherwoodforeststl.org		
4. RECEIVING WATER BODY SEGMENT #1			
NAME Adams Hollow (upper coordinates: LAT 37D28M43S & LONG 90D52M18S, lower: LAT 37D28M36S N, LONG 90D52M12S W)			
4.1 UPPER END OF SEGMENT (Location of discharge) UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
4.2 LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
Per the Missouri Antidegradation Implementation Procedure, or AIP, the definition of a segment, "a segment is a section of water that is bound, at a minimum, by significant existing sources and confluences with other significant water bodies."			
5. WATER BODY SEGMENT #2 (IF APPLICABLE, Use another form if a third segment is needed)			
NAME Middle Fork of the Black River (upper: LAT 37D28M36S N, LONG 90D52M12S W)			
5.1 UPPER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
5.2 LOWER END OF SEGMENT UTM _____ OR Lat _____, Long _____			
6. WET WEATHER ANTICIPATIONS			
If an applicant anticipates excessive inflow or infiltration and pursues approval from the department to bypass secondary treatment, a feasibility analysis is required. The feasibility analysis must comply with the criteria of all applicable state and federal regulations including 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4). Attach the feasibility analysis to the antidegradation review report.			
What is the Wet Weather Flow Peaking Factor in relation to design flow? 1			
Wet Weather Design Summary: The mechanical plant is covered and the collection system is sanitary flow only, should not have inflow or infiltration.			

7. EXISTING WATER QUALITY DATA OR MODEL SUMMARY

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

Comments/Discussion: Used Streeter-Phelps model to determine impact on receiving stream see attached documentation

8. SUMMARY OF THE POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN AND THE PROPOSED EFFLUENT LIMITS

Pollutants of Concern to be considered include those pollutants reasonably expected to be present in the discharge per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.A. and assumed or demonstrated to cause significant degradation. The tier protection levels are specified and defined in rule at 10 CSR 20-7.031 (2).

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

Pollutants of Concern*	Units	Wasteload Allocation	Average Monthly Limit	Daily Maximum Limit
BOD5	MG/L	30	30	45
TSS	MG/L	30	30	45
DISSOLVED OXYGEN	MG/L	2.0 minimum	2.0	2.0
AMMONIA	MG/L	S-1.4/W-2.9		
BACTERIA (E. COLI)	CFUS	206	206	1030

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

*Assumed Tier 2.

9. IDENTIFYING ALTERNATIVES

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

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

Non-degrading alternatives: Evaluated Land Application, Subsurface irrigation and regional sewer option-see attached report

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

Alternatives	Level of Treatment Attainable for each Pollutant of Concern			
	BOD5	TSS	AMMONIA AS N	
	(MG/L)	MG/L	MG/L	
Water Inc Extended Aeration	<30	<30	<1.4/ <2.9	
Amphidrome (SAGB)	<30	<30	<1.0	
Recirc. Sand Filter	<20	<20	<1.4/<2.9	

10. DETERMINATION OF THE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE

Per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.2, "a reasonable alternative is one that is practicable, economically efficient and affordable." Provide basis and supporting documentation in the Antidegradation Review report. **Please do not write "See Report" for any box below.**

Practicability Summary:
"The practicability of an alternative is considered by evaluating the effectiveness, reliability, and potential environmental impacts," according to the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.2.a. Examples of factors to consider, including secondary environmental impacts, are given in the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.2.a.
Less-degrading options were evaluated and deemed not practicable due to the following: Land Application-11 acres of land required and upgrading the lagoon or installing pretreatment would be required. Due to property line constraints, a residence and Adam's Hollow creek in the area. Subsurface Irrigation-5.5 acres of land would be required as well as upgrading the lagoon or installing pretreatment. Camp's flow at maximum capacity is 16,000 gallons per day which exceeds the limit of 3000 gal/d. Regional sewer-no sewers located in the area. The Recirculating sand filter, Extended aeration and Amphidrome (SAGB) systems were deemed practicable due to their ability to meet current design guides and water quality standards.

Economic Efficiency Summary:
Alternatives that are deemed practicable must undergo a direct cost comparison in order to determine economic efficiency. Means to determine economic efficiency are provided in the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.2.b.
The practicable options were evaluated for economic efficiency and affordability. Present Worth analysis revealed the following Base-to-alternative cost ratios: Recirculating Sand Filtration was 110%, Amphidrome (SAGB) system was 161% and the the Water In (extended aeration) system was 100%. This calculation was done assuming a Present Worth Factor of 13.90%, 20 year design life and 3.75% interest rate. Because the facility is already constructed and installed the initial capital costs of construction were removed from the Total Present Worth. The Recirculating Sand filter and Water Inc. extended aeration systems were deemed economically efficient and the the Amphidrome (SAGB) was deemed not economically efficient because the Base-to-Alternative cost ration >120%.

Affordability Summary:
Alternatives identified as most practicable and economically efficient are considered affordable if the applicant does not supply an affordability analysis. An affordability analysis per the Antidegradation Implementation Procedure Section II.B.2.c, "may be used to determine if the alternative is too expensive to reasonably implement."
Affordability analysis was based on present worth comparisons and practicability as noted above.

Preferred Chosen Alternative:
Water Inc. Extended Aeration was the preferred chosen alternative because the present worth cost comparison was the lowest of the two economically efficient alternatives. The cost, ease of installation and construction, extended aeration is a proven technology in Missouri made this the preferred alternative.
The Recirculating Sand filter was not chosen because this system would require a septic system or activated sludge as pretreatment. The camp's current septic system would need to be completely overhauled with a 24,000 gallon capacity and a recirculation tank with a 12,000 gallon capacity making this system not as economically feasible.

Reasons for Rejecting the other Evaluated Alternatives:
Less-degrading options were evaluated and deemed not practicable due to the following:
Land Application-11 acres of land required and upgrading the lagoon or installing pretreatment would be required. Due to property line constraints, a residence and Adam's Hollow creek in the area.
Subsurface Irrigation-5.5 acres of land would be required as well as upgrading the lagoon or installing pretreatment. Camp's flow at maximum capacity is 16,000 gallons per day which exceeds the limit of 3000 gal/day and permit would be required
Regional sewer-No regional sewers located in the area.
Upgrading the existing lagoon-available acreage and meeting current pollution limits a concern
Recirculating Sand Filter-This system would required septic system or activated sludge as pretreatment. The existing septic system would need to be completely overhauled with a 24000 gallon capacity and the recirculation tank with a 12,000 gallon capacity.

Comments/Discussion:
Continued from above:
Amphidrome (SAGB) system was not chosen due to present worth calculation revealed that this system exceeds 120% of the base cost of pollution controls measures and is not economically efficient.



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

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

Part I – General Conditions

Section A – Sampling, Monitoring, and Recording

1. **Sampling Requirements.**
 - a. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.
 - b. All samples shall be taken at the outfall(s) or Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Department) approved sampling location(s), and unless specified, before the effluent joins or is diluted by any other body of water or substance.
2. **Monitoring Requirements.**
 - a. Records of monitoring information shall include:
 - i. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
 - ii. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;
 - iii. The date(s) analyses were performed;
 - iv. The individual(s) who performed the analyses;
 - v. The analytical techniques or methods used; and
 - vi. The results of such analyses.
 - b. If the permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by the permit at the location specified in the permit using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 CFR subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reported to the Department with the discharge monitoring report data (DMR) submitted to the Department pursuant to Section B, paragraph 7.
3. **Sample and Monitoring Calculations.** Calculations for all sample and monitoring results which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in the permit.
4. **Test Procedures.** The analytical and sampling methods used shall conform to the reference methods listed in 10 CSR 20-7.015 unless alternates are approved by the Department. The facility shall use sufficiently sensitive analytical methods for detecting, identifying, and measuring the concentrations of pollutants. The facility shall ensure that the selected methods are able to quantify the presence of pollutants in a given discharge at concentrations that are low enough to determine compliance with Water Quality Standards in 10 CSR 20-7.031 or effluent limitations unless provisions in the permit allow for other alternatives. A method is “sufficiently sensitive” when; 1) the method minimum level is at or below the level of the applicable water quality criterion for the pollutant or, 2) the method minimum level is above the applicable water quality criterion, but the amount of pollutant in a facility’s discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of pollutant in the discharge, or 3) the method has the lowest minimum level of the analytical methods approved under 10 CSR 20-7.015. These methods are also required for parameters that are listed as monitoring only, as the data collected may be used to determine if limitations need to be established. A permittee is responsible for working with their contractors to ensure that the analysis performed is sufficiently sensitive.
5. **Record Retention.** Except for records of monitoring information required by the permit related to the permittee’s sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five (5) years (or longer as required by 40 CFR part 503), the permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by the permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for the permit, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Department at any time.

6. **Illegal Activities.**
 - a. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under the permit shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two (2) years, or both. If a conviction of a person is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment is a fine of not more than \$20,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than four (4) years, or both.
 - b. The Missouri Clean Water Law provides that any person or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six (6) months, or by both. Second and successive convictions for violation under this paragraph by any person shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two (2) years, or both.

Section B – Reporting Requirements

1. **Planned Changes.**
 - a. The permittee shall give notice to the Department as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility when:
 - i. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 40 CFR 122.29(b); or
 - ii. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants which are subject neither to effluent limitations in the permit, nor to notification requirements under 40 CFR 122.42(a)(1);
 - iii. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the permittee’s sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan;
 - iv. Any facility expansions, production increases, or process modifications which will result in a new or substantially different discharge or sludge characteristics must be reported to the Department 60 days before the facility or process modification begins. Notification may be accomplished by application for a new permit. If the discharge does not violate effluent limitations specified in the permit, the facility is to submit a notice to the Department of the changed discharge at least 30 days before such changes. The Department may require a construction permit and/or permit modification as a result of the proposed changes at the facility.
2. **Non-compliance Reporting.**
 - a. The permittee shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Relevant information shall be provided orally or via the current electronic method approved by the Department, within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances, and shall be reported to the appropriate Regional Office during normal business hours or the Environmental Emergency Response hotline at 573-634-2436 outside of normal business hours. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) business days of the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.



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

- b. The following shall be included as information which must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph.
 - i. Any unanticipated bypass which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit.
 - ii. Any upset which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit.
 - iii. Violation of a maximum daily discharge limitation for any of the pollutants listed by the Department in the permit required to be reported within 24 hours.
 - c. The Department may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports under paragraph 2. b. of this section if the oral report has been received within 24 hours.
3. **Anticipated Noncompliance.** The permittee shall give advance notice to the Department of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements. The notice shall be submitted to the Department 60 days prior to such changes or activity.
 4. **Compliance Schedules.** Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of the permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. The report shall provide an explanation for the instance of noncompliance and a proposed schedule or anticipated date, for achieving compliance with the compliance schedule requirement.
 5. **Other Noncompliance.** The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under paragraphs 2, 3, and 6 of this section, at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in paragraph 2. a. of this section.
 6. **Other Information.** Where the permittee becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Department, it shall promptly submit such facts or information.
 7. **Discharge Monitoring Reports.**
 - a. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the permit.
 - b. Monitoring results must be reported to the Department via the current method approved by the Department, unless the permittee has been granted a waiver from using the method. If the permittee has been granted a waiver, the permittee must use forms provided by the Department.
 - c. Monitoring results shall be reported to the Department no later than the 28th day of the month following the end of the reporting period.
- b. Notice.
 - i. Anticipated bypass. If the permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.
 - ii. Unanticipated bypass. The permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Section B – Reporting Requirements, paragraph 5 (24-hour notice).
 - c. Prohibition of bypass.
 - i. Bypass is prohibited, and the Department may take enforcement action against a permittee for bypass, unless:
 1. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;
 2. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass which occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance; and
 3. The permittee submitted notices as required under paragraph 2. b. of this section.
 - ii. The Department may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Department determines that it will meet the three (3) conditions listed above in paragraph 2. c. i. of this section.
3. **Upset Requirements.**
 - a. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of paragraph 3. b. of this section are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review.
 - b. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A permittee who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs, or other relevant evidence that:
 - i. An upset occurred and that the permittee can identify the cause(s) of the upset;
 - ii. The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated; and
 - iii. The permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in Section B – Reporting Requirements, paragraph 2. b. ii. (24-hour notice).
 - iv. The permittee complied with any remedial measures required under Section D – Administrative Requirements, paragraph 4.
 - c. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

Section C – Bypass/Upset Requirements

1. **Definitions.**
 - a. *Bypass*: the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility, except in the case of blending.
 - b. *Severe Property Damage*: substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources which can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production.
 - c. *Upset*: an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the permittee. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation.
2. **Bypass Requirements.**
 - a. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The permittee may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded, but only if it also is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2. b. and 2. c. of this section.

Section D – Administrative Requirements

1. **Duty to Comply.** The permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law and Federal Clean Water Act and is grounds for enforcement action; for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application.
 - a. The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under section 307(a) of the Federal Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions or standards for sewage sludge use or disposal, even if the permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.
 - b. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who violates section 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of the Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any such sections in a permit issued under section 402, or any requirement imposed in a pretreatment program approved under sections 402(a)(3) or 402(b)(8) of the Act, is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$25,000 per day for each violation. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who negligently violates sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Act, or any condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of the Act, or any requirement



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

- imposed in a pretreatment program approved under section 402(a)(3) or 402(b)(8) of the Act, is subject to criminal penalties of \$2,500 to \$25,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment of not more than one (1) year, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a negligent violation, a person shall be subject to criminal penalties of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than two (2) years, or both. Any person who knowingly violates such sections, or such conditions or limitations is subject to criminal penalties of \$5,000 to \$50,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment for not more than three (3) years, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a knowing violation, a person shall be subject to criminal penalties of not more than \$100,000 per day of violation, or imprisonment of not more than six (6) years, or both. Any person who knowingly violates section 301, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of the Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of the Act, and who knows at that time that he thereby places another person in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury, shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than \$250,000 or imprisonment of not more than 15 years, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction for a knowing endangerment violation, a person shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 30 years, or both. An organization, as defined in section 309(c)(3)(B)(iii) of the CWA, shall, upon conviction of violating the imminent danger provision, be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000,000 and can be fined up to \$2,000,000 for second or subsequent convictions.
- c. Any person may be assessed an administrative penalty by the EPA Director for violating section 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318 or 405 of this Act, or any permit condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under section 402 of this Act. Administrative penalties for Class I violations are not to exceed \$10,000 per violation, with the maximum amount of any Class I penalty assessed not to exceed \$25,000. Penalties for Class II violations are not to exceed \$10,000 per day for each day during which the violation continues, with the maximum amount of any Class II penalty not to exceed \$125,000.
- d. It is unlawful for any person to cause or permit any discharge of water contaminants from any water contaminant or point source located in Missouri in violation of sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law, or any standard, rule or regulation promulgated by the commission. In the event the commission or the director determines that any provision of sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law or standard, rules, limitations or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, or permits issued by, or any final abatement order, other order, or determination made by the commission or the director, or any filing requirement pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 of the Missouri Clean Water Law or any other provision which this state is required to enforce pursuant to any federal water pollution control act, is being, was, or is in imminent danger of being violated, the commission or director may cause to have instituted a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction for the injunctive relief to prevent any such violation or further violation or for the assessment of a penalty not to exceed \$10,000 per day for each day, or part thereof, the violation occurred and continues to occur, or both, as the court deems proper. Any person who willfully or negligently commits any violation in this paragraph shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than \$2,500 nor more than \$25,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. Second and successive convictions for violation of the same provision of this paragraph by any person shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two (2) years, or both.
2. **Duty to Reapply.**
- a. If the permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the permittee must apply for and obtain a new permit.
- b. A permittee with a currently effective site-specific permit shall submit an application for renewal at least 180 days before the expiration date of the existing permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the Department. (The Department shall not grant permission for applications to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.)
- c. A permittee with currently effective general permit shall submit an application for renewal at least 30 days before the existing permit expires, unless the permittee has been notified by the Department that an earlier application must be made. The Department may grant permission for a later submission date. (The Department shall not grant permission for applications to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.)
3. **Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense.** It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.
4. **Duty to Mitigate.** The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.
5. **Proper Operation and Maintenance.** The permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems which are installed by a permittee only when the operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.
6. **Permit Actions.**
- a. Subject to compliance with statutory requirements of the Law and Regulations and applicable Court Order, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked in whole or in part during its term for cause including, but not limited to, the following:
- i. Violations of any terms or conditions of this permit or the law;
- ii. Having obtained this permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully any relevant facts;
- iii. A change in any circumstances or conditions that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; or
- iv. Any reason set forth in the Law or Regulations.
- b. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit condition.
7. **Permit Transfer.**
- a. Subject to 10 CSR 20-6.010, an operating permit may be transferred upon submission to the Department of an application to transfer signed by the existing owner and the new owner, unless prohibited by the terms of the permit. Until such time the permit is officially transferred, the original permittee remains responsible for complying with the terms and conditions of the existing permit.
- b. The Department may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the permit to change the name of the permittee and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the Missouri Clean Water Law or the Federal Clean Water Act.
- c. The Department, within 30 days of receipt of the application, shall notify the new permittee of its intent to revoke or reissue or transfer the permit.
8. **Toxic Pollutants.** The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under section 307(a) of the Federal Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under section 405(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions or standards for sewage sludge use or disposal, even if the permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.
9. **Property Rights.** This permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege.



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

10. **Duty to Provide Information.** The permittee shall furnish to the Department, within a reasonable time, any information which the Department may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this permit or to determine compliance with this permit. The permittee shall also furnish to the Department upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.
11. **Inspection and Entry.** The permittee shall allow the Department, or an authorized representative (including an authorized contractor acting as a representative of the Department), upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:
 - a. Enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of the permit;
 - b. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;
 - c. Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this permit; and
 - d. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the Federal Clean Water Act or Missouri Clean Water Law, any substances or parameters at any location.
12. **Closure of Treatment Facilities.**
 - a. Persons who cease operation or plan to cease operation of waste, wastewater, and sludge handling and treatment facilities shall close the facilities in accordance with a closure plan approved by the Department.
 - b. Operating Permits under 10 CSR 20-6.010 or under 10 CSR 20-6.015 are required until all waste, wastewater, and sludges have been disposed of in accordance with the closure plan approved by the Department and any disturbed areas have been properly stabilized. Disturbed areas will be considered stabilized when perennial vegetation, pavement, or structures using permanent materials cover all areas that have been disturbed. Vegetative cover, if used, shall be at least 70% plant density over 100% of the disturbed area.
13. **Signatory Requirement.**
 - a. All permit applications, reports required by the permit, or information requested by the Department shall be signed and certified. (See 40 CFR 122.22 and 10 CSR 20-6.010)
 - b. The Federal Clean Water Act provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this permit, including monitoring reports or reports of compliance or non-compliance shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 per violation, or by imprisonment for not more than six (6) months per violation, or by both.
 - c. The Missouri Clean Water Law provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained pursuant to sections 644.006 to 644.141 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.
14. **Severability.** The provisions of the permit are severable, and if any provision of the permit, or the application of any provision of the permit to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of the permit, shall not be affected thereby.

STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR NPDES PERMITS
ISSUED BY
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
MISSOURI CLEAN WATER COMMISSION
March 1, 2015

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

SECTION A – GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. This permit pertains to sludge requirements under the Missouri Clean Water Law and regulation for domestic wastewater and industrial process wastewater. This permit also incorporates applicable federal sludge disposal requirements under 40 CFR 503 for domestic wastewater. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has principal authority for permitting and enforcement of the federal sludge regulations under 40 CFR 503 for domestic wastewater. EPA has reviewed and accepted these standard sludge conditions. EPA may choose to issue a separate sludge addendum to this permit or a separate federal sludge permit at their discretion to further address the federal requirements.
2. These PART III Standard Conditions apply only to sludge and biosolids generated at domestic wastewater treatment facilities, including public owned treatment works (POTW), privately owned facilities and sludge or biosolids generated at industrial facilities.
3. Sludge and Biosolids Use and Disposal Practices:
 - a. The permittee is authorized to operate the sludge and biosolids treatment, storage, use, and disposal facilities listed in the facility description of this permit.
 - b. The permittee shall not exceed the design sludge volume listed in the facility description and shall not use sludge disposal methods that are not listed in the facility description, without prior approval of the permitting authority.
 - c. The permittee is authorized to operate the storage, treatment or generating sites listed in the Facility Description section of this permit.
4. Sludge Received from other Facilities:
 - a. Permittees may accept domestic wastewater sludge from other facilities including septic tank pumpings from residential sources as long as the design sludge volume is not exceeded and the treatment facility performance is not impaired.
 - b. The permittee shall obtain a signed statement from the sludge generator or hauler that certifies the type and source of the sludge
5. These permit requirements do not supersede nor remove liability for compliance with county and other local ordinances.
6. These permit requirements do not supersede nor remove liability for compliance with other environmental regulations such as odor emissions under the Missouri Air Pollution Control Law and regulations.
7. This permit may (after due process) be modified, or alternatively revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable sludge disposal standard or limitation issued or approved under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act under Chapter 644 RSMo.
8. In addition to STANDARD CONDITIONS, the Department may include sludge limitations in the special conditions portion or other sections of a site specific permit.
9. Alternate Limits in the Site Specific Permit.

Where deemed appropriate, the Department may require an individual site specific permit in order to authorize alternate limitations:

 - a. A site specific permit must be obtained for each operating location, including application sites.
 - b. To request a site specific permit, an individual permit application, permit fee, and supporting documents shall be submitted for each operating location. This shall include a detailed sludge/biosolids management plan or engineering report.
10. Exceptions to these Standard Conditions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis by the Department, as follows:
 - a. The Department will prepare a permit modification and follow permit notice provisions as applicable under 10 CSR 20-6.020, 40 CFR 124.10, and 40 CFR 501.15(a)(2)(ix)(E). This includes notification of the owner of the property located adjacent to each land application site, where appropriate.
 - b. Exceptions cannot be granted where prohibited by the federal sludge regulations under 40 CFR 503.

SECTION B – DEFINITIONS

1. Best Management Practices include agronomic loading rates, soil conservation practices and other site restrictions.
2. Biosolids means organic fertilizer or soil amendment produced by the treatment of domestic wastewater sludge.
3. Biosolids land application facility is a facility where biosolids are spread onto the land at agronomic rates for production of food or fiber. The facility includes any structures necessary to store the biosolids until soil, weather, and crop conditions are favorable for land application.
4. Class A biosolids means a material that has met the Class A pathogen reduction requirements or equivalent treatment by a Process to Further Reduce Pathogens (PFRP) in accordance with 40 CFR 503.
5. Class B biosolids means a material that has met the Class B pathogen reduction requirements or equivalent treatment by a Process to Significantly Reduce Pathogens (PFRP) in accordance with 40 CFR 503.
6. Domestic wastewater means wastewater originating from the sanitary conveniences of residences, commercial buildings, factories and institutions; or co-mingled sanitary and industrial wastewater processed by a (POTW) or a privately owned facility.
7. Industrial wastewater means any wastewater, also known as process water, not defined as domestic wastewater. Per 40 CFR Part 122, process water means any water which, during manufacturing or processing, comes into direct contact with or results from the production or use of any raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product.
8. Mechanical treatment plants are wastewater treatment facilities that use mechanical devices to treat wastewater, including septic tanks, sand filters, extended aeration, activated sludge, contact stabilization, trickling filters, rotating biological discs, and other similar facilities. It does not include wastewater treatment lagoons and constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.
9. Operating location as defined in 10 CSR 20-2.010 is all contiguous lands owned, operated or controlled by one (1) person or by two (2) or more persons jointly or as tenants in common.
10. Plant Available Nitrogen (PAN) is the nitrogen that will be available to plants during the growing seasons after biosolids application.
11. Public contact site is land with a high potential for contact by the public. This includes, but is not limited to, public parks, ball fields, cemeteries, plant nurseries, turf farms, and golf courses.
12. Sludge is the solid, semisolid, or liquid residue removed during the treatment of wastewater. Sludge includes septage removed from septic tanks or equivalent facilities. Sludge does not include carbon coal byproducts (CCBs)
13. Sludge lagoon is part of a mechanical wastewater treatment facility. A sludge lagoon is an earthen basin that receives sludge that has been removed from a wastewater treatment facility. It does not include a wastewater treatment lagoon or sludge treatment units that are not a part of a mechanical wastewater treatment facility.
14. Septage is the material pumped from residential septic tanks and similar treatment works (with a design population of less than 150 people). The standard for biosolids from septage is different from other sludges.

SECTION C – MECHANICAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

1. Sludge shall be routinely removed from wastewater treatment facilities and handled according to the permit facility description and sludge conditions of this permit.
2. The permittee shall operate the facility so that there is no sludge discharged to waters of the state.
3. Mechanical treatment plants shall have separate sludge storage compartments in accordance with 10 CSR 20, Chapter 8. Failure to remove sludge from these storage compartments on the required design schedule is a violation of this permit.

SECTION D – SLUDGE DISPOSED AT OTHER TREATMENT FACILITY OR CONTRACT HAULER

1. This section applies to permittees that haul sludge to another treatment facility for disposal or use contract haulers to remove and dispose of sludge.
2. Permittees that use contract haulers are responsible for compliance with all the terms of this permit including final disposal, unless the hauler has a separate permit for sludge or biosolids disposal issued by the Department; or the hauler transports the sludge to another permitted treatment facility.
3. Haulers who land apply septage must obtain a state permit.
4. Testing of sludge, other than total solids content, is not required if sludge is hauled to a municipal wastewater treatment facility or other permitted wastewater treatment facility, unless it is required by the accepting facility.

SECTION E – INCINERATION OF SLUDGE

1. Sludge incineration facilities shall comply with the requirements of 40 CFR 503 Subpart E; air pollution control regulations under 10 CSR 10; and solid waste management regulations under 10 CSR 80.
2. Permittee may be authorized under the facility description of this permit to store incineration ash in lagoons or ash ponds. This permit does not authorize the disposal of incineration ash. Incineration ash shall be disposed in accordance with 10 CSR 80; or if the ash is determined to be hazardous with 10 CSR 25.
3. In addition to normal sludge monitoring, incineration facilities shall report the following as part of the annual report, quantity of sludge incinerated, quantity of ash generated, quantity of ash stored, and ash used or disposal method, quantity, and location. Permittee shall also provide the name of the disposal facility and the applicable permit number.

SECTION F – SURFACE DISPOSAL SITES AND SLUDGE LAGOONS

1. Surface disposal sites of domestic facilities shall comply with the requirements in 40 CFR 503 Subpart C; air pollution control regulations under 10 CSR 10; and solid waste management regulations under 10 CSR 80.
2. Sludge storage lagoons are temporary facilities and are not required to obtain a permit as a solid waste management facility under 10 CSR 80. In order to maintain sludge storage lagoons as storage facilities, accumulated sludge must be removed routinely, but not less than once every two years unless an alternate schedule is approved in the permit. The amount of sludge removed will be dependent on sludge generation and accumulation in the facility. Enough sludge must be removed to maintain adequate storage capacity in the facility.
 - a. In order to avoid damage to the lagoon seal during cleaning, the permittee may leave a layer of sludge on the bottom of the lagoon, upon prior approval of the Department; or
 - b. Permittee shall close the lagoon in accordance with Section H.

SECTION G – LAND APPLICATION

1. The permittee shall not land apply sludge or biosolids unless land application is authorized in the facility description or the special conditions of the issued NPDES permit.
2. Land application sites within a 20 miles radius of the wastewater treatment facility are authorized under this permit when biosolids are applied for beneficial use in accordance with these standard conditions unless otherwise specified in a site specific permit. If the permittee's land application site is greater than a 20 mile radius of the wastewater treatment facility, approval must be granted from the Department.
3. Land application shall not adversely affect a threatened or endangered species or its designated critical habitat.
4. Biosolids shall not be applied unless authorized in this permit or exempted under 10 CSR 20, Chapter 6.
 - a. This permit does not authorize the land application of domestic sludge except for when sludge meets the definition of biosolids.
 - b. This permit authorizes "Class A or B" biosolids derived from domestic wastewater and/or process water sludge to be land applied onto grass land, crop land, timber or other similar agricultural or silviculture lands at rates suitable for beneficial use as organic fertilizer and soil conditioner.
5. Public Contact Sites:

Permittees who wish to apply Class A biosolids to public contact sites must obtain approval from the Department after two years of proper operation with acceptable testing documentation that shows the biosolids meet Class A criteria. A shorter length of testing will be allowed with prior approval from the Department. Authorization for land applications must be provided in the special conditions section of this permit or in a separate site specific permit.

 - a. After Class B biosolids have been land applied, public access must be restricted for 12 months.
 - b. Class B biosolids are only land applied to root crops, home gardens or vegetable crops whose edible parts will not be for human consumption.
6. Agricultural and Silvicultural Sites:

Septage – Based on Water Quality guide 422 (WQ422) published by the University of Missouri

 - a. Haulers that land apply septage must obtain a state permit
 - b. Do not apply more than 30,000 gallons of septage per acre per year.
 - c. Septage tanks are designed to retain sludge for one to three years which will allow for a larger reduction in pathogens and vectors, as compared to other mechanical type treatment facilities.
 - d. To meet Class B sludge requirements, maintain septage at 12 pH for at least thirty (30) minutes before land application. 50 pounds of hydrated lime shall be added to each 1,000 gallons of septage in order to meet pathogen and vector stabilization for septage biosolids applied to crops, pastures or timberland.
 - e. Lime is to be added to the pump truck and not directly to the septic tanks, as lime would harm the beneficial bacteria of the septic tank.

Biosolids - Based on Water Quality guide 423, 424, and 425 (WQ423, WQ424, WQ425) published by the University of Missouri;

- a. Biosolids shall be monitored to determine the quality for regulated pollutants
- b. The number of samples taken is directly related to the amount of sludge produced by the facility (See Section I of these Standard Conditions). Report as dry weight unless otherwise specified in the site specific permit. Samples should be taken only during land application periods. When necessary, it is permissible to mix biosolids with lower concentrations of biosolids as well as other suitable Department approved material to reach the maximum concentration of pollutants allowed.
- c. Table 1 gives the maximum concentration allowable to protect water quality standards

TABLE 1

Biosolids ceiling concentration ¹	
Pollutant	Milligrams per kilogram dry weight
Arsenic	75
Cadmium	85
Copper	4,300
Lead	840
Mercury	57
Molybdenum	75
Nickel	420
Selenium	100
Zinc	7,500

¹ Land application is not allowed if the sludge concentration exceeds the maximum limits for any of these pollutants

- d. The low metal concentration biosolids has reduced requirements because of its higher quality and can safely be applied for 100 years or longer at typical agronomic loading rates. (See Table 2)

TABLE 2

Biosolids Low Metal Concentration ¹	
Pollutant	Milligrams per kilogram dry weight
Arsenic	41
Cadmium	39
Copper	1,500
Lead	300
Mercury	17
Nickel	420
Selenium	36
Zinc	2,800

¹ You may apply low metal biosolids without tracking cumulative metal limits, provided the cumulative application of biosolids does not exceed 500 dry tons per acre.

- e. Each pollutant in Table 3 has an annual and a total cumulative loading limit, based on the allowable pounds per acre for various soil categories.

TABLE 3

Pollutant	CEC 15+		CEC 5 to 15		CEC 0 to 5	
	Annual	Total ¹	Annual	Total ¹	Annual	Total ¹
Arsenic	1.8	36.0	1.8	36.0	1.8	36.0
Cadmium	1.7	35.0	0.9	9.0	0.4	4.5
Copper	66.0	1,335.0	25.0	250.0	12.0	125.0
Lead	13.0	267.0	13.0	267.0	13.0	133.0
Mercury	0.7	15.0	0.7	15.0	0.7	15.0
Nickel	19.0	347.0	19.0	250.0	12.0	125.0
Selenium	4.5	89.0	4.5	44.0	1.6	16.0
Zinc	124.0	2,492.0	50.0	500.0	25.0	250.0

¹ Total cumulative loading limits for soils with equal or greater than 6.0 pH (salt based test) or 6.5 pH (water based test)

TABLE 4 - Guidelines for land application of other trace substances ¹

Cumulative Loading	
Pollutant	Pounds per acre
Aluminum	4,000 ²
Beryllium	100
Cobalt	50
Fluoride	800
Manganese	500
Silver	200
Tin	1,000
Dioxin	(10 ppt in soil) ³
Other	⁴

¹ Design of land treatment systems for Industrial Waste, 1979. Michael Ray Overcash, North Carolina State University and Land Treatment of Municipal Wastewater, EPA 1981.)

² This applies for a soil with a pH between 6.0 and 7.0 (salt based test) or a pH between 6.5 to 7.5 (water based test). Case-by-case review is required for higher pH soils.

³ Total Dioxin Toxicity Equivalents (TEQ) in soils, based on a risk assessment under 40 CFR 744, May 1998.

⁴ Case by case review. Concentrations in sludge should not exceed the 95th percentile of the National Sewage Sludge Survey, EPA, January 2009.

Best Management Practices – Based on Water Quality guide 426 (WQ426) published by the University of Missouri

- a. Use best management practices when applying biosolids.
- b. Biosolids cannot discharge from the land application site
- c. Biosolid application is subject to the Missouri Department of Agriculture State Milk Board concerning grazing restrictions of lactating dairy cattle.
- d. Biosolid application must be in accordance with section 4 of the Endangered Species Act.
- e. Do not apply more than the agronomic rate of nitrogen needed.
- f. The applicator must document the Plant Available Nitrogen (PAN) loadings, available nitrogen in the soil, and crop removal when either of the following occurs: 1) When biosolids are greater than 50,000 mg/kg TN; or 2) When biosolids are land applied at an application rate greater than two dry tons per acre per year.
 - i. PAN can be determined as follows and is in accordance with WQ426
(Nitrate + nitrite nitrogen) + (organic nitrogen x 0.2) + (ammonia nitrogen x volatilization factor¹).
¹Volatilization factor is 0.7 for surface application and 1 for subsurface application.
- g. Buffer zones are as follows:
 - i. 300 feet of a water supply well, sinkhole, lake, pond, water supply reservoir or water supply intake in a stream;
 - ii. 300 feet of a losing stream, no discharge stream, stream stretches designated for whole body contact recreation, wild and scenic rivers, Ozark National Scenic Riverways or outstanding state resource waters as listed in the Water Quality Standards, 10 CSR 20-7.031;
 - iii. 150 feet if dwellings;
 - iv. 100 feet of wetlands or permanent flowing streams;
 - v. 50 feet of a property line or other waters of the state, including intermittent flowing streams.
- h. Slope limitation for application sites are as follows;
 - i. A slope 0 to 6 percent has no rate limitation
 - ii. Applied to a slope 7 to 12 percent, the applicator may apply biosolids when soil conservation practices are used to meet the minimum erosion levels
 - iii. Slopes > 12 percent, apply biosolids only when grass is vegetated and maintained with at least 80 percent ground cover at a rate of two dry tons per acre per year or less.
- i. No biosolids may be land applied in an area that it is reasonably certain that pollutants will be transported into waters of the state.
- j. Do not apply biosolids to sites with soil that is snow covered, frozen or saturated with liquid without prior approval by the Department.
- k. Biosolids / sludge applicators must keep detailed records up to five years.

SECTION H – CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

1. This section applies to all wastewater facilities (mechanical, industrial, and lagoons) and sludge or biosolids storage and treatment facilities and incineration ash ponds. It does not apply to land application sites.
2. Permittees of a domestic wastewater facility who plan to cease operation must obtain Department approval of a closure plan which addresses proper removal and disposal of all residues, including sludge, biosolids. Mechanical plants, sludge lagoons, ash ponds and other storage structures must obtain approval of a closure plan from the Department. Permittee must maintain this permit until the facility is closed in accordance with the approved closure plan per 10 CSR 20 – 6. 010 and 10 CSR 20 – 6.015.
3. Residuals that are left in place during closure of a lagoon or earthen structure or ash pond shall not exceed the agricultural loading rates as follows:
 - a. Residuals shall meet the monitoring and land application limits for agricultural rates as referenced in Section H of these standard conditions.
 - b. If a wastewater treatment lagoon has been in operation for 15 years or more without sludge removal, the sludge in the lagoon qualifies as a Class B biosolids with respect to pathogens due to anaerobic digestion, and testing for fecal coliform is not required. For other lagoons, testing for fecal coliform is required to show compliance with Class B biosolids limitations. In order to reach Class B biosolids requirements, fecal coliform must be less than 2,000,000 colony forming units or 2,000,000 most probable number. All fecal samples must be presented as geometric mean per gram.
 - c. The allowable nitrogen loading that may be left in the lagoon shall be based on the plant available nitrogen (PAN) loading. For a grass cover crop, the allowable PAN is 300 pounds/acre.
 - i. PAN can be determined as follows:
$$(\text{Nitrate} + \text{nitrite nitrogen}) + (\text{organic nitrogen} \times 0.2) + (\text{ammonia nitrogen} \times \text{volatilization factor}^1).$$

¹ Volatilization factor is 0.7 for surface application and 1 for subsurface application.
4. When closing a domestic wastewater treatment lagoon with a design treatment capacity equal or less than 150 persons, the residuals are considered “septage” under the similar treatment works definition. See Section B of these standard conditions. Under the septage category, residuals may be left in place as follows:
 - a. Testing for metals or fecal coliform is not required
 - b. If the wastewater treatment lagoon has been in use for less than 15 years, mix lime with the sludge at a rate of 50 pounds of hydrated lime per 1000 gallons (134 cubic feet) of sludge.
 - c. The amount of sludge that may be left in the lagoon shall be based on the plant available nitrogen (PAN) loading. 100 dry tons/acre of sludge may be left in the basin without testing for nitrogen. If 100 dry tons/acre or more will be left in the lagoon, test for nitrogen and determine the PAN using the calculation above. Allowable PAN loading is 300 pounds/acre.
5. Residuals left within the domestic lagoon shall be mixed with soil on at least a 1 to 1 ratio, the lagoon berm shall be demolished, and the site shall be graded and contain $\geq 70\%$ vegetative density over 100% of the site so as to avoid ponding of storm water and provide adequate surface water drainage without creating erosion.
6. Lagoons and/or earthen structure and/or ash pond closure activities shall obtain a storm water permit for land disturbance activities that equal or exceed one acre in accordance with 10 CSR 20-6.200
7. When closing a mechanical wastewater and/or industrial process wastewater plant; all sludge must be cleaned out and disposed of in accordance with the Department approved closure plan before the permit for the facility can be terminated.
 - a. Land must be stabilized which includes any grading, alternate use or fate upon approval by the Department, remediation, or other work that exposes sediment to stormwater per 10 CSR 20-6.200. The site shall be graded and contain $\geq 70\%$ vegetative density over 100% of the site, so as to avoid ponding of storm water and provide adequate surface water drainage without creating erosion.
 - b. Per 10 CSR 20-6.015(4)(B)6, Hazardous Waste shall not be land applied or disposed during industrial and mechanical plant closures unless in accordance with Missouri Hazardous Waste Management Law and Regulations under 10 CSR 25.
 - c. After demolition of the mechanical plant / industrial plant, the site must only contain clean fill defined in RSMo 260.200 (5) as uncontaminated soil, rock, sand, gravel, concrete, asphaltic concrete, cinderblocks, brick, minimal amounts of wood and metal, and inert solids as approved by rule or policy of the Department for fill or other beneficial use. Other solid wastes must be removed.
8. If sludge from the domestic lagoon or mechanical treatment plant exceeds agricultural rates under Section G and/or H, a landfill permit or solid waste disposal permit must be obtained if the permittee chooses to seek authorization for on-site sludge disposal under the Missouri Solid Waste Management Law and regulations per 10 CSR 80, and the permittee must comply with the surface disposal requirements under 40 CFR 503, Subpart C.

SECTION I – MONITORING FREQUENCY

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

TABLE 5

Design Sludge Production (dry tons per year)	Monitoring Frequency (See Notes 1, 2, and 3)			
	Metals, Pathogens and Vectors	Nitrogen TKN ¹	Nitrogen PAN ²	Priority Pollutants and TCLP ³
0 to 100	1 per year	1 per year	1 per month	1 per year
101 to 200	biannual	biannual	1 per month	1 per year
201 to 1,000	quarterly	quarterly	1 per month	1 per year
1,001 to 10,000	1 per month	1 per month	1 per week	-- ⁴
10,001 +	1 per week	1 per week	1 per day	-- ⁴

¹ Test total Kjeldahl nitrogen, if biosolids application is 2 dry tons per acre per year or less.

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

³ Priority pollutants (40 CFR 122.21, Appendix D, Tables II and III) and toxicity characteristic leaching procedure (40 CFR 261.24) is required only for permit holders that must have a pre-treatment program.

⁴ One sample for each 1,000 dry tons of sludge.

Note 1: Total solids: A grab sample of sludge shall be tested one per day during land application periods for percent total solids.

This data shall be used to calculate the dry tons of sludge applied per acre.

Note 2: Total Phosphorus: Total phosphorus and total potassium shall be tested at the same monitoring frequency as metals.

Note 3: Table 5 is not applicable for incineration and permit holders that landfill their sludge.

- If you own a wastewater treatment lagoon or sludge lagoon that is cleaned out once a year or less, you may choose to sample only when the sludge is removed or the lagoon is closed. Test one composite sample for each 100 dry tons of sludge or biosolids removed from the lagoon during the year within the lagoon at closing. Composite sample must represent various areas at one-foot depth.
- Additional testing may be required in the special conditions or other sections of the permit. Permittees receiving industrial wastewater may be required to conduct additional testing upon request from the Department.
- At this time, the Department recommends monitoring requirements shall be performed in accordance with, "POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document," United States Environmental Protection Agency, August 1989, and the subsequent revisions.

SECTION J – RECORD KEEPING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- The permittee shall maintain records on file at the facility for at least five years for the items listed in these standard conditions and any additional items in the Special Conditions section of this permit. This shall include dates when the sludge facility is checked for proper operation, records of maintenance and repairs and other relevant information.
- Reporting period
 - By January 28th of each year, an annual report shall be submitted for the previous calendar year period for all mechanical wastewater treatment facilities, sludge lagoons, and sludge or biosolids disposal facilities.
 - Permittees with wastewater treatment lagoons shall submit the above annual report only when sludge or biosolids are removed from the lagoon during the report period or when the lagoon is closed.
- Report Forms. The annual report shall be submitted on report forms provided by the Department or equivalent forms approved by the Department.
- Reports shall be submitted as follows:

Major facilities (those serving 10,000 persons or 1 million gallons per day) shall report to both the Department and EPA. Other facilities need to report only to the Department. Reports shall be submitted to the addresses listed as follows:


DNR regional office listed in your permit
(see cover letter of permit)
ATTN: Sludge Coordinator

EPA Region VII
Water Compliance Branch (WACM)
Sludge Coordinator
11201 Renner Blvd.
Lenexa, KS 66219

5. Annual report contents. The annual report shall include the following:
- a. Sludge and biosolids testing performed. Include a copy or summary of all test results, even if not required by the permit.
 - b. Sludge or biosolids quantity shall be reported as dry tons for quantity generated by the wastewater treatment facility, the quantity stored on site at the end of the year, and the quantity used or disposed.
 - c. Gallons and % solids data used to calculate the dry ton amounts.
 - d. Description of any unusual operating conditions.
 - e. Final disposal method, dates, and location, and person responsible for hauling and disposal.
 - i. This must include the name, address for the hauler and sludge facility. If hauled to a municipal wastewater treatment facility, sanitary landfill, or other approved treatment facility, give the name of that facility.
 - ii. Include a description of the type of hauling equipment used and the capacity in tons, gallons, or cubic feet.
 - f. Contract Hauler Activities:
If contract hauler, provide a copy of a signed contract from the contractor. Permittee shall require the contractor to supply information required under this permit for which the contractor is responsible. The permittee shall submit a signed statement from the contractor that he has complied with the standards contained in this permit, unless the contract hauler has a separate sludge or biosolids use permit.
 - g. Land Application Sites:
 - i. Report the location of each application site, the annual and cumulative dry tons/acre for each site, and the landowners name and address. The location for each spreading site shall be given as a legal description for nearest ¼, ¼, Section, Township, Range, and county, or UTM coordinates. The facility shall report PAN when either of the following occurs: 1) When biosolids are greater than 50,000 mg/kg TN; or 2) when biosolids are land applied at an application rate greater than two dry tons per acre per year.
 - ii. If the “Low Metals” criteria are exceeded, report the annual and cumulative pollutant loading rates in pounds per acre for each applicable pollutant, and report the percent of cumulative pollutant loading which has been reached at each site.
 - iii. Report the method used for compliance with pathogen and vector attraction requirements.
 - iv. Report soil test results for pH, CEC, and phosphorus. If none was tested during the year, report the last date when tested and results.

RECEIVED

AP 21265



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM
APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT 1-9 2015
WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY

FOR DEPARTMENT USE ONLY	
APP NO.	CP NO.
FEE RECEIVED \$1000.00	CHECK NO. 17220
DATE RECEIVED 5/19/15	

WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Application for Construction Permit – Wastewater Treatment Facility form has been developed in a modular format and consists of Part A and B. **All applicants must complete Part A.** Part B should be completed for applicants who currently land-apply wastewater or propose land application for wastewater treatment. **Please read the accompanying instructions before completing this form. Submittal of an incomplete application may result in the application being returned.**

PART A – BASIC INFORMATION

1.0 APPLICATION INFORMATION (Note – If any of the questions in this section are answered NO, this application may be considered incomplete and returned.)

- 1.1 Is this a Federal/State funded project? YES N/A Funding Agency: MoDEDNAP Project #: 2012-64045
 - 1.2 Has the Missouri Department of Natural Resources approved the proposed project's antidegradation review?
 YES Date of Approval: 4/17/2015
 - 1.3 Has the department approved the proposed project's facility plan*?
 YES Date of Approval: _____ NO N/A (If Not Applicable, complete No. 1.4.)
 - 1.4 [Complete only if answered Not Applicable on No. 1.3.] Is a copy of the engineering report* for wastewater treatment facilities with a design flow less than 22,500 gpd included with this application?
 YES NO
 - 1.5 Is a copy of the appropriate plans* and specifications* included with this application?
 YES Denote which form is submitted: Hard copy Electronic copy (See instructions.) NO
 - 1.6 Is a summary of design* included with this application? YES NO
 - 1.7 Has the appropriate operating permit application (A, B, or B2) been submitted to the department?
 YES Date of submittal: _____
 Enclosed is the appropriate operating permit application submittal. Denote which form: A B B2 *WILL SUBMIT SHORTLY*
 N/A Please explain: Will submit + soon.
 - 1.8 Is the facility currently under enforcement with the department or the Environmental Protection Agency? YES NO
 - 1.9 Is the appropriate fee included with this application? YES NO (See instructions for appropriate fee.)
- * Must be affixed with a Missouri registered professional engineer's seal, signature and date.

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 NAME OF PROJECT
Sherwood Forest Camp Wastewater Treatment Facility

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION
An extended aeration package plant by Water Inc. of GA consists of an aeration tank, aeration blower, one final clarifier, one sludge holding tank and a Trojan UV3000 system for disinfection. The connecting gravity sewer pipes and manholes are also included in this submittal.

2.3 SLUDGE HANDLING, USE AND DISPOSAL DESCRIPTION
The sludge holding tank will be pumped out by a contracted disposal company.

2.4 DESIGN INFORMATION
A. Current population: Varies; Design population: 300
B. Actual Flow: Varies gpd; Design Average Flow: 15,750 gpd;
Actual Peak Daily Flow: 15,750 gpd; Design Maximum Daily Flow: 15,750 gpd; Design Wet Weather Event: 15,750

2.5 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
A. Is a topographic map attached? YES NO
B. Is a process flow diagram attached? YES NO


3.0 WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY				
NAME		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		E-MAIL ADDRESS
ADDRESS (PHYSICAL)		CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
COUNTY				
Wastewater Treatment Facility: Mo- (Outfall Of)				
3.1 Legal Description: _____ ¼, _____ ¼, _____ ¼, Sec. _____, T _____, R _____ (Use additional pages if construction of more than one outfall is proposed.)				
3.2 UTM Coordinates Easting (X): _____ Northing (Y): _____ For Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), Zone 15 North referenced to North American Datum 1983 (NAD83)				
3.3 Name of receiving streams: _____				
4.0 PROJECT OWNER				
NAME		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mary Rogers		(314) 644-3322		MaryR@sherwoodforeststl.org
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
2708 Sutton Blvd.		St. Louis	MO	63143
5.0 CONTINUING AUTHORITY: Permanent organization that will serve as the continuing authority for the operation, maintenance and modernization of the wastewater collection system.				
NAME		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mary Rogers		(314) 644-3322		MaryR@sherwoodforeststl.org
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
2708 Sutton Blvd.		St. Louis	MO	63143
5.1 A letter from the continuing authority, if different than the owner, is included with this application. <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A				
5.2 COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING IF THE CONTINUING AUTHORITY IS A MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGULATED ENTITY.				
A. Is a copy of the certificate of convenience and necessity included with this application? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
5.3 COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING IF THE CONTINUING AUTHORITY IS A PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION.				
A. Is a copy of the as-filed restrictions and covenants included with this application? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
B. Is a copy of the as-filed warranty deed, quitclaim deed or other legal instrument which transfers ownership of the land for the wastewater treatment facility to the association included with this application? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
C. Is a copy of the as-filed legal instrument (typically the plat) that provides the association with valid easements for all sewers included with this application? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
D. Is a copy of the Missouri Secretary of State's nonprofit corporation certificate included with this application? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
6.0 ENGINEER				
ENGINEER NAME / COMPANY NAME		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		E-MAIL ADDRESS
Sarah Grace Wright		(618) 910-2941		gracewright@stlmsd.com
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
823 Castleaire Parkway		St. Louis	MO	63129
7.0 PROJECT OWNER: I hereby certify that I am familiar with the information contained in this application and to the best of my knowledge and belief such information is true, complete, and accurate, and if granted this permit, I agree to abide by the Missouri Clean Water Law and all rules, regulations, orders, and decisions, subject to any legitimate appeal available to applicant under Missouri Clean Water Law. I also understand the issuance of the construction permit does not guarantee the proposed wastewater treatment will meet the required effluent limitations of the issued Missouri State Operating Permit for this facility.				
PROJECT OWNER SIGNATURE				
				DATE
PRINTED NAME				4-28-15
Mary Rogers				4/27/2015
TITLE OR CORPORATE POSITION		TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE		E-MAIL ADDRESS
Executive Director		(314) 644-3322		MaryR@sherwoodforeststl.org
Mail completed copy to: MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM P.O. BOX 176 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-0176				
END OF PART A.				
REFER TO THE APPLICATION OVERVIEW TO DETERMINE WHETHER PART B NEEDS TO BE COMPLETE.				

EXHIBIT A BIG RIVER WATERSHED

REYNOLDS COUNTY, MO (CENTERVILLE AND
LESTERVILLE QUADRANGLE MAPS)
PART OF NE 1/4, SE 1/4, SW 1/4, SEC. 6, T22N, R22E, S.W.
Lot 279, 280, 435 Long, 900-52M 185



PROPOSED TREATMENT LOCATION

EXISTING LAGOON

PROPOSED DISCHARGE LOCATION

MIDDLE FORK BLACK RIVER

SHERWOOD FOREST HWY

RECEIVING STREAM ADAM'S HOLLOW

LESTERVILLE, MO
Lesterville
(184 71.2)



SCALE 1" = 3000'