

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-0089010

Owner: City of Lebanon
Address: P.O. Box 111, Lebanon, MO 65536

Continuing Authority: Same as above
Address: Same as above

Facility Name: Lebanon Wastewater Treatment Facility
Address: 1727 Main, Lebanon, MO 65536

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

Receiving Stream: Dry Auglaize Creek (P)
First Classified Stream and ID: Dry Auglaize Creek (P) (01145)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10290109-0303)

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

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

Fine screening/influent pump station/grit removal/oxidation ditch with three aeration basins/four clarifiers/sand filters/ultraviolet disinfection/sludge dewatering/sludge is land applied.

The use or operation of this facility shall be by or under the supervision of a **Certified "A" Operator**

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 644.051.6 of the Law.

January 4, 2012
Effective Date

Sara Parker Pauley, Director, Department of Natural Resources

January 3, 2017
Expiration Date

John Madras, Director, Water Protection Program

FACILITY DESCRIPTION (continued):

Outfall #001 – POTW – SIC 4952

Legal Description: SE ¼, NE ¼, Sec. 2, T34N, R16W, Laclede County
UTM Coordinates: X= 530831, Y= 4173143
Receiving Stream: Dry Auglaize Creek (P)
First Classified Stream and ID: Dry Auglaize Creek (P) (01145)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10290109-0303)

Design population equivalent is 20,000.
Design flow is 2.6 million gallons per day
Actual flow was 2.4 million gallons per day
Design sludge production is 420 dry tons/year. Actual sludge production is 380 dry tons/year.

In-stream Monitoring S1

In-stream Monitoring, 50 yards upstream of Outfall 001
Legal Description: NE ¼, Sec. 2, T34N, R16W, Laclede County
UTM Coordinates: X= 530822, Y=4173170
First Classified Stream and ID: Dry Auglaize Creek (P) (01145)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10290109-0303)

In-stream Monitoring S2

In-stream Monitoring, at County Road Crossing
Legal Description: NE ¼, Sec. 30, T35N, R15W, Laclede County
UTM Coordinates: X= 533229, Y=4177398
First Classified Stream and ID: Dry Auglaize Creek (P) (01145)
USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10290109-0303)

A. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					PAGE NUMBER 3 of 10	
					PERMIT NUMBER MO-0089010	
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 upon issuance and remain in effect until expiration of the permit. Such discharges shall be controlled, limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:						
OUTFALL NUMBER AND EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
		DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
<u>Outfall #001</u>						
Flow	MGD	*		*	once/day	24 hr. total
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅ **	mg/L		15	10	twice/week	24 hr. comp.
Total Suspended Solids**	mg/L		20	15	twice/week	24 hr. comp.
pH – Units	SU	***		***	twice/week	grab
<i>Escherichia coli</i> (<i>E. coli</i>) (Note 1)	#/100mL	126		126	once/week	grab
Ammonia as N, Total (April 1 – September 30) (October 1 – March 31)	mg/L	3.1 7.5		1.6 3.7	twice/week	grab
Bis(2-ethylhexyl phthalate)	mg/L	0.014		0.0059	once/month	grab
Oil & Grease	mg/L	15		10	once/month	grab
Chromium (VI), Total Recoverable	µg/L	13.9		9.57	once/month	grab
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	31.7		14.6	once/month	grab
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	215		111	once/month	grab
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED <u>MONTHLY</u> ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE <u>February 28, 2012</u> . THERE SHALL BE NO DISCHARGE OF FLOATING SOLIDS OR VISIBLE FOAM IN OTHER THAN TRACE AMOUNTS.						
Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Test	% Survival	See Special Condition #10			twice/year	24 hr. comp.
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED <u>ANNUALLY</u> ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE <u>March 28, 2012</u> .						
B. STANDARD CONDITIONS						
IN ADDITION TO SPECIFIED CONDITIONS STATED HEREIN, THIS PERMIT IS SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED <u>Parts I, II, & III</u> STANDARD CONDITIONS DATED <u>October 1, 1980 and August 15, 1994</u> , AND HEREBY INCORPORATED AS THOUGH FULLY SET FORTH HEREIN.						

A. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS (continued)					PAGE NUMBER 4 of 10	
					PERMIT NUMBER MO-0089010	
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 upon issuance and remain in effect until expiration of the permit. Such discharges shall be controlled, limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:						
OUTFALL NUMBER AND EFFLUENT PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
		DAILY MAXIMUM	WEEKLY AVERAGE	MONTHLY AVERAGE	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
<u>Instream Monitoring (Site S1)</u>						
Ammonia as N, Total	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
<u>Instream Monitoring (Site S1)</u>						
pH – Units	SU	*		*	once/month	grab
Temperature	°C	*		*	once/month	grab
<u>Instream Monitoring (Site S2)</u>						
Ammonia as N, Total	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
Temperature	°C	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
pH – Units	SU	*		*	once/quarter ****	grab
MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED <u>QUARTERLY</u> ; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE <u>April 28, 2012</u> . THERE SHALL BE NO DISCHARGE OF FLOATING SOLIDS OR VISIBLE FOAM IN OTHER THAN TRACE AMOUNTS.						
B. STANDARD CONDITIONS						
IN ADDITION TO SPECIFIED CONDITIONS STATED HEREIN, THIS PERMIT IS SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED <u>Parts I, II & III</u> STANDARD CONDITIONS DATED <u>October 1, 1980 and August 15, 1994</u> , AND HEREBY INCORPORATED AS THOUGH FULLY SET FORTH HEREIN.						

A. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS (continued)

- * Monitoring requirement only.
- ** A 24-hour composite sample is composed of 48 aliquots (subsamples) collected at 30 minute intervals by an automatic sampling device.
- *** pH is measured in pH units and is not to be averaged. The pH is limited to the range of 6.5-9.0 pH units.
- **** Sample once per quarter in the months of February, May, August, and November.

Note 1 – Final effluent limits of 126 cfu per 100 ml as daily maximum and monthly average are applicable year round due to losing stream designation.

C. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

PAGE NUMBER 5 of 10

PERMIT NUMBER MO-0089010

The facility is required to meet a removal efficiency of 85% or more as a monthly average. The monitoring requirements shall become effective upon issuance and remain in effect until expiration of the permit. To determine removal efficiencies, the influent wastewater shall be monitored by the permittee as specified below:

SAMPLING LOCATION AND PARAMETER(S)	UNITS	MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
		MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
<u>Influent</u>			
Biochemical Oxygen Demand ₅	mg/L	once/quarter	24 hr. comp.
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	once/quarter	24 hr. comp.

MONITORING REPORTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY; THE FIRST REPORT IS DUE April 28, 2012.

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. 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.

The permit as modified or reissued under this paragraph shall also contain any other requirements of the Clean Water Act then applicable.

2. All outfalls must be clearly marked in the field.

3. Changes in Discharges of Toxic Substances

The permittee shall notify the Director as soon as it knows or has reason to believe:

- (a) That any activity has occurred or will occur which would result in the discharge of any toxic pollutant which is not limited in the permit, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels:"
 - (1) One hundred micrograms per liter (100 µg/L);
 - (2) Two hundred micrograms per liter (200 µg/L) for acrolein and acrylonitrile; five hundred micrograms per liter (500 µg/L) for 2,5 dinitrophenol and for 2-methyl-4, 6-dinitrophenol; and one milligram per liter (1 mg/L) for antimony;
 - (3) Five (5) times the maximum concentration value reported for the pollutant in the permit application;
 - (4) The level established in Part A of the permit by the Director.
- (b) That they have begun or expect to begin to use or manufacture as an intermediate or final product or byproduct any toxic pollutant, which was not reported in the permit application.

4. Water Quality Standards

- (a) 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.

5. Report as no-discharge when a discharge does not occur during the report period.

6. It is a violation of the Missouri Clean Water Law to fail to pay fees associated with this permit (644.055 RSMo).

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

7. The permittee shall comply with any applicable requirements listed in 10 CSR 20-9, unless the facility has received written notification that the Department has approved a modification to the requirements. The monitoring frequencies contained in this permit shall not be construed by the permittee as a modification of the monitoring frequencies listed in 10 CSR 20-9. If a modification of the monitoring frequencies listed in 10 CSR 20-9 is needed, the permittee shall submit a written request to the department for review and, if deemed necessary, approval.
8. The permittee shall continue to implement their program for maintenance and repair of the collection system. The permittee shall submit a report annually in December to the Southwest Regional Office with the Discharge and Monitoring reports that address measures taken to locate and eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow into the collection system serving the facility.
9. Bypasses are not authorized at this facility and are subject to 40 CFR 122.41(m). If a bypass occurs, the permittee shall report in accordance to 40 CFR 122.41(m)(3)(i), and with Standard Condition Part I, Section B, subsection 2.b. Bypasses are to be reported to the Southwest Regional Office.
10. At least one sign shall appear on the fence on each side of each facility. Minimum wording shall be "SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY – KEEP OUT", in letters at least 2 inches high.
11. 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.
12. An all-weather access road shall be provided from a public right-of-way to the treatment facility.
13. As required in 40 CFR 122.21 (j)(4) the permittee shall, as part of its renewal application for this permit, submit to the department a written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits under 40 CFR 403.5 (c)(1).
14. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Test shall be conducted as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACUTE WET TESTING FOR THIS PERMIT				
OUTFALL	AEC	FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE	MONTH
001	100%	Twice/year	24 hr. composite*	February and August

* A 24-hour composite sample is composed of 48 aliquots (subsamples) collected at 30 minute intervals by an automatic sampler.

Dilution Series							
AEC%	100% effluent	50% effluent	25% effluent	12.5% effluent	6.25% effluent	(Control) 100% upstream, if available	(Control) 100% Lab Water, also called synthetic water

(a) Test Schedule and Follow-Up Requirements

- (1) Perform a MULTIPLE-dilution acute WET test in the months and at the frequency specified above. For tests which are successfully passed, submit test results using the Department's WET test report form #MO-780-1899 along with complete copies of the test reports as received from the laboratory, including copies of chain-of-custody forms within 30 calendar days of availability to the WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102. If the effluent passes the test, do not repeat the test until the next test period.
 - a. Chemical and physical analysis of the upstream control and effluent sample shall occur immediately upon being received by the laboratory, prior to any manipulation of the effluent sample beyond preservation methods consistent with federal guidelines for WET testing that are required to stabilize the sample during shipping.
 - b. Any and all chemical or physical analysis of the effluent sample performed in conjunction with the WET test shall be performed at the 100% Effluent concentration in addition to analysis performed upon any other effluent concentration.
 - c. All chemical analyses included in the Missouri Department of Natural Resources WET test report form #MO-780-1899 shall be performed and results shall be recorded in the appropriate field of the report form.
- (2) The WET test will be considered a failure if mortality observed in effluent concentrations equal to or less than the AEC is significantly different (at the 95% confidence level; $p = 0.05$) than that observed in the upstream receiving-water control sample. Where upstream receiving water is not available, synthetic laboratory control water may be used.
- (3) All failing test results along with complete copies of the test reports as received from the laboratory, INCLUDING THOSE TESTS CONDUCTED UNDER CONDITION (3) BELOW, shall be reported to the WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102 within 14 calendar days of the availability of the results.

- (4) If the effluent fails the test for BOTH test species, a multiple dilution test shall be performed for BOTH test species within 30 calendar days and biweekly thereafter (for storm water, tests shall be performed on the next and subsequent storm water discharges as they occur, but not less than 7 days apart) until one of the following conditions are met: Note: Written request regarding single species multiple dilution accelerated testing will be address by THE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM on a case by case basis.
- (i) THREE CONSECUTIVE MULTIPLE-DILUTION TESTS PASS. No further tests need to be performed until next regularly scheduled test period.
 - (ii) A TOTAL OF THREE MULTIPLE-DILUTION TESTS FAIL.

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

- (5) Follow-up tests do not negate an initial failed test.
- (6) The permittee shall submit a summary of all test results for the test series along with complete copies of the test reports as received from the laboratory to the WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102 within 14 calendar days of the third failed test.
- (7) Additionally, the following shall apply upon failure of the third follow up MULTIPLE DILUTION test The permittee should contact THE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM within 14 calendar days from availability of the test results to ascertain as to whether a TIE or TRE is appropriate. If the permittee does not contact THE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM upon the third follow up test failure, a toxicity identification evaluation (TIE) or toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) is automatically triggered. The permittee shall submit a plan for conducting a TIE or TRE to the WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM within 60 calendar days of the date of the automatic trigger or DNR's direction to perform either a TIE or TRE. This plan must be approved by DNR before the TIE or TRE is begun. A schedule for completing the TIE or TRE shall be established in the plan approval.
- (8) Upon DNR's approval, the TIE/TRE schedule may be modified if toxicity is intermittent during the TIE/TRE investigations. A revised WET test schedule may be established by DNR for this period.
- (9) If a previously completed TIE has clearly identified the cause of toxicity, additional TIEs will not be required as long as effluent characteristics remain essentially unchanged and the permittee is proceeding according to a DNR approved schedule to complete a TRE and reduce toxicity. Regularly scheduled WET testing as required in the permit, without the follow-up requirements, will be required during this period.
- (10) When WET test sampling is required to run over one DMR period, each DMR report shall contain a copy of the Department's WET test report form that was generated during the reporting period.
- (11) Submit a concise summary in tabular format of all WET test results with the annual report.

(b) Test Conditions

- (1) Test Type: Acute Static non-renewal
- (2) All tests, including repeat tests for previous failures, shall include both test species listed below unless approved by the department on a case by case basis.
- (3) Test species: Ceriodaphnia dubia and Pimephales promelas (fathead minnow). Organisms used in WET testing shall come from cultures reared for the purpose of conducting toxicity tests and cultured in a manner consistent with the most current USEPA guidelines. All test animals shall be cultured as described in the most current edition of Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms.
- (4) Test period: 48 hours at the "Allowable Effluent Concentration" (AEC) specified above.
- (5) Upstream receiving stream water shall be used as dilution water. If upstream water is unavailable or if mortality in the upstream water exceeds 10%, "reconstituted" water will be used as dilution water. Procedures for generating reconstituted water will be supplied by the MDNR upon request.
- (6) Tests will be run with 100% receiving-stream water (if available), collected upstream of the outfall at a point beyond any influence of the effluent, and reconstituted water.
- (7) If reconstituted-water control mortality for a test species exceeds 10%, the entire test will be rerun.
- (8) If upstream control mortality exceeds 10%, the entire test will be rerun using reconstituted water as the dilutant.
- (9) Whole-effluent-toxicity test shall be consistent with the most current edition of Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms

15. The permittee shall implement and enforce its approved pretreatment program in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 403. The approved pretreatment program is hereby incorporated by reference.

The permittee shall submit to the Department on or before March 31st of each year a report briefly describing its pretreatment activities during the previous calendar year. At a minimum, the report shall include the following:

- (a) An updated list of the Permittee's Industrial Users, including their names and addresses, or a list of deletions and additions keyed to a previously submitted list. The Permittee shall provide a brief explanation of each deletion. This list shall identify which Industrial Users are subject to categorical pretreatment Standards and specify which Standards are applicable to each Industrial User. The list shall indicate which Industrial Users are subject to local standards that are more stringent than the categorical Pretreatment Standards. The Permittee shall also list the Industrial Users that are subject only to local Requirements;
- (b) A summary of the status of Industrial User compliance over the reporting period;

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

- (c) A summary of compliance and enforcement activities (including inspections) conducted by the Permittee during the reporting period; and
- (d) Any other relevant information requested by the Department.

16. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING CONDITIONS

- (a) In-stream samples should be taken at the location(s) specified on page 2 of this permit. In the event that a safe, accessible location is not present at this location, a suitable location can be negotiated with the department. Samples should be taken at least four feet from the bank or from the middle of the stream (whichever is less) and 6-inches below the surface. The upstream receiving water sample should be collected at a point upstream from any influence of the effluent, where the water is visibly flowing down stream.
- (b) When conducting in-stream monitoring, the permittee shall record observations that include: the time of day, weather conditions, unusual stream/lake characteristics (e.g., septic conditions, algae growth, etc.), the stream segment (e.g., riffle, pool or run) or the lake depth from where the sample was collected. These observations shall be submitted with the sample results.
- (c) Samples shall not be collected from areas with especially turbulent flow, still water or from the stream bank, unless these conditions are representative of the stream reach or no other areas are available for sample collection. Sampling should not be made when significant precipitation has occurred recently. The sampling event should be terminated and rescheduled if any of the following conditions occur:
 - If turbidity in the stream increases notably; or
 - If rainfall over the past two weeks exceeds 2.5 inches or exceeds 1 inch in the last 24 hours
- (d) Always use the correct sampling technique and handling procedure specified for the parameter of interest. Please refer to the latest edition of Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater for further discussion of proper sampling techniques. All analyses must be conducted in accordance with an approved EPA method. Meters shall be calibrated immediately (within 1 hour) prior to the sampling event.
- (e) To obtain accurate measurements, D.O., temperature and pH analyses should be performed on-site in the receiving stream where possible. However, due to high flow conditions, access, etc., it may be necessary to collect a sample in a bucket or other container. When this is necessary, care must be taken not to aerate the sample upon collection. If for any reason samples must be collected from an alternate site from the one listed in the permit, the permittee shall report the location with the sample results.
- (f) Dissolved oxygen measurements are to be taken during the period from one hour prior to sunrise to one and one-half hour after sunrise.
- (g) Please contact the department if you need additional instructions or assistance.

17. Sewer Extension Authority

- (a) The Department has approved the Sewer Extension Program for City of Lebanon to regulate and approve construction of sanitary sewers which are tributary to this wastewater treatment plant.
- (b) The approval of the Sewer Extension Program may be modified or revoked by the Department if the sewage collection, transportation, and receiving treatment facility reach their respective design capacity, or if the Department determines that this program is causing or contributing to chronic non-compliance of the receiving treatment facility, or if the permittee fails to follow the terms and conditions of the submitted and approved program.
- (c) The Sewer Extension Program Special Condition may be reopened and modified and reissued, or alternatively revoked to incorporate new or modified conditions to the sewer construction permit authority, if information or regulation or statute indicates changes are necessary to assure compliance with Missouri's Clean Water Law and associated regulations.
- (d) If items b or c of the Sewer Extension Program occurs, the permittee will be notified to any modification to this operating permit.
- (e) The Permittee, as part of their Sewer Extension Program, shall submit an annual report by December 31st of each year, to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Southwest Regional Office. The report shall include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - (1) A list of the name of each individual project and their respective:
 - (2) Length of sewer and force main
 - (3) Capacity of the lift stations constructed under the sewer extension (if applicable);
 - (4) Inspections made of the construction and the findings of each;
 - (5) Results of leakage and deflection test;
 - (6) Population or number of lots to be served by this extension; and
 - (7) Type of wastewater (i.e., domestic or industrial);
 - (8) An annual summary of

D. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

1. Number of construction permits issued
 2. Number of inspections completed
 3. Number of sewer lines tested and/or inspected with Closed Circuit Television
 4. Number of warnings, violations, or notices given
 5. Capacity remaining at the treatment plant
- ii. A list of people reviewing and inspecting the sewer extensions.
- b. The Sewer Extension Authority is valid the length of this operating permit. Upon renewal of the permit, the Sewer Extension Authority for City of Lebanon will be reevaluated.

**Missouri Department of Natural Resources
 FACT SHEET
 FOR THE PURPOSE OF RENEWAL
 OF
 MO-0089010
 CITY OF LEBANON WWTF**

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 storm water 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 Major

Part I – Facility Information

Facility Type: POTW
 Facility SIC Code(s): 4952

Facility Description:

The existing facility consists of fine screening, influent pump station, grit removal, three aeration basins, sand filters, four clarifies, , UV disinfection, sludge storage and dewatering. In 2010, the facility added a new influent pump station, headworks, oxidation ditch, 80-foot diameter final clarifier, and UV disinfection. The current facility remains permitted at 2.6 MGD with an actual flow of 2.4 MGD

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

- No.

Application Date: 04/28/11
 Expiration Date: 09/28/11
 Last Inspection: 12/01/09 In Compliance ; Non-Compliance

OUTFALL(S) TABLE:

OUTFALL	DESIGN FLOW (CFS)	TREATMENT LEVEL	EFFLUENT TYPE	DISTANCE TO CLASSIFIED SEGMENT (MI)
001	2.6	Advanced	Domestic	0.0

Outfall #001 -

Legal Description: NW ¼, SE ¼, NE ¼, Sec. 2, T34N, R16W, Laclede County
 UTM Coordinates: X=530831, Y= 4173143
 Receiving Stream: Dry Auglaize Creek (P)
 First Classified Stream and ID: Dry Auglaize Creek (P) (01145)
 USGS Basin & Sub-watershed No.: (10290109-0303)
 Design population equivalent is 20,000.

Receiving Water Body's Water Quality & Facility Performance History:

The 1998 303(d) list for Dry Auglaize Creek noted biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and total suspended solids as the pollutants. City of Lebanon was identified as the source of the pollutant. The wastewater treatment system was not the direct cause of the impairment but rather the a documented history of sanitary sewer overflows, where wastewater in the sewer pipes overflows out of manholes were getting released into Dry Auglaize Creek. The department opted to correct the impairments in Dry Auglaize Creek through permit limits and a schedule of completion of system upgrades and improvements. The City of Lebanon is party to a consent decree with the Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Missouri. The EPA approved the permit in lieu of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).

The discharge monitoring data in the table below are the exceedences of the limitations from January 2005 to March 2011. The following as extracted from our Missouri Clean Water Information System (MOCWIS):

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Parameter</u>
Limit value exceeded	12/31/2008	Ammonia (as N)
Limit value exceeded	08/31/2010	Ammonia (as N)
Limit value exceeded	09/30/2010	Ammonia (as N)
Limit value exceeded	07/31/2006	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate
Limit value exceeded	11/30/2008	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate
Limit value exceeded	12/31/2008	BOD, 5-day
Limit value exceeded	04/30/2010	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	05/31/2010	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	09/30/2010	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	11/30/2010	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	01/31/2011	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	02/28/2011	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	03/31/2011	Copper, total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	01/31/2005	Fecal Coliform
Limit value exceeded	12/31/2007	Fecal Coliform
Limit value exceeded	10/31/2009	Fecal Coliform
Limit value exceeded	05/31/2010	Fecal Coliform
Limit value exceeded	04/30/2006	Oil and grease
Limit value exceeded	03/31/2009	Oil and grease
Limit value exceeded	04/30/2010	Zinc (Zn), total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	05/31/2010	Zinc (Zn), total recoverable
Limit value exceeded	12/31/2010	Zinc (Zn), total recoverable

The facility received notice of violations for discharge of raw and/or untreated wastewater to waters of the state (sanitary sewer system bypasses) in April 2006, April 2007, December 2008, January 2010, and February 2010. City is under federal consent decree from Sept 04.

Comments:

The facility has a planned expansion. The expanded design flow will be 3.5 MGD and peak flow design of 12 MGD. The facility was required by the January 8, 2008, permit condition to submit plans and specifications for a third oxidation ditch within 30 days of the plant reaching an average flow of 2.45 MGD for 6 months. The consent decree between EPA and the City of Lebanon did not allow for the antidegradation review in the time schedule; therefore, the city chose to build the third oxidation ditch as required by consent decree and the construction permit was issued May 2009. To use the existing capacity, Phase 2 adds 1) two supplemental mixers in the two oxidation ditches, 2) replaces the existing filters with new filters, and 3) adds cascade step aeration and, 4) likely, an aerobic digester.

Part II – Operator Certification Requirements

As per [10 CSR 20-6.010(8) Terms and Conditions of a Permit], permittees shall operate and maintain facilities to comply with the Missouri Clean Water Law and applicable permit conditions and regulations. Operators or supervisors of operations at regulated wastewater treatment facilities shall be certified in accordance with [10 CSR 20-9.020(2)] and any other applicable state law or regulation. As per [10 CSR 20-9.010(2)(A)], requirements for operation by certified personnel shall apply to all wastewater treatment systems, if applicable, as listed below:

Check boxes below that are applicable to the facility;

- Owned or operated by or for:
 - Municipalities
Each of the above entities are only applicable if they have a Population Equivalent greater than two hundred (200) and/or fifty (50) or more service connections.
- Department required:
The Department requires this facility to retain the services of a certified operator due to having a population Equivalent greater than two hundred (200) and/or fifty (50) or more service connections.State regulations require a certified operator. Facility score was 61.6 points

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

Operator’s Name: Richard C. Shockley
Certification Number: 7900
Certification Level: A

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

- This facility does currently retain an operator with the correct level of certification required to operate the wastewater treatment facility.

Part III – Receiving Stream Information

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.

Losing [10 CSR 20-7.015(4)]:

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(3)].

RECEIVING STREAM(S) TABLE:

WATERBODY NAME	CLASS	WBID	DESIGNATED USES*	8-DIGIT HUC	EDU**
Dry Auglaize Creek (losing)	P	1145	LWW, AQL, WBC(A)***	10290109	Ozark/Osage Drainage

* - Irrigation (IRR), Livestock & Wildlife Watering (LWW), Protection of Warm Water Aquatic Life and Human Health-Fish Consumption (AQL), Cool Water Fishery(CLF), Cold Water Fishery (CDF), Whole Body Contact Recreation (WBC), Secondary Contact Recreation (SCR), Drinking Water Supply (DWS), Industrial (IND), Groundwater (GRW).
** - Ecological Drainage Unit
*** - UAA has not been conducted.

RECEIVING STREAM(S) LOW-FLOW VALUES TABLE:

RECEIVING STREAM (U, C, P)	LOW-FLOW VALUES (CFS)		
	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
Dry Auglaize Creek (P)	0.1	0.1	1.0

MIXING CONSIDERATIONS TABLE:

MIXING ZONE (CFS) [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(A)4.B.(II)(a)]			ZONE OF INITIAL DILUTION (CFS) [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(A)4.B.(II)(b)]		
1Q10	7Q10	30Q10	1Q10	7Q10	30Q10
0.025	0.025	0.25	0.0025	0.0025	0.025

RECEIVING STREAM MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:

Receiving water monitoring requirements recommended at this time. Dry Auglaize Creek is on the 2002 303 (D) listing for unknown pollutant from the Lebanon WWTF. The receiving water has experienced reduced biodiversity downstream of the facility that is likely the result of low dissolved oxygen and reduced habitat due to increased BOD and TSS loading to the stream from chronic bypassing from the sanitary sewer system to the facility. The following are recommended...

The permit in-lieu-of TMDL contained these monitoring sites. After review of the instream sampling data, we noticed the following:

- 1) The monitoring frequency for pH and temperature is not sufficient to characterize ammonia criteria. Therefore, staff concluded that monthly sampling needs to be conducted for pH and temperature.
- 2) Dissolved oxygen sampling needs to indicate that sampling should be conducted one hour before sunrise to one and one half hour after to sunrise.

At this time, we are modifying the instream monitoring requirements.

For instream monitoring at site S2, the ammonia concentrations averaged 0.04 mg/L and dissolved oxygen, 9.36 mg/L from 11-2006 to 2-2011.

For instream monitoring at site S1, the ammonia concentrations averaged 0.38 mg/L and dissolved oxygen, 8.31 mg/L from 11-2006 to 2-2011.

Site 01. (Upstream)

PARAMETER(S)	SAMPLING FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE	LOCATION
Dissolved Oxygen mg/L	Once/quarter	Grab	Instream Monitoring, 50 yards upstream of Outfall 001. NE ¼, Sec. 2, T34N, R16W X= 0530827, Y=4173138
pH Units	Once/month	Grab	
Temperature (F)	Once/month	Grab	
Ammonia as N mg/L	Once/quarter	Grab	

Site 02. (Downstream)

PARAMETER(S)	SAMPLING FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE	LOCATION
Dissolved Oxygen mg/L	Once/quarter	Grab	Instream Monitoring, at County Road Crossing NE ¼, Sec. 30, T35N, R15W X= 0533229, Y=4177398
pH Units	Once/quarter	Grab	
Temperature (F)	Once/quarter	Grab	
Ammonia as N mg/L	Once/quarter	Grab	

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

ANTI-BACKSLIDING:

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

- Limitations in this operating permit for the reissuance of this permit conform to the anti-backsliding provisions of Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR Part 122.44.

ANTIDegradation:

In accordance with Missouri's Water Quality Standard [10 CSR 20-7.031(2)], 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.

- Renewal no degradation proposed and no further review necessary.

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://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/pub/index.html>, items WQ422 through WQ449.

- Permittee land applies biosolids in accordance with Standard Conditions III and a Department approved biosolids management plan.

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.

Applicable ;

The permittee/facility is currently under enforcement action due to facility failure to prevent a bypass on numerous occasions in 2010 and 2011. City is under federal consent decree from Sept 04.

PRETREATMENT PROGRAM:

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

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

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

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

Applicable ;

This permittee has an approved pretreatment program in accordance with the requirements of [40 CFR Part 403] and [10 CSR 20-6.100] and is expected to implement and enforce its approved 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)(iii)] if the permit writer determines that any give 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.

Applicable ;

A RPA was conducted on appropriate parameters. Please see **APPENDIX B – RPA RESULTS**.

REMOVAL EFFICIENCY:

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

Applicable ;

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

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

Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are defined as an untreated or partially treated sewage release are considered bypassing under state regulation [10 CSR 20-2.010(11)] and should not be confused with the federal definition of bypass. SSO's have a variety of causes including blockages, line breaks, and sewer defects that allow excess storm water and ground water to (1) enter and overload the collection system, and (2) overload the treatment facility. Additionally, SSO's can be also be caused by lapses in sewer system operation and maintenance, inadequate sewer design and construction, power failures, and vandalism. SSOs also include overflows out of manholes and onto city streets, sidewalks, and other terrestrial locations.

Additionally, Missouri RSMo §644.026.1 mandates that the Department require proper maintenance and operation of treatment facilities and sewer systems and proper disposal of residual waste from all such facilities.

- In accordance with Missouri RSMo §644.026.1.(15) and 40 CFR Part 122.41(e), the permittee is required to develop and/or implement a program for maintenance and repair of the collection system and shall be required in this operating permit by either means of a Special Condition or Schedule of Compliance. In addition, the Department considers the development of this program as an implementation of this condition. Additionally, 40 CFR Part 403.3(o) defines a POTW to include any device and systems used in the storage, treatment, recycling and reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of liquid nature. It also includes sewers, pipes, and other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW Treatment Plant.

At this time, the Department recommends the US EPA's Guide for Evaluating Capacity, Management, Operation and Maintenance (CMOM) Programs At Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems (Document # EPA 305-B-05-002). The CMOM identifies some of the criteria used by the EPA to evaluate a collection system's management, operation, and maintenance and was intended for use by the EPA, state, regulated community, and/or third party entities. The CMOM is applicable to small, medium, and large systems; both public and privately owned; and both regional and satellite collection systems. The CMOM does not substitute for the Clean Water Act, the Missouri Clean Water Law, and both federal and state regulations, as it is not a regulation.

SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE (SOC):

A schedule of remedial measures included in a permit, including 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.

Not Applicable ;

This permit does not contain a SOC.

STORM WATER 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 storm water 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 Storm Water 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 storm water discharges.

Not Applicable ;

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.

Not Applicable ;

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.

Applicable ;

Wasteload allocations were calculated where applicable 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
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.

Not Applicable ;

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

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS:

Per [10 CSR 20-7.031(3)], 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:

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

Applicable .

Under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) §101(a)(3), requiring WET testing is reasonably appropriate for site-specific Missouri State Operating Permits for discharges to waters of the state issued under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). WET testing is also required by 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1). WET testing ensures that the provisions in the 10 CSR 20-6.010(8)(A)7. and the Water Quality Standards 10 CSR 20-7.031(3)(D),(F),(G),(I)2.A & B are being met. Under [10 CSR 20-6.010(8)(A)4], the Department may require other terms and conditions that it deems necessary to assure compliance with the Clean Water Act and related regulations of the Missouri Clean Water Commission. In addition the following MCWL apply: §§644.051.3 requires the Department to set permit conditions that comply with the MCWL and CWA; 644.051.4 specifically references toxicity as an item we must consider in writing permits (along with water quality-based effluent limits, pretreatment, etc...); and 644.051.5 is the basic authority to require testing conditions. WET test will be required by all facilities meeting the following criteria:

Facility is a designated Major.

Facility has Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations for toxic substances (other than NH₃)

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, which includes blending, 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 20-2.010(11) defines a bypass as the diversion of wastewater from any portion of wastewater treatment facility or sewer system 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.

- Not Applicable, this facility does not bypass.

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

Applicable .

(Receiving water body’s name) or (1st classified water body’s name) is listed on the (YEAR) Missouri 303(d) List for (pollutant).

- This facility is considered to be a source of or has the potential to contribute to the above listed pollutant(s).

Part V – Effluent Limits Determination

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 LIMITATIONS
FLOW	GPD	1	*		*	N	
BOD ₅	MG/L	1		15	10	N	
TSS	MG/L	1		20	15	N	
pH (S.U.)	SU	1	6.5–9.0		6.5–9.0	Y	6.0-9.0
AMMONIA AS N (APR 1 – SEPT 30)	MG/L	2/3/5	3.1		1.4	Y	NA/1.6
AMMONIA AS N (OCT 1 – MAR 31)	MG/L	2/3/5	7.5		3.7	N	
<i>Escherichia coli (E. coli)</i>	***	1/2	126		126	Y	NEW
OIL & GREASE (MG/L)	MG/L	1	15		10	N	
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXL PHTHALATE)	MG/L	2/3	0.014		0.0059	Y	0.006/NA
CHROMIUM (VI), TOTAL RECOVERABLE	µg/L	2/3	13.9		9.57	Y	MONITORING ONLY
COPPER, TOTAL RECOVERABLE	µg/L	2/3	31.7		14.6	Y	0.021/0.01
ZINC, TOTAL RECOVERABLE	µg/L	2/3	215		111	Y	0.192/0.089
TOTAL PHOSPHORUS AND TOTAL NITROGEN	THE DEPARTMENT IS CURRENTLY DEVELOPING AN IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE TO ADDRESS NUTRIENT CRITERIA THAT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN 10 CSR 20-7.031 4(N)						
WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET) TEST	% Survival	11	Please see WET Test in the Derivation and Discussion Section below.				

* - Monitoring requirement only.
*** - # of colonies/100mL; the Monthly Average for *E. coli* is a geometric mean.
**** - Parameter not previously established in previous state operating permit.

Basis for Limitations Codes:

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

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).** Effluent limitations from the previous state operating permit have been reassessed and verified that they are still protective of the receiving stream’s Water Quality. Therefore, effluent limitations have been retained from previous state operating permit, please see the **APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF WATERS OF THE STATE** sub-section of the **Receiving Stream Information**.
- **Total Suspended Solids (TSS).** Effluent limitations from the previous state operating permit have been reassessed and verified that they are still protective of the receiving stream’s Water Quality. Therefore, effluent limitations have been retained from previous state operating permit, please see the **APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF WATERS OF THE STATE** sub-section of the **Receiving Stream Information**.

POC	Count	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Standard Deviation	CV
BOD	53	16.000	2.00	5.39	3.20	0.593
TSS	53	19.000	1.00	7.65	5.48	0.716

- **pH.** Effluent limitations have been retained from previous state operating permit, please see the **APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF WATERS OF THE STATE** sub-section of the **Receiving Stream Information.** pH shall be maintained in the range from 6.5 to nine (6.5– 9) standard units [10 CSR 20-7.015(8)(A)2.].
- **Total Ammonia Nitrogen.** Early Life Stages Present Total Ammonia Nitrogen criteria apply [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(B)7.C. & Table B3] default pH 7.8 SU Background sample taken from S1--total ammonia nitrogen = 0.38 mg/L. **The parameter has reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B.**

Ammonia limitations developed from ammonia water quality standards criteria that use site-specific pH and temperature will be less stringent than limitations in the current permit. pH and temperature data that were collected from S1 are insufficient for the purpose of developing site-specific ammonia criteria. In a letter dated March 12, 2008, from William Spratlin, Region 7 EPA approved a permit in-lieu-of a total maximum daily load (TMDL). The EPA Region 7 4B Rationale factsheet indicated that the ammonia permit limitation will ensure that the WQS for dissolved oxygen of 5 mg/L, and the narrative standards for TSS will be met. Essentially, the current permit has the ammonia as nitrogen WLA that is protective of water quality standards for this facility. The current permit has limitations that are more protective of water quality than the limitations developed from the using site-specific criteria; therefore, staff has provided ammonia limitation calculations below.

Current Permit in-lieu-of TMDL limitations:

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

Background total ammonia nitrogen = 0.01 mg/L (Default).

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)1.5 - (0.025 * 0.01)) / 4.0$

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

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)12.1 - (0.0025 * 0.01)) / 4.0$

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

$LTA_c = 1.5 \text{ mg/L (0.780)} = \mathbf{1.2 \text{ mg/L}}$ [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: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)3.1 - (0.025 * 0.01)) / 4.0$

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

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)12.1 - (0.0025 * 0.01)) / 4.0$

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

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

The average monthly for ammonia has changed to reflect the correct method to calculate average monthly limitations using a 30-day average rather than a 4-day average.

- **Escherichia coli (E. coli).** Discharges to losing streams shall not exceed 126 per 100 ml as a Daily Maximum and Monthly Average at any time, as per 10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(C).
- **Oil & Grease.** Conventional pollutant, effluent limitation for protection of aquatic life; 10 mg/L monthly average, 15 mg/L daily maximum.
- **Bis(2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate.** Protection of Human Health Fish Consumption [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A] is listed as 5.9 µg/L and the groundwater standard is 6 µg/L. Both of these criteria apply because Dry Auglaize Creek is classified as losing and has aquatic life beneficial uses. The parameter has reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B. Therefore, the following wasteload allocation process applies for human health fish consumption protection:

$$WLA: C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)5.9 - (0.025 * 0.0))/4.0$$

$$C_e = 5.9 \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$AML = WLA = 5.9 \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$MDL = WLA * 2.37 = 14.0 \mu\text{g/L}$$

[CV = 2.99, 95th Percentile], n=1 sample per month

- **Phenols.** Protection of Aquatic Life [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A] is listed as 100 µg/L. The parameter has no reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B. This pollutant has been exceeded one monthly effluent analysis from January 2005 to October 2010 and it was below the aquatic life numeric criteria for phenols. Previously, “monitoring only” will be no longer required.
- **Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen.** Lake of the Ozarks is listed on the 2010 303 (d) listing for impairments caused by nutrients. For discharges to watersheds of lakes, the department is currently developing an implementation procedure to address nutrient criteria that has been established in 10 CSR 20-7.031 4(N). Upon completion of the procedure, the city may be required to monitor for TP and TN upon the completion of construction. Therefore, the city should make plans to sample for these two parameters for their information until a procedure is implemented or a total maximum daily load for nutrients is established for the Lake of the Ozarks.

Metals

Effluent limitations for total recoverable metals were developed using methods and procedures outlined in the “Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxic Controls” (EPA/505/2-90-001) and “The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating A Total Recoverable Permit Limit From A Dissolved Criterion” (EPA 823-B-96-007). General warm-water fishery criteria apply and a water hardness of 198 mg/L is used in the conversion below.

Due to the absence of contemporaneous effluent and instream data for total recoverable metals, dissolved metals, hardness, and total suspended solids with which to calculate metals translators, partitioning between the dissolved and adsorbed phases was assumed to be minimal (Section 5.7.3, EPA/505/2-90-001). Freshwater criteria conversion factors for dissolved metals were used as the metals translator as recommended in guidance (Section 1.3, 1.5.3, and Table 1, EPA 823-B-96-007). If concurrent site-specific data for total recoverable metals, dissolved metals, hardness, and total suspended solids are provided to the department, partitioning evaluations may be considered and site-specific translators developed.

METAL	CONVERSION FACTORS	
	ACUTE	CHRONIC
Chromium III	0.316	0.860
Chromium VI	NA	NA
Copper	0.810	0.810
Zinc	0.980	0.980

Values calculated using equation found in Section 1.3 of EPA 823-B-96-007 and hardness = 198 mg/L.

- **Copper (Cu), Total Recoverable.** Protection of Aquatic Life CCC = 15.9 µg/L, CMC = 21.6 µg/L [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]; Background Cu = 2.5 µg/L. The parameter has reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B.

$$\text{CMC} = e^{(0.9422 \cdot \ln(198) - 1.7003)} \cdot 0.960 = 25.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$\text{CCC} = e^{(0.8545 \cdot \ln(198) - 1.702)} \cdot 0.960 = 16.1 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

In July 2010, Water Protection Program Staff reviewed and approved the copper translator report that Geosyntec Consultants prepared on behalf of the City of Lebanon Wastewater Treatment Plant. The report presented data for dissolved and total copper and water hardness that was collected from Dry Auglaize Creek 0.25 miles downstream of the facility’s main outfall. The number and frequency of the samples are appropriate and conform to the quality assurance project plan (QAPP). The resultant site-specific translator [0.81= Cu dissolved/Cu total as a geometric mean] is adequate and protective of water quality in Dry Auglaize Creek. The default translator that is found in state Water Quality Standards Regulations is 0.960.

$$C \text{ (Chronic)} = \text{CCC}/\text{CF} = 16.1/0.81 = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C \text{ (Acute)} = \text{CMC}/\text{CF} = 25.6/0.81 = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)19.9 - (0.025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)31.6 - (0.0025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

$\text{LTA}_c = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.476) = 9.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$ [CV = 0.71, 99th Percentile]
 $\text{LTA}_a = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.277) = \mathbf{8.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}}$ [CV = 0.71, 99th Percentile]

MDL = 8.8 µg/L * 3.60 = 31.7 µg/L [CV = 0.71, 99th Percentile]
AML = 8.8 µg/L * 1.66 = 14.6 µg/L [CV = 0.71, 95th Percentile, n = 4]

- **Chromium III, Total Recoverable.** Upon review of discharge monitoring data and based upon reasonable potential analysis in Appendix B, this parameter should be removed from the permit. Chromium III was detected five times out of 53 samples and was always below the water quality standards for AQL. Previously, “monitoring only” will be no longer required.

- **Chromium VI, Total Dissolved.** Protection of Aquatic Life CCC = 10 µg/L, CMC = 15 µg/L [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]; Background Zn = 2.5 µg/L. The parameter has reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B.

$$C \text{ (Chronic)} = \text{CCC}/\text{CF} = 10/0.98 = 10.4 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C \text{ (Acute)} = \text{CMC}/\text{CF} = 15/0.98 = 15.3 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)10.4 - (0.025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 10.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)15.3 - (0.0025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 15.4 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

$\text{LTA}_c = 10.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.735) = 7.72 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$ [CV = 0.27, 99th Percentile]
 $\text{LTA}_a = 15.4 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.555) = \mathbf{8.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}}$ [CV = 0.27, 99th Percentile]

MDL = 7.72 µg/L * 1.80 = 13.9 µg/L [CV = 0.27, 99th Percentile]
AML = 7.72 µg/L * 1.24 = 9.57 µg/L [CV = 0.27, 95th Percentile, n = 4]

- **Zinc (Zn), Total Recoverable.** Protection of Aquatic Life CCC = 209.5 µg/L, CMC = 209.5 µg/L [10 CSR 20-7.031, Table A]; Background Zn = 2.5 µg/L. The parameter has reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards as shown in Appendix B.

$$\text{CMC} = e^{(0.8473 \cdot \ln(198) + 0.884)} \cdot 0.98 = 209.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$\text{CMC} = e^{(0.8473 \cdot \ln(198) + 0.884)} \cdot 0.98 = 209.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C \text{ (Chronic)} = \text{CCC}/\text{CF} = 209.5/0.98 = 213.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C \text{ (Acute)} = \text{CMC}/\text{CF} = 209.5/0.98 = 213.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)213.7 - (0.025 \cdot 2.5)) / 4.0$
 $C_e = 214.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)213.7 - (0.0025 \cdot 2.5)) / 4.0$
 $C_e = 214.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

$\text{LTA}_c = 214.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.547) = 117.4 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$ [CV = 0.56, 99th Percentile]
 $\text{LTA}_a = 214.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.339) = \mathbf{72.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}}$ [CV = 0.56, 99th Percentile]

MDL = 72.8 µg/L * (2.95) = 215 µg/L [CV = 0.56, 99th Percentile]
AML = 72.8 µg/L * (1.52) = 111 µg/L [CV = 0.56, 95th Percentile, n = 4]

The water quality standards have changed for zinc since the calculation of the limitations in the current permit; therefore, this will not be considered backsliding.

- **WET Test.** WET Testing schedules and intervals are established in accordance with the Department’s Permit Manual; Section 5.2 *Effluent Limits / WET Testing for Compliance Bio-monitoring*. It is recommended that WET testing be conducted during the period of lowest stream flow.

Acute

No less than **TWICE/YEAR:**

- Facility is subject to production processes alterations throughout the year.
- Facility handles large quantities of toxic substances, or substances that are toxic in large amounts.
- Facility has been granted seasonal relief of numeric limitations.

Acute and/or Chronic Allowable Effluent Concentrations (AECs) for facilities that discharge to unclassified, Class C, Class P (with default Mixing Considerations), or Lakes [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(A)4.B.(IV)(b)] are 100%, 50%, 25%, 12.5%, & 6.25%.

$$\text{Acute AEC\%} = ((\text{design flow}_{\text{cfs}} + \text{ZID}_{7\text{Q}10}) / \text{design flow}_{\text{cfs}})^{-1} \times 100 = 100\%$$

- **Minimum Sampling and Reporting Frequency Requirements.** Sampling and reporting frequency requirements have been retained from previous state operating permit.

In accordance with 10 CSR 20-7.015(8), the Department has developed a minimum sampling based on this facility’s design flow.

$$\text{DF} = 2.6 \text{ MGD} = 2,600,000 \text{ gpd} \div 25,000 \text{ gpd/ sample per year} = 104 \text{ samples per year}$$

$$104 \text{ samples per year} \div 12 \text{ months per year} = 8.7 \text{ samples per month}$$

$$8.7 \text{ samples per month.}$$

PART VI: Finding of Affordability

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.

Not Applicable;

The Department is not required to determine findings of affordability because the facility is not a **combined or separate sanitary sewer system or a publically-owned treatment works.**

Applicable; The Department is required to determine findings of affordability because the permit applies to a **combined or separate sanitary sewer system or a publically-owned treatment works.**

Finding of affordability - The department has made a reasonable search for empirical data indicating the permit is affordable. The search consisted of a review of department records that might contain economic data on the community, a review of information provided by the applicant as part of the application, and public comments received in response to public notices of this draft permit. If the empirical cost data was used by the permit writer, this data may consist of median household income, any other ongoing projects that the Department has knowledge, and other demographic financial information that the community provided as contemplated by Section 44.145.3.

The department is hereby making a finding based from the following facts:

1) The applicant states that the terms and conditions are affordable for the community.

OR; This permit action was taken at the discretion of the facility, therefore the department assumes the applicant already determined it is affordable;

2) The permit action is taken at the discretion of the system itself (e.g., sewer extension construction permits, or the relocation of an outfall in lieu of otherwise upgrading a system in order to comply with a permit issued to July 11, 2011);

3) This permit contains no new or expanded terms and conditions;

4) The department is not aware of any significant economic impacts this permit would cause on distressed populations;

5) No comments indication such impact were received during the public comment period on the draft permit;

6) The department is not aware of any other more cost effective wastewater treatment options that would achieve the required effluent quality;

7) The Facility Plan on the construction permit contained an affordability finding;

8) The applicant provided increased effluent discharge monitoring costs due to expanded monitoring frequency for certain permit parameters;

9) An affordability analysis was performed as part of the Long Term Control Plan on Combined Sewer Overflows;

10) An affordability analysis was performed as part of an Antidegradation Review Determination;

11) Others: explain.

Part VII – 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 is tentatively schedule to begin on October 28, 2011.

DATE OF FACT SHEET: 7//2011

COMPLETED BY:

**TODD BLANC, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST IV
WASTEWATER ENGINEERING UNIT
PERMITTING AND ENGINEERING SECTION
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM
(314) 416-2960
TODD.BLANC@DNR.MO.GOV**

Modified by: Hillary Clark 12/07/2011

Part VIII – Appendices

APPENDIX A - CLASSIFICATION WORKSHEET:

ITEM	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS ASSIGNED
Maximum Population Equivalent (P.E.) served (Max 10 pts.)	1 pt./10,000 PE or major fraction thereof.	2
Maximum: 10 pt Design Flow (avg. day) or peak month; use greater (Max 10 pts.)	1 pt. / MGD or major fraction thereof.	3
EFFLUENT DISCHARGE RECEIVING WATER SENSITIVITY:		
Missouri or Mississippi River	0	
All other stream discharges except to losing streams and stream reaches supporting whole body contact	1	
Discharge to lake or reservoir outside of designated whole body contact recreational area	2	
Discharge to losing stream, or stream, lake or reservoir area supporting whole body contact recreation	3	3
PRELIMINARY TREATMENT – Headworks		
Screening and/or comminution	3	3
Grit removal	3	3
Plant pumping of main flow (lift station at the headworks)	3	3
PRIMARY TREATMENT		
Primary clarifiers	5	
Combined sedimentation/digestion	5	
Chemical addition (except chlorine, enzymes)	4	
REQUIRED LABORATORY CONTROL – performed by plant personnel (highest level only)		
Push – button or visual methods for simple test such as pH, Settleable solids	3	
Additional procedures such as DO, COD, BOD, titrations, solids, volatile content	5	
More advanced determinations such as BOD seeding procedures, fecal coliform, nutrients, total oils, phenols, etc.	7	7
Highly sophisticated instrumentation, such as atomic absorption and gas chromatograph	10	
ALTERNATIVE FATE OF EFFLUENT		
Direct reuse or recycle of effluent	6	
Land Disposal – low rate	3	
High rate	5	
Overland flow	4	
Total from page ONE (1)	----	24

APPENDIX A - CLASSIFICATION WORKSHEET (CONTINUED):

ITEM	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS ASSIGNED
VARIATION IN RAW WASTE (highest level only) (DMR exceedances and Design Flow exceedances)		
Variation do not exceed those normally or typically expected	0	0
Recurring deviations or excessive variations of 100 to 200 % in strength and/or flow	2	
Recurring deviations or excessive variations of more than 200 % in strength and/or flow	4	
Raw wastes subject to toxic waste discharge	6	6
SECONDARY TREATMENT		
Trickling filter and other fixed film media with secondary clarifiers	10	
Activated sludge with secondary clarifiers (including extended aeration and oxidation ditches)	15	15
Stabilization ponds without aeration	5	
Aerated lagoon	8	
Advanced Waste Treatment Polishing Pond	2	
Chemical/physical – without secondary	15	
Chemical/physical – following secondary	10	10
Biological or chemical/biological	12	
Carbon regeneration	4	
DISINFECTION		
Chlorination or comparable	5	
Dechlorination	2	
On-site generation of disinfectant (except UV light)	5	
UV light	4	4
SOLIDS HANDLING - SLUDGE		
Solids Handling Thickening	5	
Anaerobic digestion	10	
Aerobic digestion	6	
Evaporative sludge drying	2	
Mechanical dewatering	8	8
Solids reduction (incineration, wet oxidation)	12	
Land application	6	6
Total from page TWO (2)	---	49
Total from page ONE (1)	---	24
Grand Total	---	73

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

APPENDIX B – REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS (RPA) RESULTS:

Outfall #001
Classified P stream
Facility Name City of Lebanon WWTF
Permit Number **MO-0089010**

Qs = Stream 7Q10 flow (ft³/s), or 1Q10, or 30Q10
Qe = Effluent **design** flow (ft³/s)

$$C = \frac{(C_s * Q_s) + (C_e * Q_e)}{(Q_e + Q_s)}$$

Dry Auglaize
Stream name **Creek** **Qs 1Q10 = 0.1** Cs = combined stream concentrations (see Footnote 1 below)
 Qs 30Q10 = 1 Ce = maximum effluent concentration
 Qe= 4.0 **Qs 7Q10 = 0.1** NA = not applicable

UNITS: = Ammonia, O&G = mg/L; others =ug/L	Aquatic Life Acute (Cc)	Aquatic Life Chronic (Cc)	Chronic Drinking Water Standard			Maximum Conc'tn (Ce)	Upstream WQ (Cs) ¹	RPTE Calculation	Receiving Stream Concentration (C)-MZ	Receiving Stream Concentration (C)-ZID	RPTE (Y/N)
			N	CV							
Ammonia (Apr-Sept)	12.1	1.5		23	2.13	14.30	0.01	92.38	86.95	92.32	Y
Ammonia (Oct-Mar)	12.1	3.1		30	1.61	7.70	0.01	34.41	32.39	34.39	Y
Oil & Grease(O&G)		10.0		53	1.14	16.00	0.01	37.24	37.01	37.22	Y
Chromium VI	15.3	10.4	5	53	0.27	10.00	0.01	12.83	12.75	12.82	Y
Chromium III	3155.0	151.0	100	54	0.44	16.00	0.01	23.69	23.55	23.68	N
Copper	26.7	19.6	1300	53	0.71	60.00	0.01	108.39	107.72	108.12	Y
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ²		5.9	6	53	2.99	190.00	0.01	772.61	767.81	772.12	Y
Phenols		100.0	100	53	0.22	50.00	0.01	61.22	60.84	61.18	N
Zinc	213.8	213.8	5000	53	0.56	157.00	0.01	255.15	253.56	254.99	Y

Footnote1: Upstream concentration is assumed.
Footnote2: Cc is human health fish consumpt.
Assumptions and Basis: Qe= the current discharge.
Zeros in the dataset were assigned 1/2 the detection limit (DL).
Stream Flow and Mixing Zone Determination:
Mixing Zone (MZ): One-quarter (1/4) of the stream volume of flow; length one-quarter (1/4) mile. [10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(A)4.B.(III)(a)].
Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID): One-tenth (0.1) of the mixing zone volume of flow, not to exceed 10 times the effluent design flow.
[10 CSR 20-7.031(4)(A)4.B.(III)(b)].

WQ Criteria: Metals Aquatic life chronic and acute standards were converted to total recoverable.
Hardness of 198 mg/L was used to calculate criteria for metals that are hardness dependent.
Hardness data obtained from March 2011 Antidegradation Review Report on Lebanon WWTF

- Units are noted in column one of table.
 - If the number of samples is greater than 10, then the CV value must be used in the WQBEL for the applicable constituent.
 - Coefficient of Variation (CV) is calculated by dividing the Standard Deviation of the sample set by the Mean of the same sample set.
- C – Receiving Stream Concentration. It is the concentration of a toxicant or the parameter toxicity in the receiving water after mixing (if applicable).

Multiplying Factors (MF) were (maximum value times the MF = RPTE concentration):

POC	C99/Cpn
NH3-Winter	4.468591
NH3-Summer	6.459944
BIS	4.066355
CR VI TR	1.282678
CR III TR	1.480772
CU TR	1.806436
O&G	2.327597
Phenol	1.224369
ZN TR	1.625133

RPTE– Reasonable Potential To Exceed. It is where an effluent is projected or calculated to cause an excursion above a water quality standard based on a number of factors including, as a minimum, the four factors listed in 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(ii).

Reasonable Potential Analysis is conducted as per (TSD, EPA/505/2-90-001, Section 3.3.2). A more detailed version including calculations of this RPA is available upon request.

Part IX: Public Notice Comments

Comment 1: *The acute (CMC) and chronic (CCC) copper criteria formulas presented on page 12 of the fact sheet use the site-specific value of 0.81 as the criteria conversion. The correct copper criteria conversion factor is 0.96.*

Response 1: The copper criteria conversion factor is indeed 0.96. The limits for copper have been recalculated below. The permit and fact sheet have been updated to include these changes.

$$\text{CMC} = e^{(0.9422 \cdot \ln(198) - 1.7003)} \cdot 0.960 = 25.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$
$$\text{CCC} = e^{(0.8545 \cdot \ln(198) - 1.702)} \cdot 0.960 = 16.1 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$\text{C (Chronic)} = \text{CCC}/\text{CF} = 16.1/0.81 = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$
$$\text{C (Acute)} = \text{CMC}/\text{CF} = 25.6/0.81 = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$$

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

Chronic WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.025)19.9 - (0.025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

Acute WLA: $C_e = ((4.0 + 0.0025)31.6 - (0.0025 \cdot 2.5))/4.0$
 $C_e = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

$$\text{LTA}_c = 19.9 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.476) = 9.5 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.71, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$
$$\text{LTA}_a = 31.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} (0.277) = \mathbf{8.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.71, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$

$$\text{MDL} = 8.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} \cdot 3.60 = 31.7 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.71, 99^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile}]$$
$$\text{AML} = 8.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} \cdot 1.66 = 14.6 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L} \quad [\text{CV} = 0.71, 95^{\text{th}} \text{ Percentile, } n = 4]$$

Comment 2: *The City requests a detailed version of the RPA calculations, particularly for chromium VI.*

Response 2: Your request has been granted. The RPA calculations are attached for your review.