

**FACT SHEET AND STATEMENT OF BASIS
MORGAN CITY CORPORATION
RENEWAL PERMIT: DISCHARGE
UPDES PERMIT NUMBER: UT0020893
MINOR MUNICIPAL**

FACILITY CONTACTS

Person Name: Jamie Grandpre
Position: Water & Wastewater Supervisor
Phone Number: 801.821.6324

Facility Name: Morgan City Corporation
Mailing Address: PO Box 1085
90 West Young Street
Morgan, Utah 84050

Telephone: 801.821.6324

Actual Address: 90 West Young Street
Morgan, Utah 84050

DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY

The Morgan City Wastewater Treatment Facility (Morgan) is located approximately 1.5 northwest of Morgan, Utah in Morgan County. Morgan has a population of approximately 4,200 with 1,400 sewer connections. The design capacity of the facility is 0.45 million gallons per day (MGD).

The facility comprises of two influent lift stations with influent 8-inch Parshall Flume, influent flow meters, grinders, headworks screening and grit removal system, four aerated lagoon cells, switchover chlorination, dechlorination equipment, reaeration equipment, effluent 90 degree “v” notch weir and effluent flow meter. Chlorination takes place in two maze type configuration contact basins following the last stabilization cell. The first lagoon cell has six aerators, pond two has three aerators, pond three has two aerators and pond one has one aerator.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS PERMIT

Morgan has improved the headworks building with an updated grit removal system and the chlorine contact basin and installed a de-chlorination station.

Morgan’s previous permit allowed for the alternative limits for BOD and TSS based on R317-1-3.2.G. In a letter dated August 1, 2020, Morgan has requested to keep the alternative limits. The letter also requested to have the percentage removal for BOD and TSS removed from the UPDES permit based on I&I in the system during the seasonal run off and the close proximity to the Weber River. The request shall be reevaluated during every permit cycle by Morgan and DWQ.

TBPEL Rule

Water Quality adopted UAC R317-1-3.3, Technology-Based Phosphorus Effluent Limit (TBPEL) Rule in 2014. No TBPEL will be instituted for discharging treatment lagoons. Instead, each discharging lagoon will be evaluated to determine the current annual average total phosphorus load measured in pounds per year based on monthly average flow rates and concentrations. Absent field data to determine these loads,

and in case of intermittent discharging lagoons, the phosphorus load cap will be estimated by the Director. A cap of 125% of the current annual total phosphorus load will be established and referred to as phosphorus loading cap. Once the lagoon's phosphorus loading cap has been reached, the owner of the facility will have five years to construct treatment processes or implement treatment alternatives to prevent the total phosphorus loading cap from being exceeded. The load cap shall become effective July 1, 2018.

The TBPEL discharging treatment works are required to implement, at a minimum, monthly monitoring of the following beginning July 1, 2015:

- R317-1-3.3, E, 1, a. Influent for total phosphorus (as P) and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (as N) concentrations;
- R317-1-3.3, E, 1, b. Effluent for total phosphorus and orthophosphate (as P), ammonia, nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (an N);

In R317-1-3.3, E, 3 the rule states that all monitoring shall be based on 24-hour composite samples by use of an automatic sampler or a minimum of four grab samples collected a minimum of two hours apart.

The phosphorus annual loading cap is defined as:

"Annual Loading Cap" is the highest allowable phosphorus loading discharged over a calendar year, calculated as the sum of all the monthly loading discharges measured during a calendar year divided by the number of monthly discharges measured during that year.

The reported monthly loading is calculated as shown here:

$$\text{Monthyl Mass Loading, } \frac{\text{lbs}}{\text{Month}} = (\text{Ave Flow}) * (\text{Ave Concetration}) * \left(8.34 \frac{\text{lbs}}{\text{gal}}\right) * \left(\frac{\text{Days Discharged}}{\text{Month}}\right)$$

The annual total phosphorus loading:

$$\text{Annual Mass Loading, lbs} = \text{Sum} \left(\text{Monthyl Mass Loading, } \frac{\text{lbs}}{\text{Month}} \right)$$

DISCHARGE

DESCRIPTION OF DISCHARGE

Morgan has been reporting self-monitoring results on Discharge Monitoring Reports in NetDMR on a monthly basis. Over the last five years Morgan has had BOD, TSS, *E.coli* and TRC violations. In 2015 and 2016, the lagoons had a septic event while dredging ponds 1 and 2 causing violations in BOD, TSS, *E.coli* and TRC. In the Spring of 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 violations were caused from algae sloughing off. Late 2018 through 2019 violations were caused from the construction at the facility.

<u>Outfall</u>	<u>Description of Discharge Point</u>
001	A 12-inch outfall pipe, located at latitude 41°03'07" and longitude 111°41'57" on the southwest side of the lagoon system into the Weber River.

RECEIVING WATERS AND STREAM CLASSIFICATION

The designated beneficial uses of the Weber River and tributaries, from Stoddard diversion to headwaters, are 1C, 2B, 3A and 4 according to *Utah Administrative Code (UAC) R317-2-13.4.a.*

- Class 1C Protected for domestic purposes with prior treatment by treatment processes as required by the Utah Division of Drinking Water
- Class 2B Protected for infrequent primary contact recreation. Also protected for secondary contact recreation where there is a low likelihood of ingestion of water or a low degree of bodily contact with the water. Examples include, but are not limited to, wading, hunting, and fishing
- Class 3A Protected for cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
- Class 4 Protected for agricultural uses including irrigation of crops and stock watering.

BASIS FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

Limitations on total suspended solids (TSS), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD5), *E. coli*, pH and percent removal for BOD5 and TSS are based on current Utah Secondary Treatment Standards, *UAC R317-1-3.2*. For at least the last two permit cycle, Morgan has had the alternative limits as stated in *UAC R317-1-3.2.G* for BOD5 and TSS. Those limits will remain in effect for this permit cycle. Morgan has requested the percentage limitation removed for BOD and TSS from the requirements due to I&I. For at least this permit cycle, the percentage limitation for BOD and TSS has been removed from the UPDES limitation and self-monitoring requirements. The alternative limits and percentage limitation will be reevaluated by Morgan and DWQ during each permit cycle. The oil and grease is based on best professional judgment (BPJ). Temperature has been added as monitoring only parameter. Annual metal sampling has been added for reasonable potential analysis (RP). Ammonia does not have a limit based on the WLA but will be monitored monthly.

Attached is a Wasteload Analysis for this discharge into the Weber River. It has been determined that this discharge will not cause a violation of water quality standards. An Antidegradation Level II review is not required since the Level I review shows that water quality impacts are minimal. The permittee is expected to be able to comply with these limitations.

Parameters of Concern

Besides TSS, no additional potential parameters of concern were identified based on review of the impairment status of the receiving water and review of the previous permit.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

According to the Utah's 2016 303(d) Water Quality Assessment Report, the receiving water for the discharge, Weber River between East Canyon Creek Confluence and Lost Creek Confluence (UT16020102-022_00, Weber-6) is impaired for Bioassessment and requires a TMDL.

Reasonable Potential Analysis

Since January 1, 2016, DWQ has conducted reasonable potential analysis (RP) on all new and renewal applications received after that date. To complete a RP analysis, more than 10 data points per parameter are needed. Morgan was not required to sample for metal parameters in their previous permit, therefore, analysis data is not available to perform a RP analysis. For this permit cycle, Morgan will be required to permit, at a minimum, annual metal sampling. If additional sampling is performed, it shall be reported to DWQ. Less than 10 data points may affect the RP outcomes which may require additional monitoring in the future.

Table 1					
Parameter	Effluent Limitations^a				
	Maximum Monthly Avg	Maximum Weekly Avg	Daily Minimum	Daily Maximum	Yearly Maximum
Flow, MGD	--	--	--	0.450	
BOD₅, mg/L	45	65	--	--	
TSS, mg/L	45	65	--	--	
<i>E. coli</i>, No./100mL	126	158	--	--	
pH, Standard Units	--	--	6.5	9	
DO, mg/L	--	--	5.0	--	
TRC, mg/L					
Summer (Jul-Sep)	5.19	--	--	5.02	
Fall (Oct-Dec)	0.66	--	--	0.64	
Winter (Jan-Mar)	0.38	--	--	0.38	
Spring (Apr-Jun)	2.75	--	--	2.67	
Oil & Grease, mg/L	--	--	--	10.0	
Total Phosphorus, lbs/year					8583

SELF-MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The permit will require reports to be submitted monthly and annually, as applicable, on Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) in NetDMR unless the permittee has successfully petitioned for an exception. Lab sheets for metals must be attached to the DMRs.

Table 2			
Self-Monitoring and Reporting Requirements^{a, b}			
Parameter	Frequency	Sample Type	Units
Total Flow^{c, d}			
Effluent	Continuous	Recorder	MGD
BOD₅			
Influent^e	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
TSS			
Influent^e	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
<i>E. coli</i>			
Effluent	Monthly	Grab	No./100mL
pH			
Effluent	Daily	Grab	SU
DO			
Effluent	Monthly	Grab	mg/L
TRC, mg/L^f			
Effluent	Daily	Grab	mg/L
Oil & Grease^{g, h}			
Effluent	When Sheen Observed	Grab	mg/L
Total Phosphorus (as P)ⁱ			
Influent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Total Ammonia (as N)			
Effluent	Monthly	Grab	mg/L
Temperature, mg/L			
Effluent	Weekly	Recorder	Fahrenheit
Orthophosphate (as P)ⁱ			
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN (as N))ⁱ			
Influent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Nitrate, NO₃ⁱ			
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Nitrite, NO₂ⁱ			
Effluent	Monthly	Composite	mg/L
Metals^{j, k, l}			
Effluent	Quarterly	Composite	mg/L

Table References

- a. See Definitions, *Part VIII*, for definition of terms.
- b. All parameters in this table will be reported on the monthly Discharge Monitoring Report.
- c. Flow measurements of effluent volume shall be made in such a manner that the permittee can affirmatively demonstrate that representative values are being obtained.
- d. If the rate of discharge is controlled, the rate and duration of discharge shall be reported.
- e. In addition to monitoring the final discharge, influent samples shall be taken and analyzed for this constituent at the same frequency as required for this constituent in the discharge.
- f. Analytical results less than 0.06 mg/l will not be considered out of compliance with the permit. For purposes of calculating averages and reporting on the Discharge Monitoring Report form, the following will apply:
 - Analytical values less than 0.02 mg/L shall be considered zero; and
 - Analytical values less than 0.06 mg/L and equal to or greater than 0.02 mg/L will be recorded as measured.
- g. There shall be no visible sheen or floating solids or visible foam in other than trace amounts.
- h. Oil & Grease sampled when sheen is present or visible. If no sheen is present or visible, report 9 under “NODP” in NetDMR.
- i. Monitoring only for total phosphorus (TP), orthophosphate as P (OP), total ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, and total Kjeldahl nitrogen as N (TKN) have been included to comply with Utah Secondary Treatment Standards and the Technology-based Phosphorus Effluent limit rule in *UAC R317-1-3.3*
- j. Metals samples should be analyzed using a method that meets MDL requirements. If a test method is not available the permittee must submit documentation to the Director regarding the method that will be used. The sample type (composite or grab) should be performed according to the methods requirements.
- k. Metals are being sampled in support of the work being done for the Reasonable Potential Analysis. The Metal parameters will be monitored and reported on an annual basis by the facility on Discharge Monitoring Report, but will not have a limit associated with them, if Morgan City decides to sample more frequently for these parameters, the additional data will be welcome.

l. Metals

Arsenic	Chromium	Lead	Selenium
Cadmium	Copper	Mercury	Silver
Total	Cyanide	Nickel	Zinc

End Table References

Lagoon Best Management Practices:

- 1) The permittee shall take such parameters as are necessary to maintain and operate the facility in a manner that will minimize upsets and ensure stable operating conditions.
- 2) The permittee shall visually inspect, at least weekly, the pond(s) to determine if there is adequate freeboard to minimize the likelihood of an accidental discharge occurring. If it is determined that a discharge is occurring and/or there is not adequate freeboard, the appropriate corrective measures shall be taken immediately.

- 3) The permittee shall take precautions and have erosion control measures in place that, in the event of a bypass of treatment, the discharge will not cause erosion into the Waters of the State.

BIOSOLIDS

The State of Utah has adopted the 40 CFR 503 federal regulations for the disposal of sewage sludge (biosolids) by reference. However, since this facility is a lagoon, there is not any regular sludge production. Therefore 40 CFR 503 does not apply at this time. In the future, if the sludge needs to be removed from the lagoons and is disposed in some way, the Division of Water Quality must be contacted prior to the removal of the sludge to ensure that all applicable state and federal regulations are met

STORM WATER

Separate storm water permits may be required based on the types of activities occurring on site.

Wastewater treatment facilities, including lagoon systems, are required to obtain permit coverage under the Multi Sector General Permit (MSGP) for Storm Water Discharges from Industrial Activities if the facility has an approved pretreatment program or has a design flow of 1.0 MGD or greater. This permit does not include industrial storm water permit requirements since this facility does not meet either of these criteria. A permit will be required if the conditions change and the criteria are met.

Permit coverage under the Construction General Storm Water Permit (CGP) is required for any construction at the facility which disturb an acre or more, or is part of a common plan of development or sale that is an acre or greater. A Notice of Intent (NOI) is required to obtain a construction storm water permit prior to the period of construction.

Information on storm water permit requirements can be found at <http://stormwater.utah.gov>

PRETREATMENT REQUIREMENTS

The permittee has not been designated for pretreatment program development because it does not meet conditions which necessitate a full program. The flow through the plant is less than five (5) MGD, there are no known categorical industries discharging to the treatment facility, and there is no indication of pass through or interference with the operation of the treatment facility such as upsets or violations of the POTW's UPDES permit limits.

Although the permittee does not have to develop a State-approved pretreatment program, any wastewater discharges to the sanitary sewer are subject to Federal, State and local regulations. Pursuant to Section 307 of the Clean Water Act, the permittee shall comply with all applicable Federal General Pretreatment Regulations promulgated, found in 40 CFR 403 and the State Pretreatment Requirements found in UAC R317-8-8.

An industrial waste survey (IWS) is required of the permittee as stated in Part II of the permit. The IWS is to assess the needs of the permittee regarding pretreatment assistance. The IWS is required to be submitted within sixty (60) days after the issuance of the permit. If an Industrial User begins to discharge or an existing Industrial User changes their discharge the permittee must resubmit an IWS no later than sixty days following the introduction or change as stated in Part II of the permit.

It is required that the permittee submit for review any local limits that are developed to the Division of

Water Quality for review. If local limits are developed it is required that the permittee perform an annual evaluation of the need to revise or develop technically based local limits for pollutants of concern, to implement the general and specific prohibitions *40 CFR, Part 403.5(a)* and *Part 403.5(b)*. This evaluation may indicate that present local limits are sufficiently protective, need to be revised or should be developed.

BIOMONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A nationwide effort to control toxic discharges where effluent toxicity is an existing or potential concern is regulated in accordance with the Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit and Enforcement Guidance Document for Whole Effluent Toxicity Control (biomonitoring) dated February 2018. Authority to require effluent biomonitoring is provided in Permit Conditions, UAC R317-8-4.2, Permit Provisions, UAC R317-8-5.3 and Water Quality Standards, UAC R317-2-5 and R317 -2-7.2.

The permittee is a minor municipal facility that will be discharging a small volume of effluent, in which toxicity is neither an existing concern, nor likely to be present. Based on these considerations and the absence of receiving stream water quality monitoring data, there is no reasonable potential for toxicity in the permittee's discharge (per State of Utah Permitting and Enforcement Guidance Document for WET Control). As such, there will be no numerical WET limitations or WET monitoring requirements in this permit. However, the permit will contain a toxicity limitation re-opener provision that allows for modification of the permit should additional information indicate the presence of toxicity in the discharge.

PERMIT DURATION

It is recommended that this permit be effective for a duration of five (5) years.

Drafted by
Sarah Leavitt Ward, Discharge
Daniel Griffin, Biosolids
Jennifer Robinson, Pretreatment
Lonnie Shull, Biomonitoring
Lisa Stevens, Storm Water
Suzan Tahir, Wasteload Analysis
Utah Division of Water Quality, (801) 536-4300

PUBLIC NOTICE

Began: Month Day, Year
Ended: Month Day, Year

Comments will be received at: 195 North 1950 West
PO Box 144870
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4870

The Public Noticed of the draft permit was published in the (NEWSPAPER OF RECORD FOR AREA).

During the public comment period provided under R317-8-6.5, any interested person may submit written comments on the draft permit and may request a public hearing, if no hearing has already been scheduled. A request for a public hearing shall be in writing and shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. All comments will be considered in making the final decision and shall be answered as provided in R317-8-6.12.

ADDENDUM TO FSSOB

During finalization of the Permit certain dates, spelling edits and minor language corrections were completed. Due to the nature of these changes they were not considered Major and the permit is not required to be re Public Noticed.

Responsiveness Summary

(Explain any comments received and response sent. Actual letters can be referenced, but not required to be included).

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

PNDraft

ATTACHMENT 1

Industrial Waste Survey

PVNDraft

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Industrial Pretreatment Wastewater Survey



Do you periodically experience any of the following treatment works problems?

- foam, floaties or unusual colors
- plugged collection lines caused by grease, sand, flour, etc.
- discharging excessive suspended solids, even in the winter
- smells unusually bad
- waste treatment facility doesn't seem to be treating the waste right

Perhaps the solution to a problem like one of these may lie in investigating the types and amounts of wastewater entering the sewer system from industrial users.

An industrial user (IU) is defined as a non-domestic user discharging to the waste treatment facility which meets any of the following criteria:

1. **has a lot of process wastewater (5% of the flow at the waste treatment facility or more than 25,000 gallons per work day.)**

Examples: Food processor, dairy, slaughterhouse, industrial laundry.

2. **is subject to Federal Categorical Pretreatment Standards;**

Examples: metal plating, cleaning or coating of metals, blueing of metals, aluminum extruding, circuit board manufacturing, tanning animal skins, pesticide formulating or packaging, and pharmaceutical manufacturing or packaging,

3. **is a concern to the POTW.**

Examples: septage hauler, restaurant and food service, car wash, hospital, photo lab, carpet cleaner, commercial laundry.

All users of the water treatment facility are **prohibited** from making the following types of discharges:

1. A discharge which creates a fire or explosion hazard in the collection system.
2. A discharge which creates toxic gases, vapor or fumes in the collection system.
3. A discharge of solids or thick liquids which creates flow obstructions in the collection system.
4. An acidic discharge (low pH) which causes corrosive damage to the collection system.
5. Petroleum oil, nonbiodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause problems in the collection system or at the waste treatment facility.
6. Waste haulers are prohibited from discharging without permission. (No midnight dumping!)

When the solution to a sewer system problem may be found by investigating the types and amounts of wastewater entering the sewer system discharged from IUs, it's appropriate to conduct an Industrial Waste Survey.

An Industrial Waste Survey consists of:

Step 1: Identify Industrial Users

Make a list of all the commercial and industrial sewer connections.

Sources for the list:

business license, building permits, water and wastewater billing, Chamber of Commerce, newspaper, telephone book, yellow pages.

Split the list into two groups:

domestic wastewater only--no further information needed
everyone else (IUs)

Step 2: Preliminary Inspection

Go visit each IU identified on the "everybody else" list.

Fill out the **Preliminary Inspection Form** during the site visit.

Step 3: Informing the State

Please fax or send a copy of the Preliminary inspection form (both sides) to:

Jennifer Robinson

Division of Water Quality
288 North 1460 West
PO Box 144870
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4870

Phone: (801) 536-4383
Fax: (801) 536-4301
E-mail: jenrobinson@utah.gov

PRELIMINARY INSPECTION FORM

INSPECTION DATE ___ / ___ /

Name of Business _____ Person Contacted _____
Address _____ Phone Number _____

Description of Business _____

Principal product or service: _____

Raw Materials used: _____

Production process is: Batch Continuous Both

Is production subject to seasonal variation? yes no

If yes, briefly describe seasonal production cycle.

This facility generates the following types of wastes (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic wastes | (Restrooms, employee showers, etc.) |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Cooling water, non-contact | 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Boiler/Tower blowdown |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Cooling water, contact | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Process |
| 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment/Facility wash-down | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control Unit |
| 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Storm water runoff to sewer | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other describe |

Wastes are discharged to (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary sewer | <input type="checkbox"/> Storm sewer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Surface water | <input type="checkbox"/> Ground water |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Waste haulers | <input type="checkbox"/> Evaporation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) | |

Name of waste hauler(s), if used

Is a grease trap installed? Yes No

Is it operational? Yes No

Does the business discharge a lot of process wastewater?

- More than 5% of the flow to the waste treatment facility? Yes No
- More than 25,000 gallons per work day? Yes No

Does the business do any of the following:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adhesives | <input type="checkbox"/> Car Wash |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aluminum Forming | <input type="checkbox"/> Carpet Cleaner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Battery Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Dairy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Copper Forming | <input type="checkbox"/> Food Processor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric & Electronic Components | <input type="checkbox"/> Hospital |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Explosives Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Laundries |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foundries | <input type="checkbox"/> Photo Lab |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inorganic Chemicals Mfg. or Packaging | <input type="checkbox"/> Restaurant & Food Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Porcelain Ceramic Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Septage Hauler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Iron & Steel | <input type="checkbox"/> Slaughter House |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Metal Finishing, Coating or Cleaning | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mining | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nonferrous Metals Manufacturing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Organic Chemicals Manufacturing or Packaging | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Paint & Ink Manufacturing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides Formulating or Packaging | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Petroleum Refining | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pharmaceuticals Manufacturing or Packaging | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plastics Manufacturing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rubber Manufacturing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soaps & Detergents Manufacturing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Steam Electric Generation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tanning Animal Skins | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Textile Mills | |

Are any process changes or expansions planned during the next three years? Yes No
If yes, attach a separate sheet to this form describing the nature of planned changes or expansions.

Inspector

Waste Treatment Facility

Please send a copy of the preliminary inspection form (both sides) to:

Jennifer Robinson
Division of Water Quality
PO Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870

Phone: (801) 536-4383
Fax: (801) 536-4301
E-Mail: jenrobinson@utah.gov

	Industrial User	Jurisdiction	SIC Codes	Categorical Standard Number	Total Average Process Flow (gpd)	Total Average Facility Flow (gpd)	Facility Description
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							

PND Draft

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

ATTACHMENT 2

Effluent Monitoring Data

PND Draft

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Month	Year	Flow	BOD		TSS		E-Coll		TRC, Seasonal	DO	pH			T Phos	Nitrate	Nitrite	Ammonia	Comments
Parameters		0.45	45	65	45	65	126	157		5.0	6.5	9.0	Report	Report	Report	Report		
Jan	2015	0.247	10	10	25	25	3	3	0.13	11.0	8.09	8.17	4.1	2.4	0.0	24.1		
Feb		0.244	9	9	24	24	10	10	0.07	11.2	8.03	8.26	4.1	1.1	0.0	25.9		
Mar		0.197	17	17	29	29	3	3	0.09	11.4	8.32	8.41	4.3	1.7	0.0	26.8		
Apr		0.234	11	11	28	28	0	0	0.11	9.4	7.06	8.39	4.3	3.4	0.6	24.9		
May		0.216	14	14	46	46	0	0	0.39	6.3	7.50	7.89	3.2	10.7	0.0	0		
Jun		0.108	8	8	13	13	0	0	0.11	7.1	7.04	7.78	3.3	3.5	0.0	0.3		
Jul		0.122	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	4.7	7.41	7.51	8.8	0	0.0	4.5		
Aug		0.219	41	41	19	19	>2400	>2400	0	3.0	7.30	7.59	8.5	0	0.0	18.6		
Sep		0.262	43	43	30	30	>2400	>2400	0	0.3			7.1	0	0.0	27	No Discharge to Weber River	
Oct		0.275	46	46	33	33	>2400	>2400	0	1.6			5.0	0	0.0	29.4	No Discharge to Weber River	
Nov		0.284	49	49	74	74	>2400	>2400	0	2.9			4.6	0	0.0	30.9	No Discharge to Weber River	
Dec		0.253	53	53	134	134	>2400	>2400	0	2.6			7.3	0	0.0	59.8	No Discharge to Weber River	

Month	Year	Flow	BOD		TSS		E-Coll		TRC, Seasonal	DO	pH			T Phos	Nitrate	Nitrite	Ammonia	Comments
Parameters		0.45	45	65	45	65	126	157		5.0	6.5	9.0	Report	Report	Report	Report		
Jan	2016	0.257	45	45	43	43	>2400	>2400	0	6.3			6.3	0.2	0.0	53.5	No Discharge to Weber River	
Feb		0.205	73	73	37	37	1	1	0	5.5	7.5	7.7	6.5	0.0	0.0	43.4		
Mar		0.211	29	29	34	34	0	0	0	5.8	7.6	7.8	5.1	0.0	0.0	34.3		
Apr		0.267	34	34	54	54	50	50	0.09	6.8	7.7	8.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	41.4		
May		0.221	11	11	13	13	30	30	0.06	6.4	7.9	8.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	48.7		
Jun		0.179	15	15	19	19	34	34	0.27	6.1	8.1	8.4	8.0	0.0	0.0	38.8		
Jul		0.106	9	9	15	15	0	0	1.05	6	7.7	8.4	5.9	0.3	0.5	27.1		
Aug		0.182	0	0	5	5	60	60	0.6	5.6	7.8	7.8	7.3	0.0	0.0	35.5		
Sep		0.222	10	10	5	5	0	0	0.63	5.4	7.8	7.9	6.8	0.0	0.0	32.8		
Oct		0.235	6	6	6	6	0	0	0.42	6.5	7.8	8.0	6.3	0.2	0.0	35.8		
Nov		0.311	14	14	11	11	25	25	0.13	8.9	7.8	8.2	6.0	1.1	0.0	26.2		
Dec		0.283	24	24	35	35	20	20	0.05	12.4	8.0	8.2	6.1	4.0	0.0	21.6		

Month	Year	Flow	BOD		TSS		E-Coll		TRC, Seasonal	DO	pH			T Phos	Nitrate	Nitrite	Ammonia	Comments
Parameters		0.45	45	65	45	65	126	157		5.0	6.5	9.0	Report	Report	Report	Report		
Jan	2017	0.278	17	17	34	34	0	0	0.32	7.7	7.6	8.0	6.1	2.8	0.0	28.8		
Feb		0.265	17	17	38	38	5	5	0.3	7.2	7.6	7.8	6.3	2.3	0.4	33.2		
Mar		0.231	21	21	47	47	46	46	0.15	7.8	7.7	8.5	6.0	3.4	0.5	23.8		
Apr		0.236	34	34	30	30	26	26	0.43	7.6	7.8	8.2	5.0	1.0	0.4	24.9		
May		0.221	57	57	92	92	5	5	0.06	7.4	8.5	9.4	6.6	7.9	1.1	3.9		
Jun		0.255	36	36	33	33	1	1	0.1	5.4	7.8	8.0	4.6	0.3	0.4	1.5		
Jul		0.27	24	24	28	28	199	199	0.05	4.8	7.5	7.8	6.2	0.0	0.0	1.7		
Aug		0.269	11	11	17	17	1730	1730	2.49	6.8	7.6	7.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	8.8		
Sep		0.314	13	13	11	11	0	0	1.62	7.7	7.6	7.8	4.6	0.0	0.0	19.4		
Oct		0.339	8	8	10	10	96	96	0.31	8.1	7.7	8.4	4.0	0.3	0.8	22.4		
Nov		0.381	12	12	22	22	435	435	0.24	9.2	7.6	7.9	4.8	1.8	1.1	21.3		
Dec		0.333	19	19	40	40	0	0	0.47	11.6	7.8	8.1	5.1	4.0	0.3	19.2		

ATTACHMENT 3

Wasteload Analysis

PND Draft

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

ATTACHMENT 4

Reasonable Potential Analysis

PND Draft

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

Water Quality has worked to improve our reasonable potential analysis (RP) for the inclusion of limits for parameters in the permit by using an EPA provided model. As a result of the model, more parameters may be included in the renewal permit. A Copy of the Reasonable Potential Analysis Guidance (RP Guide) is available at water Quality. There are four outcomes for the RP Analysis¹. They are;

- Outcome A: A new effluent limitation will be placed in the permit.
- Outcome B: No new effluent limitation. Routine monitoring requirements will be placed or increased from what they are in the permit,
- Outcome C: No new effluent limitation. Routine monitoring requirements maintained as they are in the permit,
- Outcome D: No limitation or routine monitoring requirements are in the permit.

Since January 1, 2016, DWQ has conducted reasonable potential analysis (RP) on all new and renewal applications received after that date. In order to complete a RP analysis, more than 10 data points per parameter are needed. Morgan was not required to sample for metal parameters in their previous permit, therefore, analysis data is not available to perform a RP analysis. For this permit cycle, Morgan will be required to permit, at a minimum, annual metal sampling. If additional sampling is performed, it shall be reported to DWQ. Less than 10 data points may affect the RP outcomes which may require additional monitoring in the future.

¹ See Reasonable Potential Analysis Guidance for definitions of terms

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

PVNDraft