WASTELOAD ANALYSIS [WLA] Addendum: Statement of Basis

= not included in the WLA



Facilities:Sunnyside CogenerationDischarging to:Icelander and Grassy Trail Creeks -> Price River

UPDES No: UT-0024759

I. Introduction

Wasteload analyses are performed to determine point source effluent limitations necessary to maintain designated beneficial uses by evaluating projected effects of discharge concentrations on in-stream water quality. The wasteload analysis also takes into account downstream designated uses [R317-2-8, UAC]. Projected concentrations are compared to numeric water quality standards to determine acceptability. The anti-degradation policy and procedures are also considered. The primary in-stream parameters of concern may include metals (as a function of hardness), total dissolved solids (TDS), total residual chlorine (TRC), un-ionized ammonia (as a function of pH and temperature, measured and evaluated interms of total ammonia), and dissolved oxygen.

Mathematical water quality modeling is employed to determine stream quality response to point source discharges. Models aid in the effort of anticipating stream quality at future effluent flows at critical environmental conditions (e.g., low stream flow, high temperature, high pH, etc).

The numeric criteria in this wasteload analysis may always be modified by narrative criteria and other conditions determined by staff of the Division of Water Quality.

II. Receiving Water and Stream Classification

Icelander and Grassy Trail Creeks -> Price 2B,3C,4Antidegradation Review:Level I review completed. Level II review is not required.

III. Numeric Stream Standards for Protection of Aquatic Wildlife

Total Ammonia (TNH3)			nction of Tem See Water Q	perature and uality Standards
Chronic Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)			mg/l (4 Day / mg/l (1 Hour	0,
Chronic Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	N/A		mg/l (30 Day mg/l (7Day A mg/l (1 Day /	verage)
Maximum Total Dissolved Solids	300	0.0	mg/l	Background

Acute and Chronic Heavy Metals (Dissolved)

	4 Day Average (Chronic) S	Standard	1 Hour Avera	ge (Acute) St	andard
Parameter	Concentration	Load*	Concentration		Load*
Aluminum	87.00 ug/l**	1.277 lbs/day	750.00	ug/l	11.008 lbs/day
Arsenic	0	2.202 lbs/day	340.00	ug/l	4.990 lbs/day
Cadmium	0	0.040 lbs/day	8.73	ug/l	0.128 lbs/day
Chromium III	308.71 ug/l	4.531 lbs/day	6458.76	ug/l	94.798 lbs/day
ChromiumVI	11.00 ug/l	0.161 lbs/day	16.00	ug/l	0.235 lbs/day
Copper	35.32 ug/l	0.518 lbs/day	60.76	ug/l	0.892 lbs/day
Iron			1000.00	ug/l	14.677 lbs/day
Lead	23.12 ug/l	0.339 lbs/day	593.27	ug/l	8.708 lbs/day
Mercury	0.0120 ug/l	0.000 lbs/day	2.40	ug/l	0.035 lbs/day
Nickel	194.88 ug/l	2.860 lbs/day	1752.85	ug/l	25.727 lbs/day
Selenium	4.60 ug/l	0.068 lbs/day	20.00	ug/l	0.294 lbs/day
Silver	N/A ug/l	N/A lbs/day	55.18	ug/l	0.810 lbs/day
Zinc	448.55 ug/l	6.583 lbs/day	448.55	ug/l	6.583 lbs/day
* Allow	ved below discharge				

**Chronic Aluminum standard applies only to waters with a pH < 7.0 and a Hardness < 50 mg/l as CaCO3

Metals Standards Based upon a Hardness of 474.91 mg/l as CaCO3

IV. Numeric Stream Standards for Protection of Agriculture

4 Day Average (Chronic) Standard		1 Hour Average (Acute	e) Standard
Concentration	Load*	Concentration	Load*
		100.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		750.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		10.0 ug/l	0.07 lbs/day
		100.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		200.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		100.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		50.0 ug/l	lbs/day
		3000.0 mg/l	22.02 tons/day
		Concentration Load*	Concentration Load* Concentration 100.0 ug/l 750.0 ug/l 750.0 ug/l 10.0 ug/l 100.0 ug/l 100.0 ug/l 100.0 ug/l 200.0 ug/l 100.0 ug/l 200.0 ug/l 50.0 ug/l 100.0 ug/l

V. Numeric Stream Standards for Protection of Human Health (Class 1C Waters)

4 Day Average (Chronic) Standard			1 Hour Average (Acute) Standard		
Metals	Concentration	Load*	Concentration	Load*	
Arsenic			ug/l	lbs/day	
Barium			ug/l	lbs/day	
Cadmium			ug/l	lbs/day	
Chromium			ug/l	lbs/day	
Lead			ug/l	lbs/day	
Mercury			ug/l	lbs/day	
Selenium			ug/l	lbs/day	
Silver			ug/l	lbs/day	
Fluoride (3)			ug/l	lbs/day	
to			ug/l	lbs/day	
Nitrates as N			ug/l	lbs/day	

VI. Numeric Stream Standards the Protection of Human Health from Water & Fish Consumption [Toxics]

	Махі	mum Conc., ug/l - Acı	ute Standards	
	Class 1C		Class 3A, 3	В
Metals				
Antimony	ug/l	lbs/day		
Arsenic	ug/l	lbs/day	4300.00 ug/l	63.13 lbs/day
Asbestos	ug/l	lbs/day		
Beryllium				
Cadmium				
Chromium (III)				
Chromium (VI)				
Copper				
Cyanide	ug/l	lbs/day	2.2E+05 ug/l	3229.79 lbs/day
Lead	ug/l	lbs/day		
Mercury			0.15 ug/l	0.00 lbs/day
Nickel			4600.00 ug/l	67.53 lbs/day
Selenium	ug/l	lbs/day		
Silver	ug/l	lbs/day		
Thallium	-	·	6.30 ug/l	0.09 lbs/day
Zinc			·	

There are additional standards that apply to this receiving water, but were not considered in this modeling/waste load allocation analysis.

VII. Mathematical Modeling of Stream Quality

Model configuration was accomplished utilizing standard modeling procedures. Data points were plotted and coefficients adjusted as required to match observed data as closely as possible.

The modeling approach used in this analysis included one or a combination of the following models.

(1) The Utah River Model, Utah Division of Water Quality, 1992. Based upon STREAMDO IV (Region VIII) and Supplemental Ammonia Toxicity Models; EPA Region VIII, Sept. 1990 and

QUAL2E (EPA, Athens, GA).

(2) Utah Ammonia/Chlorine Model, Utah Division of Water Quality, 1992.

- (3) AMMTOX Model, University of Colorado, Center of Limnology, and EPA Region 8
- (4) Principles of Surface Water Quality Modeling and Control. Robert V. Thomann, et.al. Harper Collins Publisher, Inc. 1987, pp. 644.

Coefficients used in the model were based, in part, upon the following references:

(1) Rates, Constants, and Kinetics Formulations in Surface Water Quality Modeling. Environmental Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens Georgia. EPA/600/3-85/040 June 1985.

(2) Principles of Surface Water Quality Modeling and Control. Robert V. Thomann, et.al. Harper Collins Publisher, Inc. 1987, pp. 644.

VIII. Modeling Information

The required information for the model may include the following information for both the upstream conditions at low flow and the effluent conditions:

Flow, Q, (cfs or MGD)	D.O. mg/l
Temperature, Deg. C.	Total Residual Chlorine (TRC), mg/l
рН	Total NH3-N, mg/l
BOD5, mg/l	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), mg/l
Metals, ug/l	Toxic Organics of Concern, ug/l

Other Conditions

In addition to the upstream and effluent conditions, the models require a variety of physical and biological coefficients and other technical information. In the process of actually establishing the permit limits for an effluent, values are used based upon the available data, model calibration, literature values, site visits and best professional judgement. **Model Inputs**

The following is upstream and discharge information that was utilized as inputs for the analysis. Dry washes are considered to have an upstream flow equal to the flow of the discharge.

Current Upstream	Information Stream							
	Critical Low							
	Flow	Temp.	рН	T-NH3	BOD5	DO	TRC	TDS
	cfs	Deg. C		mg/l as N	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
Summer (Irrig. Season)	0.0	16.0	8.4	0.10	0.50	10.39	0.00	1968.0
Fall	0.0	14.4	8.2	0.10	0.50		0.00	1471.7
Winter	0.0	10.7	8.2	0.10	0.50		0.00	1471.7
Spring	0.0	13.6	8.4	0.10	0.50		0.00	1471.7
Dissolved	AI	As	Cd	CrIII	CrVI	Copper	Fe	Pb
Metals	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l
All Seasons	15.00	2.50	0.50	2.50	2.65*	19.40	6940.0	1.50
Dissolved	Hg	Ni	Se	Ag	Zn	Boron		
Metals	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l		
All Seasons	0.0000	0.53*	26.00	1.00	62.20	10.0	*	1/2 MDL

Projected Discharge Information

Season	TDS tons/day
--------	-----------------

Summer	1.76000	17.0	1174.00	8.61450
Fall	1.76000	12.0		
Winter	1.76000	8.0		
Spring	1.76000	13.0		

All model numerical inputs, intermediate calculations, outputs and graphs are available for discussion, inspection and copy at the Division of Water Quality.

IX. Effluent Limitations

Current State water quality standards are required to be met under a variety of conditions including in-stream flows targeted to the 7-day, 10-year low flow (R317-2-9).

Other conditions used in the modeling effort coincide with the environmental conditions expected at low stream flows.

Effluent Limitation for Flow based upon Water Quality Standards

In-stream criteria of downstream segments will be met with an effluent flow maximum value as follows:

Season	Daily Average	
Summer	1.760 MGD	2.723 cfs
Fall	1.760 MGD	2.723 cfs
Winter	1.760 MGD	2.723 cfs
Spring	1.760 MGD	2.723 cfs

Flow Requirement or Loading Requirement

The calculations in this wasteload analysis utilize the maximum effluent discharge flow of 1.76 MGD. If the discharger is allowed to have a flow greater than 1.76 MGD during 7Q10 conditions, and effluent limit concentrations as indicated, then water quality standards will be violated. In order to prevent this from occuring, the permit writers must include the discharge flow limititation as indicated above; or, include loading effluent limits in the permit.

Effluent Limitation for Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) based upon WET Policy

Effluent Toxicity will not occur in downstream segements if the values below are met.

WET Requiren	nents	LC50 >	-	Effluent	[Acute]		
	Receiving	IC25 >	100.0% E	Effluent	[Chronic]	Chronic	Acute
	Water Flow	Effluent	Effluent	Combined	Totally	IC25 %	LC50 %
Season	(cfs)	Flow (MGD)	Flow (cfs)	Flow (cfs)	Mixed	Effluent	Effluent
Summer	0.00	1.8	2.7	2.7	YES	100.0%	EOP
Fall	0.00	1.8	2.7	2.7	YES	100.0%	EOP
Winter	0.00	1.8	2.7	2.7	YES	100.0%	EOP
Spring	0.00	1.8	2.7	2.7	YES	100.0%	EOP

Effluent Limitation for Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) based upon Water Quality Standards or Regulations

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Dissolved Oxygen will be met with an effluent BOD limitation as follows:

Season	Concentration	
Summer	25.0 mg/l as BOD5	366.9 lbs/day
Fall	25.0 mg/l as BOD5	366.9 lbs/day
Winter	25.0 mg/l as BOD5	366.9 lbs/day
Spring	25.0 mg/l as BOD5	366.9 lbs/day

Effluent Limitation for Dissolved Oxygen (DO) based upon Water Quality Standards

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Dissolved Oxygen will be met with an effluent D.O. limitation as follows:

Season	Concentration
Summer	5.00
Fall	5.00
Winter	5.00
Spring	5.00

Effluent Limitation for Total Ammonia based upon Water Quality Standards

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Total Ammonia will be met with an effluent limitation (expressed as Total Ammonia as N) as follows:

Seas	on				
	Conce	ntration		Loa	d
Summer	4 Day Avg Chronic	1.2 mg/l	as N	18.0	lbs/day
	1 Hour Avg Acute	5.1 mg/l	as N	75.5	lbs/day
Fall	4 Day Avg Chronic	7.3 mg/l	as N	107.0	lbs/day
	1 Hour Avg Acute	41.7 mg/l	as N	611.8	lbs/day
Winter	4 Day Avg Chronic	2.2 mg/l	as N	33.0	lbs/day
	1 Hour Avg Acute	7.0 mg/l	as N	102.8	lbs/day
Spring	4 Day Avg Chronic	7.3 mg/l	as N	107.0	lbs/day
	1 Hour Avg Acute	41.7 mg/l	l as N	611.8	lbs/day

Acute limit calculated with an Acute Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID) to be equal to 100.%.

Effluent Limitation for Total Residual Chlorine based upon Water Quality Standards

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Total Residual Chlorine will be met with an effluent limitation as follows:

Season		on	Concentrati	on	Load		
	Summer	4 Day Avg Chronic	0.011	mg/l	0.16	lbs/day	
		1 Hour Avg Acute	0.019	mg/l	0.28	lbs/day	
	Fall	4 Day Avg Chronic	0.011	mg/l	0.16	lbs/day	
		1 Hour Avg Acute	0.019	mg/l	0.28	lbs/day	
	Winter	4 Day Avg Chronic	0.011	mg/l	0.16	lbs/day	
		1 Hour Avg Acute	0.019	mg/l	0.28	lbs/day	
	Spring	4 Day Avg Chronic	0.011	mg/l	0.16	lbs/day	
		1 Hour Avg Acute	0.019	mg/l	0.28	lbs/day	

Effluent Limitations for Total Dissolved Solids based upon Water Quality Standards

Season		Concentrati	ion	Load		
Summer Fall Winter Spring	Maximum, Acute Maximum, Acute Maximum, Acute 4 Day Avg Chronic	3000.4 3000.6 3000.5 3000.6	mg/l mg/l mg/l mg/l	22.02 22.02 22.02 22.02	tons/day tons/day tons/day tons/day	
Colorado Salinity Forum Limits		Determined	by Permitting	Section		

Effluent Limitations for Total Recoverable Metals based upon Water Quality Standards

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Dissolved Metals will be met with an effluent limitation as follows (based upon a hardness of 474.91 mg/l):

		4 Day Average		1 Hou	r Average	
	Conce	ntration	Load	Concentration	•	Load
Aluminum	N/A		N/A	750.3	ug/l	11.0 lbs/day
Arsenic	150.05	ug/l	1.4 lbs/day	340.1	ug/l	5.0 lbs/day
Cadmium	2.74	ug/l	0.0 lbs/day	8.7	ug/l	0.1 lbs/day
Chromium III	308.82	ug/l	2.9 lbs/day	6,461.1	ug/l	94.8 lbs/day
Chromium VI	11.00	ug/l	0.1 lbs/day	16.0	ug/l	0.2 lbs/day
Copper	35.32	ug/l	0.3 lbs/day	60.8	ug/l	0.9 lbs/day
Iron	N/A		N/A	997.8	ug/l	14.6 lbs/day
Lead	23.13	ug/l	0.2 lbs/day	593.5	ug/l	8.7 lbs/day
Mercury	0.01	ug/l	0.0 lbs/day	2.4	ug/l	0.0 lbs/day
Nickel	194.95	ug/l	1.8 lbs/day	1,753.5	ug/l	25.7 lbs/day
Selenium	4.59	ug/l	0.0 lbs/day	20.0	ug/l	0.3 lbs/day
Silver	N/A	ug/l	N/A lbs/day	55.2	ug/l	0.8 lbs/day
Zinc	448.69	ug/l	4.3 lbs/day	448.7	ug/l	6.6 lbs/day
Cyanide (free)	5.20	ug/l	0.0 lbs/day	22.0	ug/l	0.3 lbs/day

Effluent Limitations for Heat/Temperature based upon Water Quality Standards

Summer	20.0 Deg. C.	68.1 Deg. F
Fall	18.4 Deg. C.	65.1 Deg. F
Winter	14.7 Deg. C.	58.4 Deg. F
Spring	17.6 Deg. C.	63.6 Deg. F

Effluent Limitations for Protection of Human Health [Toxics Rule] Based upon Water Quality Standards (Most stringent of 1C or 3A & 3B as appropriate.)

In-stream criteria of downstream segments for Protection of Human Health [Toxics] will be met with an effluent limit as follows:

	Maximum Co	oncentration
	Concentration	Load
Metals		
Antimony	ug/l	lbs/day
Arsenic	ug/l	lbs/day
Asbestos	ug/l	lbs/day
Beryllium		
Cadmium		
Chromium (III)		
Chromium (VI)		
Copper	ug/l	lbs/day
Cyanide	ug/l	lbs/day
Lead		
Mercury	ug/l	lbs/day
Nickel	ug/l	lbs/day
Selenium		
Silver		
Thallium	ug/l	lbs/day
Zinc		

Metals Effluent Limitations for Protection of All Beneficial Uses Based upon Water Quality Standards and Toxics Rule

		Acute				
	Class 3	Toxics				Class 3
Class 4	Acute	Drinking	Acute	1C Acute		Chronic
Acute	Aquatic	Water	Toxics	Health	Acute Most	Aquatic
Agricultural	Wildlife	Source	Wildlife	Criteria	Stringent	Wildlife

	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l
Aluminum		750.3				750.3	N/A
Antimony				4301.6		4301.6	
Arsenic	100.0	340.1			0.0	100.0	150.1
Asbestos						0.00E+00	
Barium						0.0	
Beryllium						0.0	
Cadmium	10.0	8.7			0.0	8.7	2.7
Chromium (III)		6461.1			0.0	6461.1	308.8
Chromium (VI)	100.0	16.0			0.0	16.00	11.00
Copper	200.1	60.8				60.8	35.3
Cyanide		22.0	220080.8			22.0	5.2
Iron		997.8				997.8	
Lead	100.0	593.5			0.0	100.0	23.1
Mercury		2.40		0.15	0.0	0.15	0.012
Nickel		1753.5		4601.7		1753.5	195.0
Selenium	50.0	20.0			0.0	20.0	4.6
Silver		55.2			0.0	55.2	
Thallium				6.3		6.3	
Zinc		448.7				448.7	448.7
Boron	750.3					750.3	

Summary Effluent Limitations for Metals [Wasteload Allocation, TMDL]

[If Acute is more stringent than Chronic, then the Chronic takes on the Acute value.]

	WLA Acute	WLA Chronic	
	ug/l	ug/l	
Aluminum	750.3	N/A	
Antimony	4301.58		
Arsenic	100.0	150.1	Acute Controls
Asbestos	0.00E+00		
Barium			
Beryllium			
Cadmium	8.7	2.7	
Chromium (III)	6461.1	309	
Chromium (VI)	16.0	11.0	
Copper	60.8	35.3	
Cyanide	22.0	5.2	
Iron	997.8		
Lead	100.0	23.1	
Mercury	0.150	0.012	
Nickel	1753.5	195	
Selenium	20.0	4.6	
Silver	55.2	N/A	
Thallium	6.3		
Zinc	448.7	448.7	
Boron	750.28		

Other Effluent Limitations are based upon R317-1. E. coli 126.0 organisms per 100 ml

X. Antidegradation Considerations

The Utah Antidegradation Policy allows for degradation of existing quality where it is determined that such lowering of water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are protected [R317-2-3]. It has been determined that certain chemical parameters introduced by this discharge will cause an increase of the concentration of said parameters in the receiving waters. Under no conditions will the increase in concentration be allowed to interfere with existing instream water uses.

The antidegradation rules and procedures allow for modification of effluent limits less than those based strictly upon mass balance equations utilizing 100% of the assimilative capacity of the receiving water.

Additional factors include considerations for "Blue-ribbon" fisheries, special recreational areas, threatened and endangered species, and drinking water sources.

An Antidegradation Level I Review was conducted on this discharge and its effect on the receiving water. Based upon that review, it has been determined that an Antidegradation Level II Review is NOT required because the UPDES permit is being renewed and there is no increase in load or concentration over that which was approved in the previous permit.

XI. Colorado River Salinity Forum Considerations

Discharges in the Colorado River Basin are required to have their discharge at a TDS loading of less than 1.00 tons/day unless certain exemptions apply. Refer to the Forum's Guidelines for additional information allowing for an exceedence of this value. This doesn't apply to facilities that do not discharge to the Colorado River Basin.

XII. Summary Comments

The mathematical modeling and best professional judgement indicate that violations of receiving water beneficial uses with their associated water quality standards, including important down-stream segments, will not occur for the evaluated parameters of concern as discussed above if the effluent limitations indicated above are met.

XIII. Notice of UPDES Requirement

This Addendum to the Statement of Basis does not authorize any entity or party to discharge to the waters of the State of Utah. That authority is granted through a UPDES permit issued by the Utah Division of Water Quality. The numbers presented here may be changed as a function of other factors. Dischargers are strongly urged to contact the Permits Section for further information. Permit writers may utilize other information to adjust these limits and/or to determine other limits based upon best available technology and other considerations provided that the values in this wasteload analysis [TMDL] are not compromised. See special provisions in Utah Water Quality Standards for adjustments in the Total Dissolved Solids values based upon background concentration.

Utah Division of Water Quality 801-538-6052 File Name: Sunnyside_Cogen_WLA_2023.xlsm

APPENDIX - Coefficients and Other Model Information

CBOD Coeff. (Kd)20 1/day 2.000	CBOD Coeff. FORCED (Kd)/day 0.000	CBOD Coeff. (Ka)T 1/day 0.804	REAER. Coeff. (Ka)20 (Ka)/day 10779.494	REAER. Coeff. FORCED 1/day 0.000	REAER. Coeff. (Ka)T 1/day 6733.652	NBOD Coeff. (Kn)20 1/day 0.400	NBOD Coeff. (Kn)T 1/day 0.087
Open Coeff.	Open Coeff.	NH3 LOSS	NH3	NO2+NO3 LOSS	NO2+NO3	TRC Decay	TRC
(K4)20	(K4)T	(K5)20	(K5)T	(K6)20	(K6)T	K(CI)20	K(CI)(T)
1/day	1/day	1/day	1/day	1/day	1/day	1/day	1/day
0.000	0.000	4.000	1.608	0.000	0.000	32.000	10.071
BENTHIC DEMAND (SOD)20 gm/m2/day 1.000	BENTHIC DEMAND (SOD)T gm/m2/day 0.287						
K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K(Cl)	S
CBOD	Reaer.	NH3	Open	NH3 Loss	NO2+3	TRC	Benthic
{theta}	{theta}	{theta}	{theta}	{theta}	{theta}	{theta}	{theta}
1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1

Antidegredation Review

An antidegradation review (ADR) was conducted to determine whether the proposed activity complies with the applicable antidegradation requirements for receiving waters that may be affected. The Level I ADR evaluated the criteria of R317-2-3.5(b) and determined that a Level II antidegradation Review is NOT required because the UPDES permit is being renewed and there is no increase in load or concentration over that which was approved in the previous permit.