**FACT SHEET AND STATEMENT OF BASIS**

#### USBR FLAMING GORGE DAM WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT RENEWAL PERMIT: DISCHARGE & BIOSOLIDS

**UPDES PERMIT NUMBER: UT0020338**

**UPDES BIOSOLIDS PERMIT NUMBER: UTL-020338**

**MINOR MUNICIPAL**

# FACILITY CONTACTS

Person Name: C. Steven Hulet

Position: Manager Flaming Gorge Field Division

Person Name: Keith Babcock

Position: Plant Superintendent

Facility Name: USBR – Flaming Gorge Dam Wastewater Treatment Plant

Mailing Address: 5995 Flaming Gorge Visitor Center

Dutch John, Utah 84023

Telephone: (435) 885-3231

Actual Address: 5995 Flaming Gorge Visitor Center

###### DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY

The USBR Flaming Gorge Dam Wastewater Treatment Plant (Flaming Gorge) is located at the Dam site in Daggett County. The facility serves the Flaming Gorge Dam Visitors Center and the United States Bureau of Reclamation personnel employed at the Dam. The Flaming Gorge expanded its capacity in 1968 from 3000 gallons per day to 6400 gallons per day. The flow varies from extremely low flows during the winter months to high flows during the summer months.

The treatment plant is located within the Dam and the discharge flows into the Green River via a 6” pipe. The raw wastewater is fed into a holding tank, which then pumps the wastewater as needed to the treatment plant. The treatment process consists of a screening basket, followed by an aerator, a settling tank, an airlift skimmer, and finally the chlorination chamber. The sludge from the facility is taken to the Dutch John Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant where it is dried, stored and then hauled to a landfill operated by the United States Forest Service. The facility is located at latitude 40o54’30” and longitude 109o25’25”, with an outfall STORET Number of 493850.

###### SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS PERMIT

There have been no changes in the treatment facility or flows from the plant.

1. WLA Model

A new model is used by Water Quality to develop a waste load allocation (WLA) for dischargers to Waters of the State.

1. RP

During the permit cycle, Water Quality has worked to improve our reasonable potential analysis (RP) for parameters to have limits included by using an EPA provided model. The results of the RP Analysis are included in Attachment 2 of the FSSOB

1. TBPEL Rule

Water Quality adopted UAC R317-1-3.3, Technology-Based Phosphorus Effluent Limit (TBPEL) Rule in 2014. The TBPEL rule as it relates to "non-lagoon" wastewater treatment plants establishes new regulations for the discharge of phosphorus to surface waters and is self-implementing. The TBPEL rule includes the following requirements for non-lagoon wastewater treatment plants:

The TBPEL requires that all non-lagoon wastewater treatment works discharging wastewater to surface waters of the state shall provide treatment processes which will produce effluent less than or equal to an annual mean of 1.0 mg/L for total phosphorus. This TBPEL shall be achieved by January 1, 2020.

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, D, 1 Influent for total phosphorus (as P) and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (as N) concentrations;

R317-1-3.3, D, 2. Effluent for total phosphorus and orthophosphate (as P), ammonia, nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (an N);

In R317-1-3.3, D, 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.

###### DISCHARGE

DESCRIPTION OF DISCHARGE

The Flaming Gorge discharges directly into the Green River. The facility has submitted discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) from which effluent data was taken from discharge concentrations used in the wasteload allocation. The last three years of self-monitoring data is attached. There were violations of their discharge limits for Total Suspended Solids and BOD; however the violations were not chronic in nature and did not require enforcement action.

##### Outfall Description of Discharge Point

 001 Located at latitude 40° 54' 30" and longitude 109° 25' 25". The discharge is through a pipe leading from the chlorine contact basin to the Green River.

RECEIVING WATERS AND STREAM CLASSIFICATION

The discharge flows directly into the Green River, immediately down stream from Flaming Gorge Dam. The Green River (from Utah-Colorado state line to Flaming Gorge Dam) is classified 2B, 3A and 4 according to *Utah Administrative Code (UAC) R317-2-13*:

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. The oil and grease is based on best professional judgment (BPJ). Attached is a Wasteload Analysis for this discharge into the Green 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.

Total dissolved solids (TDS) limitations are based upon Utah Water Quality Standards for concentration values and the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum (CRBSCF) for mass loading values when applicable as authorized in *UAC R317-2-4*. CRBSCF has established a policy for the reasonable increase of salinity for municipal discharges to any portion of the Colorado River stream system that has an impact on the lower main stem. The CRBSCF Policy entitled “NPDES Permit Program Policy for Implementation of Colorado River Salinity Standards” (Policy), with the most current version dated October 2017, states that the incremental increase in salinity shall be 400 mg/L or less, which is considered to be a reasonable incremental increase above the flow weighted average salinity of the intake water supply.

Reasonable Potential Analysis

Since January 1, 2016, DWQ has conducted reasonable potential analysis (RP) on all new and renewal applications received after that date. RP for this permit renewal was conducted following DWQ’s September 10, 2015 Reasonable Potential Analysis Guidance (RP Guidance). There are four outcomes defined in the RP Guidance: Outcome A, B, C, or D. These Outcomes provide a frame work for what routine monitoring or effluent limitations are required

Flaming Gorge has not monitored for metals in the past. As a result there is no data to evaluate in a RP. Flaming Gorge also has had minimal discharge during the life cycle of the permit and has limited to no industrial contributions to their waste stream. Therefore it was determined that no RP was required, and that no metals monitoring is being added to the permit.

The permittee is expected to be able to comply with these limitations. The permit limitations are:

| Parameter | Effluent Limitations[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| --- | --- |
| Maximum Monthly Avg | Maximum Weekly Avg | YearlyAverage | Daily Minimum | Daily Maximum |
| Total Flow | 0.0064 | - | - | - | - |
| BOD5, mg/LBOD5 Min. % Removal | 2585 | 35-- | -- | -- | -- |
| TSS, mg/LTSS Min. % Removal | 2585 | 35-- | -- | -- | -- |
| Oil & Grease[[2]](#footnote-2), mg/L | - | - | - | - | 10.0 |
| pH, Standard Units | - | - | - | 6.5 | 9 |
| *E. coli*, No./100mL | 126 | 157 | - | - | - |
| TDS[[3]](#footnote-3), mg/L | <400 Increase | - | - | - | - |

SELF-MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following self-monitoring requirements are the same as in the previous permit. The permit will require reports to be submitted monthly and annually, as applicable, on Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) forms due 28 days after the end of the monitoring period. Effective January 1, 2017, monitoring results must be submitted using NetDMR unless the permittee has successfully petitioned for an exception. Lab sheets for biomonitoring must be attached to the biomonitoring DMR. Lab sheets for metals and toxic organics must be attached to the DMRs.

| Self-Monitoring and Reporting Requirements1 |
| --- |
| Parameter | Frequency | Sample Type | Units |
| Total Flow[[4]](#footnote-4) [[5]](#footnote-5) | Continuous | Recorder | MGD |
| BOD5, Influent[[6]](#footnote-6)Effluent | MonthlyMonthly | CompositeComposite | mg/Lmg/L |
| TSS, Influent5Effluent | MonthlyMonthly | CompositeComposite | mg/Lmg/L |
| *E. coli* | Monthly | Grab | No./100mL |
| Oil & Grease² | Monthly | Grab | mg/L |
| pH | Monthly | Grab | SU |
| TDS[[7]](#footnote-7), mg/L, EffluentSource Water | YearlyYearly | GrabGrab | mg/Lmg/L |
| Orthophosphate, (as P)[[8]](#footnote-8)Effluent | Monthly | Composite | mg/L |
| Total Phosphorus8, InfluentEffluent | MonthlyMonthly | CompositeComposite | mg/L mg/L |
| Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, TKN (as N) 8InfluentEffluent | MonthlyMonthly | CompositeComposite | mg/L mg/L |
| Nitrate, NO38 | Monthly | Composite | mg/L |
| Nitrite, NO28 | Monthly | Composite | mg/L |

**BIOSOLIDS**

For clarification purposes, sewage sludge is considered solids, until treatment or testing shows that the solids are safe, and meet beneficial use standards. After the solids are tested or treated, the solids are then known as biosolids. Class A biosolids, may be used for high public contact sites, such as home lawns and gardens, parks, or playing fields, etc. Class B biosolids may be used for low public contact sites, such as farms, rangeland, or reclamation sites, etc.

The only solids (sewage sludge) produced from the FGWTP is from the clarifiers. The solids are pumped twice a year from the clarifiers to a truck and hauled to the town of Dutch John and disposed of in their lagoons. Because there is no regular solids production the requirements of 40 CFR 503 (standards for the use or disposal of sewage sludge) do not apply unless the solids are removed from the Dutch John lagoon system and disposed, therefore there are no monitoring requirements.

###### STORM WATER

Wastewater treatment facilities, which includes treatment lagoons, are required to comply with storm water permit requirements if they meet one or both of the following criteria,

1. The facility has an approved pretreatment program as described in 40 CFR Part 403.

2. The facility has a design flow of 1.0 MGD or greater.

Flaming Gorge does not meet the above mentioned criteria required for permit coverage, thus the facility does not need a UPDES Multi Sector General Permit for industrial activities at this time. Furthermore, this treatment facility is within the dam structure and not exposed to storm waters at all.

## 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 categorical industries discharging to the treatment facility, industrial discharges comprise less than 1 percent of the flow through 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 State of Utah Permitting and Enforcement Guidance Document for Whole Effluent Toxicity Control (biomonitoring). 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 potential for toxicity is not deemed sufficient to require biomonitoring or whole effluent toxicity (WET) limits because there are no present or anticipated industrial dischargers on the system nor are there any anticipated for the duration of this permit. The waste discharge is anticipated to be household waste only. Therefore, biomonitoring is not required in this permit; however the permit will contain a WET reopener provision.

###### PERMIT DURATION

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

Drafted by

Daniel Griffin, Discharge, Biosolids

Jennifer Robinson, Pretreatment

Michael George, Storm Water

Nate Nichols, Reasonable Potential Analysis

Dave Wham, Wasteload Analysis

Utah Division of Water Quality, (801) 536-4300

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

Began: February 20, 2018

Ended: March 22, 2018

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 Vernal Express.

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**

No comments were received regarding this permit. 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.

**ATTACHMENT 1**

*Effluent Monitoring Data*
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**Effluent Monitoring Data.**

| Month | Flow | BOD | E, coli | pH | TSS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acute | Chronic | Acute | Chronic | Max | Min | Acute | Chronic |
| Oct-14 | 0.002400 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 6 | 6 |
| Nov-14 | 0.001300 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 | 6.7 | 4 | 4 |
| Dec-14 | 0.000950 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 4 | 4 |
| Jan-15 | 0.000300 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 4 | 4 |
| Feb-15 | 0.000850 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 4 | 4 |
| Mar-15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Apr-15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| May-15 | 0.001920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Jun-15 | 0.001344 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6 | 6 |
| Jul-15 | 0.002112 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8.0 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Aug-15 | 0.001450 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Sep-15 | 0.001500 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Oct-15 | 0.000700 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Nov-15 | 0.001000 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 8 | 8 |
| Dec-15 | 0.000500 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 5 | 5 |
| Jan-16 | 0.000350 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 8.4 | 7.2 | 15 | 15 |
| Feb-16 | 0.000550 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 7.8 | 6.7 | 5 | 5 |
| Mar-16 | 0.000550 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 5 | 5 |
| Apr-16 | 0.000800 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8.2 | 6.6 | 5 | 5 |
| May-16 | 0.001400 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 | 6.6 | 5 | 5 |
| Jun-16 | 0.001650 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Jul-16 | 0.001650 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 4 | 4 |
| Aug-16 | 0.001100 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 5 | 5 |
| Sep-16 | 0.001750 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 4 | 4 |
| Oct-16 | 0.001700 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 5 | 5 |
| Nov-16 | 0.001100 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 15 | 15 |
| Dec-16 | 0.000600 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 53 | 53 |
| Jan-17 | 0.001000 | 17 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 17 | 17 |
| Feb-17 | 0.000300 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 54 | 54 |
| Mar-17 | 0.000450 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 24 | 24 |
| Apr-17 | 0.000550 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 68 | 68 |
| May-17 | 0.001500 | 28 | 28 | 10 | 10 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 18 | 18 |
| Jun-17 | 0.001200 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 8.0 | 6.6 | 26 | 26 |
| Jul-17 | 0.001350 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| Aug-17 | 0.002500 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Sep-17 | 0.001600 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 7 | 7 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.6 | 9.6 |

TBPEL Monitoring Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effluent | Influent |
| Month | Ammonia | NO3-+ NO2- | Ortho P | TKN | Total P | Total P | TKN |
| Jul-15 | 1.4 | 30.7 | 5.2 | 1 | 5.6 | 16 | 72 |
| Aug-15 | 0.5 | 51 | 5.9 | 1 | 6.9 | 18 | 93 |
| Sep-15 | 2 | 62 | 6.6 | 1 | 7 | 4.6 | 50 |
| Oct-15 | 0.2 | 69 | 8.6 | 1 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 63 |
| Nov-15 | 0.3 | 63 | 3.6 | 1 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 41 |
| Dec-15 | 0.2 | 54 | 6.9 | 1 | 7.2 | 8.9 | 34 |
| Jan-16 | 0.2 | 48 | 5.4 | 1 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 22 |
| Feb-16 | 0.2 | 54 | 6.5 | 1 | 6.7 | 13 | 62 |
| Mar-16 | 0.2 | 61.6 | 7.9 | 1 | 8.4 | 12 | 109 |
| Apr-16 | 0.2 | 76 | 7.6 | 5 | 8 | 7.9 | 53 |
| May-16 | 0.2 | 81.1 | 7.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 71 |
| Jun-16 | 0.2 | 74.7 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 75 |
| Jul-16 | 3.2 | 64.6 | 9.5 | 1 | 10 | 17 | 112 |
| Aug-16 | 0.5 | 66.3 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 372 |
| Sep-16 | 0.2 | 75.5 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 110 |
| Oct-16 | 0.2 | 81.3 | 6.3 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 102 |
| Nov-16 | 0.2 | 61.4 | 9 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 72.3 |
| Dec-16 | 0.2 | 71.9 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 5.1 | 27.1 |
| Jan-17 | 0.7 | 49.9 | 6.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 12 | 89.1 |
| Feb-17 | 0.9 | 56 | 8.4 | 1.2 | 9.6 | 12 | 106 |
| Mar-17 | 1.3 | 65.7 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 11 | 47 |
| Apr-17 | 2.9 | 67.9 | 11 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 51.4 |
| May-17 | 0.2 | 79 | 6.4 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 88.4 |
| Jun-17 | 0.2 | 61.3 | 5.2 | 1 | 5.4 | 11 | 104 |
| Jul-17 | 18.6 | 12.4 | 4.43 | 25.4 | 4.63 | 8.3 | 24.1 |
| Aug-17 | 66.2 | 1.88 | 8.07 | 72 | 8.45 | 9.87 | 84.9 |
| Sep-17 | 61 | 2.68 | 6.6 | 67.2 | 8.54 | 12.5 | 84.1 |

**ATTACHMENT 2**

*Wasteload Analysis*

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

**ATTACHMENT 3**

*Reasonable Potential Analysis*
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**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 Analysis[[9]](#footnote-9). 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.

As a result of the ratio of in stream low flow and maximum discharge flow (80,000:1) the WLA indicated limits are relatively high. The nature of the wastewater being treated (no categorical flows, domestic sanitary waste) has been an indicator of a low likely hood of metals being present in the effluent. As a result Flaming Gorge has not been required to monitor for metals in the past. Due to the relatively high values indicated in the WLA it was deemed that a full RPO was not required.

|  |
| --- |
| Possible WLA Indicated Metals Limits |
|  | ug/1 | mg/l | g/l |
|  | Acute | Chronic | Acute | Chronic | Acute | Chronic |
| Aluminum | 30,200,000 |  | 30,200 |  | 30 |  |
| Antimony | 347,000,000 |  | 347,000 |  | 347 |  |
| Arsenic | 8,080,255 | 11,700,000 | 8,080 | 11,700 | 8.08 | 11.7 |
| Cadmium | 211,993 | 27,777 | 212 | 28 | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| Chromium (Ill) | 152,000,000 | 11,125,570 | 152,000 | 11,126 | 152 | 11 |
| Chromium (VI) | 485,835 | 435,827 | 486 | 436 | 0.49 | 0.44 |
| Copper | 1,288,683 | 1,199,638 | 1,289 | 1,200 | 1.29 | 1.20 |
| Cyanide | 888,839 | 322,602 | 889 | 323 | 0.89 | 0.32 |
| Iron | 8,016,018 |  | 8,016 |  | 8.02 |  |
| Lead | 40,400,000 | 744 | 40,400 | 0.74 | 40.4 | 0.0007 |
| Mercury | 12,120 | 571,503 | 12 | 572 | 0.01 | 0.57 |
| Nickel | 40,600,000 | 6,881,053 | 40,600 | 6,881 | 40.6 | 6.88 |
| Selenium | 743,798 | 186,739 | 744 | 187 | 0.74 | 0.19 |
| Silver | 719,129 |  | 719 |  | 0.72 |  |
| Zinc | 10,400,000 | 15,900,000 | 10,400 | 15,900 | 10.4 | 15.9 |

| Possible WLA Indicated Limits |
| --- |
|  | Concentration, mg/l | Load, lds/day |
| Season | Chronic | Acute | Chronic | Acute |
| Ammonia |
| Summer | 102,478 | 72,337 | 5,469 | 3,860 |
| Fall | 224,733 | 128,599 | 11,993 | 6,863 |
| Winter | 143,149 | 7,639 | 7,639 | 5,695 |
| Spring | 224,728 | 128,599 | 1,193 | 6,863 |
| TRC |
| All | 629 | 764 | 34 | 41 |

DWQ-2017-012403

1. See Definitions, Part VIII, for definition of terms. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Oil & Grease sampled when sheen is present or visible. If no sheen is present or visible, report NA. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The effluent shall not exceed the culinary source water intake by more than 400 mg/L of TDS. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Flow measurements of influent/effluent volume shall be made in such a manner that the permittee can affirmatively demonstrate that representative values are being obtained. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If the rate of discharge is controlled, the rate and duration of discharge shall be reported [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The effluent shall not exceed the culinary source water intake by more than 400 mg/L of TDS. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. These reflect changes required with the adoption of UCA R317-1-3.3, Technology-based Phosphorus Effluent Limits rule [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See Reasonable Potential Analysis Guidance for definitions of terms [↑](#footnote-ref-9)