

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION 8
NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM
STATEMENT OF BASIS**

PERMITEE: **Wulf Cattle Depot**

FACILITY NAME AND ADDRESS: **Wulf Cattle Depot
400 Sale Barn Road
McLaughlin, South Dakota 57642**

CAFO NPDES PERMIT No.: **SD-0034606**

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL AND FACILITY CONTACT: **Mr. Lucas Sutherland, Manager**

PHONE: **605-823-4467**

PERMIT TYPE: **CAFO Minor**

Introduction

This statement of basis (SoB) is for the re-issuance of a NPDES permit (Permit) to the Wulf Cattle Depot. The Permit establishes discharge limitations for any discharge of wastewater from the facility discharge. The SoB explains the nature of the discharges, and EPA's decisions for limiting the pollutants in the wastewater, as well as the regulatory and technical basis for these decisions.

EPA Region 8 is the permitting authority for facilities located in Indian country, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1151, located within Region 8 states and supports implementation of federal environmental laws consistent with the federal trust responsibility, the government-to-government relationship, and EPA's 1984 Indian Policy.

Part I. Background Information

This Permit is for a beef cattle feedlot located on the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Reservation at the NE 1/4 of Section 5, Township 21 North, Range 27 East, latitude 45.818450° N and longitude 100.798517° W in McLaughlin, South Dakota. This feedlot started background feeding in 1992 with about 160 animals. It expanded to a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) with over 1,000 animals in 1997, which meets the large CAFO definition in 40 CFR Part 122.23(b)(4). The feedlot was previously known as the McLaughlin Livestock Auction, then Corson County Feeders, and now Wulf Cattle Depot.

The Wulf Cattle Depot building is located in the NE 1/4 of Section 5, Township 21 North, Range 27 East, latitude 45.816935° N and longitude 100.808304° W in the town of McLaughlin, Corson County, South Dakota. This building is adjacent and west of the Wulf Cattle Depot feedlot.

However, in the spring of 2012 Wulf Cattle Depot purchased all of McLaughlin Livestock Auction (pens and building) with the intent to convert all auction pens into feedlot pens in the future.

Currently, the Wulf Cattle Depot feedlot consists of approximately 153 acres of land with approximately 45 feeding pens, five settling basins, and four holding or retention ponds. This facility can hold up to a total of 12,400 head of background cattle. These cattle weigh an average of 650 pounds. Once the cattle reach approximately 800 pounds, they typically will be shipped to finishing lots. However, at other times, livestock may be fed out depending on market conditions.

A. Receiving Waters

The closest named water stream is Oak Creek. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Reservation draft water quality standards (WQS) (November 2015 version) classify Oak Creek with the following designated uses: cultural, warmwater permanent fish life propagation, other aquatic life, full contact recreation, wildlife, and agricultural / livestock. These standards are not EPA-approved WQS and are solely used for receiving water characterization purposes for this Permit. The Oak Creek Road County Road runs along the north side of the facility. There is a dry bed drainage that runs north of the Oak Creek Road from the Wulf Cattle CAFO facility. This drainage flows to Oak Creek, which is approximately one mile northeast of the facility. Oak Creek is a tributary to the Missouri River (Lake Oahe). The Missouri River (Lake Oahe) has the following designated uses: coldwater permanent fish life propagation water, commerce and industry waters, domestic water supply waters, fish and wildlife propagation, recreation, and stock watering waters, immersion recreation waters, irrigation waters, and limited contact recreation waters.

The Wulf Cattle CAFO facility has constructed five settling basins and four wastewater holding ponds to collect all runoff from the feedlot. A wastewater flow diagram outlining the feedlot and the drainage areas is in Section A of the Nutrient Management Plan (NMP). There are four drainage areas ponds, which include a combination of sediment basins, diversions and holding ponds. All the basins, diversions and ponds ultimately drain via gravity to Holding Pond #4. Wastewater from Holding Pond #4 is pumped via a floating pump to a center pivot on Field #3 for land application.

All of the pens and part of the parking lot that were previously part of the McLaughlin Livestock Auction, which are now owned and being incorporated into the feedlot, drain to Holding Ponds #3 or #4. The feedlot holding ponds were designed to account for this additional capacity to handle the drainage from the previous livestock auction. The holding ponds were sized approximately 6.7 percent larger to account for this area. The facility also planted about 1,800 seedlings (five rows) with a drip system along the north side of the feedlot to act as a barrier for noise and appearance between the feedlot and its neighbors.

The facility has wastewater storage capacity of 3,043,050 ft³ (22,763,595 gallons) for manure, litter, and process wastewater generated from the feedlot, as indicated in the NMP and the permit application. According to the NMP, the facility generates approximately 1,428,971 ft³/year

(10,688,702 gallons/year) of manure, litter and wastewater. Therefore, there is excess storage capacity in the wastewater lagoon system.

There are approximately 7,312 acres of land owned or leased by the Permittee. These lands are available for applying the CAFO's manure, litter, and process wastewater.

B. Monitoring Data

No discharges have been reported from this facility over the past 14 years.

C. General Statutory and Regulatory Information

Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), 33 USC 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of pollutants to waters of the U.S. in the absence of authorizing permits, including NPDES permits. The CWA Section 402, 33 USC 1342, authorizes EPA (or EPA-approved States) to issue NPDES permits allowing such discharges on condition that they in part will comply with requirements implementing CWA Sections 301, 304, and 401 [33 USC 1311, 1314, and 1341].

Among those requirements are effluent limitations reflecting levels of technological capability, water quality standards, and other more stringent requirements States may adopt. Violation of a condition contained in this Permit is a violation of the CWA and subjects the operator of the permitted facility to the penalties specified in Section 309 of the Act.

D. Permit Expiration

In accordance with 40 CFR Part 122.46(a), this Permit has a term of 5 years from the effective date.

Part II. Rational for Effluent Limitations and Standards

A. Effluent Limitations

Section 301 of the CWA prohibits the discharge of pollutants by any point source into waters of the U.S. except in accordance with a permit. It also requires that dischargers comply with effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. The NPDES permit regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(a) and (d) implement Section 301 by requiring that each NPDES permit issued under Section 402 include conditions that meet technology-based effluent limitations and standards, as well as water quality standards.

1. Technology-based Effluent Limitations

The facility meets the definition of an animal feeding operation (AFO) in 40 CFR 122.23(b)(1), because it is a feedlot where animals have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period and crops, vegetation, forage growth, or post-harvest residues are not sustained in the normal growing season over any portion of the feedlot. The facility further meets the definition of a Large CAFO in 40 CFR 122.23(b)(4),

because it stables or confines at least 1,000 cattle and, if livestock may be fed out, at least 1,000 cattle.

Large CAFOs are subject to the effluent guidelines found at 40 CFR Part 412, and the facility is subject to Subparts C (Dairy Cows and Cattle Other Than Veal Calves)

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act (the “Act”) Section 402(a)(2) [40 CFR 122.44(k)(3)], best management practices (BMPs) are being proposed in the Permit. These practices are reasonably necessary either to achieve effluent limitations or to carry out the Act’s goals of eliminating the discharge of pollutants as much as practicable and to maintain water quality.

a. Technology-based Effluent Limitations and Standards – Production Area

In accordance with 40 CFR 412.31, there shall be **no discharge** of manure, litter, or process wastewater pollutants into waters of the United States from the production area except as provided below:

The design storage volume must reflect manure, wastewater, and other wastes accumulated during the storage period; normal precipitation less evaporation on the surface area during the entire storage period; normal runoff from the facility’s drainage area during the storage period; 25-year, 24-hour precipitation on the surface (at the required design storage volume level) of the facility; 25-year, 24-hour runoff from the facility’s drainage area; residual solids after liquids have been removed; necessary freeboard; and, in the case of treatment lagoons, a minimum treatment volume necessary to allow anaerobic treatment to occur.

[40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(i)]

b. The additional measures and records. In accordance with 40 CFR 412.37(a) and (b). (See below for these measures)

2. Additional Measures – Applicable to the Production Area

Visual inspections of the production area including: [412.37(a)(1)]

- a. Weekly inspections of all storm water diversion devices, runoff diversion structures, and devices channeling contaminated storm water to the wastewater and manure storage and containment structures. [40 CFR 412.37(a)(1)(i)]
- b. Daily inspections of all water lines, including drinking water and cooling water lines. [40 CFR 412.37(a)(1)(ii)]
- c. Weekly inspections of the manure, litter, and process wastewater impoundments noting the level as indicated by the depth marker installed in accordance with part d below, and 40 CFR 412.37(a)(2). [40 CFR 412.37(a)(1)(iii)]

- d. Installation of a depth marker in all open surface liquid impoundments which clearly indicates the minimum capacity necessary to contain the runoff and direct precipitation of the 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event. [40 CFR 412.37(a)(2)]
- e. Correction of any deficiencies that are identified as a result of visual inspections as soon as possible. [40 CFR 412.37(a)(3)]
- f. No disposal of animal mortalities in any liquid manure or process wastewater systems and handling of animal mortalities in such a way as to prevent discharge of pollutants to surface water. [40 CFR 412.37(a)(4)]
- g. Complete records of maintenance for the production area, in accordance with 40 CFR 412.37(b). Records must be maintained on-site at the permitted CAFO for 5 years from the date they are created and must include the records identified in the Operation and Maintenance section of Table IV-A of the Permit.

3. Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations and Standards – Production Area

In those cases where technology-based effluent limitations are not sufficient to meet water quality standards, the permitting authority must develop more stringent water quality-based effluent limitations on a site-specific basis.

4. Technology-based Effluent Limitations and Standards – Land Application Areas under the Control of the CAFO Owner/Operator

The CAFO must develop and implement a NMP. [40 CFR 412.4(c)(1)]

- a. Develop and implement a NMP that is based on a field-specific assessment of the potential for nitrogen and phosphorus transport from the field. [40 CFR 412(c)(1)]
- b. Address the form, source, amount, timing, and method of application of nutrients on each field to achieve realistic production goals, while minimizing nitrogen and phosphorus movement to surface waters. [40 CFR 412(c)(1)]
- c. Determine application rates for manure, litter, and process wastewater that minimize phosphorus and nitrogen transport from the field to surface waters in accordance with the technical standards for nutrient management established by EPA. [40 CFR 412(c)(2)]
- d. In addition to the above technology-based effluent limitations for the land application areas, EPA has established best professional judgement (BPJ) requirements for identification of site specific conservation practices to control runoff of pollutants to waters of the U.S. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(vi)]
- e. Establishment of protocols to land apply manure, litter, and process wastewater in accordance with site specific nutrient management practices that ensure appropriate

agricultural utilization of the nutrients in the manure, litter, or process wastewater. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(vii)]

- f. Analyze manure a minimum of once annually for nitrogen and phosphorus content and soil a minimum of once every 5 years for phosphorus content. [40 CFR 412.4(c)(3)]
- g. Periodically inspect for leaks equipment used for land application of manure, litter, or process wastewater. [40 CFR 412.4(c)(4)]
- h. Do not apply manure, litter, or process wastewater closer than 100 feet to any down-gradient surface waters, open tile line intake structures, sinkholes, agricultural well heads, or other conduits to surface waters. As a compliance alternative, the CAFO may substitute the 100-foot setback with a 35-foot wide vegetated buffer where applications of manure, litter, or process wastewater are prohibited. [40 CFR 412.4(c)(5) and 40 CFR 412.4(c)(5)(i)]
- i. Complete on-site records including the site specific NMP must be maintained to document implementation of all required land application practices. [40 CFR 412.37(b)]

5. Other Limitations for Land Application Areas under the Control of the CAFO Owner/Operator

- a. Additional BMPs to control discharges from land application areas. (See below for these additional BMPs)
[Based on BPJ]
- b. Prohibitions
 - (i) There shall be no discharge of manure, litter or process wastewater to a water of the United States from a CAFO as a result of the application of manure, litter or process wastewater to land areas under the control of the CAFO, except where it is an agricultural storm water discharge. [40 CFR 122.23(e)]
- c. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.
Discharges from CAFO land application areas, except where it is an agricultural storm water discharge, are subject to NPDES requirements, including water quality-based effluent limitations. Federal regulations [40 CFR 122.44(d)] require permit limitations to control all pollutants which may be discharged at a level with will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above water quality standard. In most instances, a CAFO that meets technology-based permit limits requiring manure to be applied at appropriate agronomic rates will eliminate all or most dry weather discharges. However, if such discharges remain, the permitting authority must determine the need for additional water quality-based effluent limitations to meet applicable water quality standards based on the circumstances of each particular case (see the Preamble to the Final Rule, 73 FR 70,418 (November 20, 2008)).

This Permit prohibits all dry weather discharge from the land application area. This includes, but is not limited to, the dry weather discharge of irrigation water not associated with nutrient application on fields where manure was previously applied.

6. Effluent Limitations - Other Discharges

a. Other production area discharges

Permit limitations are based on BPJ when national effluent limitations guidelines that apply to the appropriate category, or to the particular process involved, have not been issued. EPA can use BPJ to develop special permit conditions to address specific discharges at CAFOs, such as washdown of equipment that has been in contact with manure, discharges of fuel, and pollutants (i.e., manure and feed) which have fallen to the ground immediately downwind from confinement building exhaust ducts and ventilation fans and are carried by storm water runoff to waters of the U.S. (see Section 4.1.1 of EPA's NPDES Permit Writers' Guidance Manual and Example NPDES Permit for CAFOs, February 2012). Discharges from CAFOs, including process wastewater discharges from outside the production area, non-process wastewater discharges, and storm water discharges not addressed under the ELG, except where they are considered an agricultural storm water discharge, are subject to NPDES requirements, including water quality-based effluent limitations.

B. Other Legal Requirements

No condition of this Permit releases the Permittee from any responsibility or requirements under other statutes or regulations, Federal, Indian Tribe or Local. [40 CFR Parts 122.1(f) and 122.49]

Part III. Special Conditions

A. Nutrient Management Plan

The completed NMP was submitted to EPA with the permit application for CAFO seeking coverage under this Permit, as required. The Permittee shall implement its NMP upon authorization under this Permit. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(5)]

1. NMP Terms and Conditions

The Permittee must develop, submit with the permit application, and upon authorization implement a site specific NMP. The NMP must specifically identify and describe the practices that will be implemented to assure compliance with the effluent limitations and special conditions in this CAFO permit. The NMP must be developed in accordance with the South Dakota Natural Resource Conservation Service (SD NRCS) Conservation Practice Standard Code 590 (Nutrient Management). As provided in 40 CFR 123.36, these technical standards must be consistent with 412.4(c)(2), which in part provides that such standards must operate to minimize the transport of nutrients to surface waters. The NMP accomplishes this primarily by restricting the quantity of nutrients that can be land applied and matching that quantity with the

nutrient needs of the crops being grown on the fields used for such land application. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(5)]

Upon receipt of the NMP, EPA will review the NMP. EPA can request additional information if needed. EPA will use the NMP to identify site-specific permit terms, which must be incorporated as terms and conditions of the permit. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(5)]

Once the permit application and NMP are complete and have been reviewed by EPA, EPA will notify the public make available for public review and comment of the proposed permit and materials submitted by the CAFO, including the CAFO's NMP, and the terms of the NMP identified by EPA to be incorporated into the permit, as determined by EPA, at EPA Region 8 internet site (<https://www.epa.gov/npdes-permits/south-dakota-npdes-permits>). The notice will also provide the opportunity for the request for a public hearing on the proposed permit and NMP in accordance with 40 CFR 124.11 and 12. The public is provided 30 days to comment and request a hearing on the proposed terms of the NMP to be incorporated into the permit. EPA will respond to significant comments and can revise the NMP or terms of the permit if necessary. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(5)]

The permit specifies that the NMP must, at a minimum, include practices and procedures necessary to implement the applicable effluent limitations and standards. In addition, the NMP must meet nine minimum measures required under 40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(i-ix) and specified in this Permit. These requirements include the following:

- a. Ensure adequate storage of manure, litter, and process wastewater, including procedures to ensure proper operation and maintenance of the storage facilities. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(i)]
- b. Ensure proper management of mortalities (i.e., dead animals) to ensure that they are not disposed of in a liquid manure, storm water, or process wastewater storage or treatment system that is not specifically designed to treat animal mortalities. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(ii)]
- c. Ensure that clean water is diverted, as appropriate, from the production area. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(1)(iii)]
- d. Prevent the direct contact of animals confined or stabled at the facility with waters of the United States. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(iv)]
- e. Ensure that chemicals and other contaminants handled on-site are not disposed of in any manure, litter, process wastewater, or storm water storage or treatment system unless specifically designed to treat such chemicals or contaminants. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(v)]
- f. Identify appropriate site specific conservation practices to be implemented, including as appropriate buffers or equivalent practices, to control runoff of pollutants to waters of the United States and specifically, to minimize the runoff of nitrogen and phosphorus. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(vi)]

- g. Identify protocols for appropriate testing of manure, litter, process wastewater, and soil. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(vii)]
- h. Establish protocols to land apply manure, litter, or process wastewater in accordance with site specific nutrient management practices that ensure appropriate agricultural utilization of the nutrients in the manure, litter, or process wastewater. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(viii)]

Application rates will be expressed in the NMP consistent with the approach described below:

Narrative Rate Approach. An approach that expresses rates of application as narrative rate of application that results in the amount, in tons or gallons, of manure, litter, and process wastewater to be land applied according to the following specifications:

- (A) The terms include maximum amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus derived from all sources of nutrients, for each crop identified in the NMP, in chemical forms determined to be acceptable to EPA, in pounds per acre, for each field, and certain factors necessary to determine such amounts. At a minimum, the factors that are terms must include: the outcome of the field-specific assessment of the potential for nitrogen and phosphorus transport from each field; the crops to be planted in each field or any other uses such as pasture or fallow fields (including alternative crops identified in accordance with paragraph (B) below of this section); the realistic yield goal for each crop or use identified for each field, and the nitrogen and phosphorus recommendations from sources specified by EPA for each crop or use identified for each field. In addition, the terms include the methodology by which the NMP accounts for the following factors when calculating the amounts of manure, litter, and process wastewater to be land applied: results of soil tests conducted in accordance with protocols identified in the NMP, credits for all nitrogen in the field that will be plant available; the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus in the manure, litter and process wastewater to be applied; consideration of multi-year phosphorus application; accounting for all other additions of plant available nitrogen and phosphorus to the field, the form and source of manure, litter, and process wastewater; the timing and method of land application; and volatilization of nitrogen and mineralization of organic nitrogen.
- (B) The terms of the NMP include alternative crops identified in the CAFO's NMP that are not in the planned rotation. Where a CAFO includes alternative crops in its NMP, the crops must be listed by field, in addition to the crops identified in the planned crop rotation for that field and the NMP must include realistic crop yield goals and the nitrogen and phosphorus recommendations from sources specified by EPA for each crop. Maximum amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus from all sources of nutrients and the amounts of manure, litter, and process wastewater to be applied must be determined in accordance with the methodology described in paragraph (A) above of this section.

(C) For CAFOs using this approach the following projections must be included in the NMP submitted to EPA, but are not terms of the NMP: the CAFO's planned crop rotations for each field for the period of permit coverage, the projected amount of manure, litter, or process wastewater to be applied; projected credits for all nitrogen in the field that will be plant available; consideration of multi-year phosphorus application: accounting for all other additions of plant available nitrogen and phosphorus to the field; and the predicted form, source, and method of application of manure, litter, and process wastewater for each crop. Timing of application for each field, insofar as it concerns the calculation of rates of application, is not a term of the NMP.

(D) CAFOs that use the narrative approach must calculate maximum amounts of manure, litter, and process wastewater to be land applied at least once each year using the methodology required in paragraph (A) above of this section before land applying manure, litter, and process wastewater and must rely on the following data;

- (1) a field-specific determination of soil levels of nitrogen and phosphorus, including, for nitrogen, a concurrent determination of nitrogen that will be plant available consistent with the methodology required in paragraph (A) above of this section, and for phosphorus, the result of the most recent soil test conducted in accordance with soil testing requirements approved by EPA; and
- (2) the results of most recent representative manure, litter, and process wastewater tests for nitrogen and phosphorus taken within 12 months of the date of land application, in order to determine the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus in the manure, litter., and process wastewater to be applied. [122.42(e)(5)(ii)]

- i. Identify and maintain all records necessary to document the development and implementation of the NMP and compliance with the permit. [40 CFR 122.23(1)(ix)]
2. Signature. The NMP shall be signed by the owner/operator or other signatory authority in accordance with Part VI.E (Signatory Requirements) of this Permit. [40 CFR 122.41(k)]
3. A current copy of the NMP shall be kept on-site at the permitted facility in accordance with Part IV.C of this Permit and provided to the permitting authority upon request. [40 CFR 412.37(c)]
4. Changes to the NMP
 - a. The Permit recognizes that a CAFO owner or operator may need to make changes to its NMP. When the Permittee makes changes to the CAFO's NMP previously submitted to EPA, the CAFO owner or operator must provide EPA with the most current version of the CAFO's NMP and identify changes from the previous version. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(i)]
 - b. EPA will review the revised NMP. If EPA determines that the changes to the NMP require revision of the terms of the NMP incorporated into the permit issued to the

CAFO, EPA must then determine whether such changes are substantial. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(ii)]. Substantial changes to the terms of a NMP incorporated as terms and conditions of a permit include, but are not limited to: [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(iii)]

- (i) Addition of new land application areas not previously included in the CAFO's NMP, except that if the added land application area is covered by the terms of a NMP incorporated into an existing NPDES permit and the Permittee complies with such terms when applying manure, litter, and process wastewater to the added land; [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(iii)(A)]
 - (ii) For NMPs using the Narrative Rate Approach, changes to the maximum amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus derived from all sources for each crop; [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(iii)(B)]
 - (iii) Addition of any crop or other uses not included in the terms of the CAFO's NMP; [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(iii)(C)]
 - (iv) Changes to site specific components of the CAFO's NMP, where such changes are likely to increase the risk of nitrogen and phosphorus transport to waters of the U.S. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(iii)(D)]
- c. If the changes to the terms of the NMP are not substantial, EPA will include the revised NMP in the Permit record, revise the terms of the Permit based on the site specific NMP, and notify the Permittee and the public of any changes to the terms of the permit based on revisions to the NMP. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(ii)(A)]
 - d. If EPA determines that the changes to the terms of the NMP are substantial, EPA will notify the public, make the proposed changes and make the information submitted by the CAFO owner or operator available for public review and comment, and respond to all significant comments received during the comment period. EPA may require the Permittee to further revise the NMP, if necessary. Once EPA incorporates the revised terms of the NMP into the Permit, EPA will notify the Permittee of the revised terms and conditions of the Permit. [40 CFR 122.42(e)(6)(ii)(B)]

B. Facility Closure

Abandoned or improperly closed CAFOs pose a pollution threat to surface water and groundwater that can be significant for large facilities and increases due to a lack of proper maintenance and management.

This CAFO Permit includes specific closure requirements for lagoons and other surface impoundments, as well as for other manure, litter and process wastewater storage and handling facilities. Under this Permit, no such facilities may be abandoned and each must be properly closed as promptly as practicable upon ceasing operation. In addition, any lagoon or other earthen or synthetic lined basin that is not in use for a period of 12 consecutive months must be properly closed unless the facility is financially viable, intends to resume use of the structure at a

later date, and either: (1) maintains the structure as though it were actively in use, to prevent compromise of structural integrity; or (2) removes manure and wastewater to a depth of one foot or less and refills the structure with clean water to preserve the integrity of the synthetic or earthen liner. In either case, the Permittee must notify EPA of the action taken, and must conduct routine inspections, maintenance, and record keeping as though the structure were in use. Prior to restoration of use of the structure, the Permittee shall notify EPA and provide the opportunity for inspection.

All closure of lagoons and other earthen or synthetic lined basins must be consistent with SD NRCS Conservation Practice Standard Code 360 (Closure of Waste Impoundments). Consistent with this standard the Permittee must remove all waste materials to the maximum extent practicable and dispose of them in accordance with the Permittee's NMP, unless otherwise authorized by EPA.

Closure of all other manure, litter, or process wastewater storage and handling structures must occur as promptly as practicable after the Permittee has ceased to operate, or, if the Permittee has not ceased to operate, within 12 months after the date on which the use of the structure ceased. To close a manure, litter, or process wastewater storage and handling structure, the Permittee must remove all manure, litter, or process wastewater and dispose of it in accordance with the Permittee's NMP, or document its transfer from the permitted facility in accordance with off-site transfer requirements specified in this Permit, unless otherwise authorized by EPA.

C. Requirements for the Transfer of Manure, Litter, and Process Wastewater to Other Persons

Under this CAFO Permit, where CAFO-generated manure, litter, or process wastewater is sold or given away the Permittee must comply with specific requirements that document the transaction and promote proper management. These include the following conditions:

- a. Maintain records showing the date and amount of manure, litter, and/or process wastewater that leaves the permitted operation;
- b. Record the name and address of the recipient;
- c. Provide the recipient(s) with representative information on the nutrient content of the manure, litter, and/or process wastewater; and
- d. These records must be retained on-site, for a period of 5 years, and be submitted to the permitting authority upon request. [122.42(e)(3)]

This CAFO Permit does not establish requirements for off-site management of CAFO generated manure, litter, or process wastewater. However, EPA can use the documentation specified above to ensure proper management of such materials as appropriate.

Part IV. Discharge Monitoring and notification Requirements

A. Notification of Discharges Resulting from Manure, Litter, and Process Wastewater Storage, Handling, On-site Transport and Application

This Permit provides that in the event of a discharge of pollutants to a water of the United States, the Permittee is required to make immediate oral notification within 24-hours to EPA Region 8, Emergency Management Branch at (303) 293-1788 and notify EPA in writing within five (5) working days of the discharge from the facility. In addition, the Permittee must keep a copy of the notification submitted to EPA together with the other records required by this Permit. The discharge notification must include: 1) a description of the discharge and its cause, including a description of the flow path to the receiving water body and an estimate of the flow and volume discharged; 2) the period of non-compliance, including exact dates and times, the anticipated time it is expected to continue, and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate and prevent recurrence of the discharge; and 3) the signed certification statement required by the Permit. This reporting requirement is a standard permit condition under 40 CFR 122.41(1)(6) and 40 CFR 122.22(b). Note that runoff that meets the criteria of the agricultural stormwater exemption does not constitute a point source discharge.

B. Monitoring Requirements for All Discharges from Retention Structures

This CAFO Permit provides that in the event of any overflow or other discharge of pollutants from a manure and/or wastewater storage or retention structure, whether or not authorized by this Permit, all discharges must be sampled and analyzed, and an estimate of the volume of the release and the date and time must be recorded. [40 CFR 122.41(j)]

Samples must, at a minimum, be collected and analyzed for the following parameters: total nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, total phosphorus, *E. coli* bacteria, five-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids, pH, and temperature. The samples must be collected and analyzed in accordance with approved EPA methods for water analysis listed in 40 CFR Part 136. [40 CFR 122.41]. Samples shall consist of grab samples collected from the over-flow or discharges from the retention structure. A minimum of one sample shall be collected from the initial discharge (within 30 minutes). Grab samples are required in the first 30 minutes to ensure a good sample is collected.

If conditions are not safe for sampling, the Permittee must provide documentation of why samples could not be collected and analyzed. For example, the Permittee may be unable to collect samples during dangerous weather conditions (such as local flooding, high winds, hurricane, tornadoes, electrical storms, etc.). However, once dangerous conditions have passed, the Permittee shall collect a sample from the retention structure (pond or lagoon) from which the discharge occurred. [40 CFR 122.41]

C. General Inspection, Monitoring, and Record keeping Requirements

Under this Permit, the Permittee shall inspect, monitor, and record the results of such inspection and monitoring in accordance with Table IV–A:

Table IV-A NPDES Large CAFO Permit Record Keeping Requirements		
Parameter	Units	Frequency
Permit and NMP (Note: Required by the NPDES CAFO Regulation – applicable to all CAFOs)		
The CAFO must maintain on-site a copy of the current NPDES permit.	N/A	Maintain at all times
The CAFO must maintain on-site a current site specific NMP that reflects existing operational characteristics. The operation must also maintain on-site all necessary records to document that the NMP is being properly implemented with respect to manure and wastewater generation, storage and handling, and land application. In addition, records must be maintained that the development and implementation of the NMP is in accordance with the minimum practices defined in 40 CFR 122.42(e).	N/A	Maintain at all times
Soil and Manure/Wastewater Nutrient Analysis (Note: Required by the CAFO ELG – applicable to Large CAFOs)		
Analysis of manure, litter, and process wastewater to determine nitrogen and phosphorus content. ¹	ppm Pounds/ton	At least annually after initial sampling
Analysis of soil in all fields where land application activities are conducted to determine phosphorus content. ¹	ppm	At least once every 5 years after initial sampling
Operation and Maintenance (Note: Required by the CAFO ELG – applicable to Large CAFOs)		
Visual inspections of all storm water diversion devices, runoff diversion structures, and devices channeling contaminated storm water to the wastewater and manure storage and containment structures including the inspection date, who conducted the inspection, and deficiencies	N/A	Weekly
Visual inspection of all water lines including the inspection date, who conducted the inspection, and deficiencies	N/A	Daily ²
Documentation of depth of manure and process wastewater in all liquid impoundments including the date and who made the measurement	Feet	Weekly
Documentation of all corrective actions taken and dates of corrective actions. Deficiencies not corrected within 30 days must be accompanied by an explanation of the factors preventing immediate correction.	N/A	As necessary

Table IV-A NPDES Large CAFO Permit Record Keeping Requirements		
Parameter	Units	Frequency
Documentation of animal mortality handling practices (such as burial, landfill, incineration, etc)	N/A	As necessary
Design documentation for all manure, litter, and wastewater storage structures including the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume for solids accumulation • Design treatment volume • Total design storage volume³ • Days of storage capacity 	Cubic yards/gallons Cubic yards/gallons Cubic yards/gallons Days	Once in the permit term unless revised
Documentation of all overflows from all manure and wastewater storage structures including: <i>(Note: Required by the NPDES Regulation – applicable to all CAFOs)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date and time of overflow • Estimated volume of overflow • Analysis of overflow (as required by EPA) 	Month/day/year Total gallons TBD	Per event Per event Per event
Land Application (Note: Required by the CAFO ELG – applicable to Large CAFOs)		
For each application event where manure, litter, or process wastewater is applied, documentation of the following by field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of application • Method of application • Weather conditions at the time of application and for 24 hours prior to and following application • Total amount of nitrogen and phosphorus applied⁴ 	Month/day/year N/A N/A Pounds/acre	Daily Daily Daily Daily
Documentation of the crop and expected yield for each field	Bushel/acre	Seasonally
Documentation of the actual crop planted and actual yield for each field	Bushel/acre	Seasonally
Documentation of test methods and sampling protocols used to sample and analyze manure, litter, and wastewater and soil.	N/A	Once in the permit term unless revised
Documentation of the basis for the application rates used for each field where manure, litter, or wastewater is applied.	N/A	Once in the permit term unless revised

Documentation showing the total nitrogen and phosphorus to be applied to each field including nutrients from the application of manure, litter, and wastewater and other sources	Pounds/acre	Once in the permit term unless revised
Documentation of manure application equipment inspection including inspection dates	N/A	Seasonally
Manure Transfer (Note: Required by the NPDES CAFO Regulation – applicable to Large CAFOs)		
For all manure transfers the CAFO must maintain the following records:		
• Date of transfer	N/A	As necessary
• Name and address of recipient	N/A	As necessary
• Approximate amount of manure, litter, or wastewater transferred	Tons/gallons	As necessary
<p>¹ Refer to the state nutrient management technical standard for the specific analyses to be used.</p> <p>² Visual inspections should take place daily during the course of normal operations. The completion of such inspection should be documented in a manner appropriate to the operation. Some operations may wish to maintain a daily log. Other operations may choose to make a weekly entry, when they update other weekly records, that required daily inspections have been completed.</p> <p>³ Total design volume includes normal precipitation less evaporation on the surface of the structure for the storage period, normal runoff from the production area for the storage period, 25-year, 24-hour precipitation on the surface of the structure, 25-year, 24-hour runoff from the production area, and residual solids.</p> <p>⁴ Including quantity/volume of manure, litter, or process wastewater applied and the basis for the rate of phosphorus application.</p>		

[40 CFR 122.42(e)(2) and (3); 40 CFR 412.37(b) and (c)]

The Permittee shall maintain a log recording information obtained during the inspection.

Part V. Annual Reporting

Under this Permit, the Permittee must submit an annual report to EPA by March 31st of each year. The requirement and criteria for the annual report are specified in 40 CFR 122.42(e)(4).

The annual report must include the following information:

- a. The number and type of animals, whether in open confinement or housed under roof;
- b. Estimated amount of total manure, litter and process wastewater generated by the CAFO in the previous 12 months (tons/gallons);
- c. Estimated amount of total manure, litter and process wastewater transferred to other person by the CAFO in the previous 12 months (tons/gallons);

- d. Total number of acres for land application covered by the NMP;
- e. Total number of acres under control of the CAFO that were used for land application of manure, litter and process wastewater in the previous 12 months;
- f. Summary of all manure, litter and process wastewater discharges from the production area that have occurred in the previous 12 months, including date, time, and approximate volume;
- g. A statement indicating whether the current version of the CAFO's NMP was developed or approved by a certified nutrient management planner;
- h. Actual crops planted and actual yields for each field for the preceding 12 months;
- i. Results of all samples of manure, litter or process wastewater for nitrogen and phosphorus content for manure, litter and process wastewater that was land applied;
- j. Results of calculations conducted in accordance with Parts III.A.1.f. (for the Narrative Rate Approach);
- k. Amount of manure, litter, and process wastewater applied to each field during the preceding 12 months; and
- l. For CAFOs using the Narrative Rate Approach to address rates of application:
 - The results of any soil testing for nitrogen and phosphorus conducted during the preceding 12 months.
 - The data used in calculations conducted in accordance with Part III.A.1.f.
 - The amount of any supplemental fertilizer applied during the preceding 12 months.

Part VI. Standard Conditions

This Permit incorporates the standard conditions applicable to all permits issued under the NPDES program. These conditions consist of: general conditions, proper operation and maintenance, monitoring and records, reporting requirements, signatory requirements, certification, availability of reports, and penalties for violations of permit conditions. Additional information on each of these standard permit conditions is contained in Part VI of this Permit [40 CFR Part 122.41].

Endangered Species Act (ESA) Requirements

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 requires all Federal Agencies to ensure, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), that any Federal action carried out by the Agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species, or result in the adverse modification or destruction of habitat of such species that is designated by the USFWS as critical ("critical habitat"). See 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2), 50 CFR Part 402. When a Federal agency's action "may affect" a protected species,

that agency is required to consult with the USFWS, depending upon the endangered species, threatened species, or designated critical habitat that may be affected by the action (50 CFR Part 402.14(a)).

The USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) website program was utilized to determine what federally listed Endangered, Threatened, Proposed and Candidate Species may occur within the project area. The federally listed threatened and endangered species that may occur within the project area in Corson County, South Dakota include:

Species/Critical Habitat	Scientific Name	Status	Determination
Northern Long-eared Bat	<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	Threatened	Not likely to adversely affect
Least Tern	<i>Sterna antillarum</i>	Endangered	Not likely to adversely affect
Piping Plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	Threatened	Not likely to adversely affect
Red Knot	<i>Calidris canutus rufa</i>	Threatened	Not likely to adversely affect
Whooping Crane	<i>Grus americana</i>	Endangered	Not likely to adversely affect
Pallid Sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>	Endangered	Not likely to adversely affect

EPA is utilizing the information provided by the USFWS IPaC system and sent a letter to USFWS to seek concurrence with EPA’s determination of “Not likely to adversely affect” before public notice of the Permit.

Biological Evaluation

The justification to support the determination for the species are as follows. This is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. The closest named water stream is Oak Creek. Oak Creek is a tributary to the Missouri River. There will be no expected changes in water quality in the receiving water and no new construction for this facility from the previous permit. Any water discharged will have to meet applicable water quality standards, criteria, and requirements; therefore, there are no expected changes or impacts to downstream habitats.

Northern Long-eared Bat

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “No critical habitat has been designated for this species.” This is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Least Tern

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “No critical habitat has been designated for this species.” This is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Piping Plover

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “There is final critical habitat for this species (published in the Federal Register on May 19, 2009). Your location overlaps the critical habitat.” However, this is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Red Knot

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “No critical habitat has been designated for this species.” This is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Whooping Crane

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “There is final critical habitat for this species (published in the Federal Register on May 15, 1978). Your location is outside the critical habitat.” However, this is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Pallid Sturgeon

The facility location is identified in the IPaC system as “No critical habitat has been designated for this species.” This is a no discharge and it is an existing facility. EPA’s determination is “Not likely to adversely affect” based on the justification provided above.

Based on the IPaC information, EPA determined this Permit will have “Not likely to adversely affect” for species as described in the table above.

EPA received a concurrence letter dated July 6, 2020 from the USFWS South Dakota Field Supervisor that this Permit is “Not likely to adversely affect” for any of the species listed by the USFWS under the ESA.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Requirements

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. § 470(f) requires that federal agencies consider the effects of federal undertakings on historic properties. EPA has evaluated its planned reissuance of the NPDES permit for Wulf Cattle Depot to assess this action’s potential effects on any listed or eligible historic properties or cultural resources. EPA does not anticipate any impacts on listed/eligible historic properties or cultural resources because this Permit is a renewal and will not be associated with any new ground disturbance or changes to the volume or point of discharge.

During the public comment period, EPA will notify the Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Reservation of our planned issuance of this NPDES permit and requested their input on potential effects on historic properties and EPA’s preliminary determination in this regard.

401 Certification

EPA, Region 8 is certifying this Permit for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe that do not have §401 (a)(1) certification authority. The discharges authorized by this Permit will comply with the applicable provisions of the Clean Water Act Sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 [33 U.S.C. Sections 1311, 1312, 1313, 1316, and 1317] so long as the Permittee complies with all permit conditions.

Miscellaneous

This Permit will be reissued in approximately 5 years and the Permit effective date and expiration date will be determined at time of issuance.

Prepared by: Qian Zhang, P.E., Wastewater Unit, 303-312-6267
May 5, 2020

Reviewed by: Wastewater Unit Staff
May 18, 2020

Addendum to Statement of Basis

Response to Comments:

EPA public noticed the Wulf Cattle Depot permit and 401 certification on July 23, 2020 and the public notice period closed on August 25, 2020. EPA received comments from South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (SDDENR) and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe during the public notice period.

SDDENR Comments:

1. "Section 1.2.1.3. on page 8 of South Dakota's 2017 General Water Pollution Control Permit for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations states, "Large concentrated animal feeding operations located in other states or in Indian Country that stockpile or land apply un-manipulated manure or process wastewater on land under the jurisdiction of South Dakota shall obtain state permit coverage under this permit for their land application activities in South Dakota. The Secretary may waive this requirement if the South Dakota land application is already covered under a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency issued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for operations in Indian Country."

At this time the Secretary is waiving the requirement for Wulf Cattle Depot to obtain permit coverage for lands where South Dakota claims jurisdiction. However, we are aware that the proposed NPDES permit allows the producer to transfer manure to others, bypassing the permit's main nutrient management planning requirements. DENR wants EPA and the producer to know that if we receive complaints about manure from the Wulf Cattle Depot transferred to land where South Dakota claims jurisdiction, we may require the operation to comply with section 1.2.1.3. of DENR's general permit, which would require this operation to get permit coverage under the general permit for nutrient management planning activities where South Dakota claims jurisdiction."

Response: EPA acknowledges this requirement.
No change has been made in response to this comment.

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Comments:

1. "There is no evidence that Wulf Cattle Depot complies with Title 34 of the Standing Rock Code of Justice, the Water Code, which requires that it obtain a Tribal water permit. This should be a condition of the NPDES permit."

Response: Region 8 reviewed Title 34 of the Standing Rock Code of Justice (SRCJ), the Water Code, to determine whether it includes any "appropriate requirements" that should be included as conditions for this NPDES permit pursuant to CWA § 401 and its implementing regulation at 40 CFR part 121 (1971). The Water Code includes the following provisions pertaining to waters of the Reservation.

SRCJ 34-104 requires authorization for activities or actions that substantially affect waters of the Reservation. It provides:

34-104. USE OF WATER PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS CODE

(a) One hundred and eighty (180) days after the enactment of this Code, it shall be unlawful to divert or withdraw or otherwise make any use of, or take any action of whatever kind substantially affecting, the waters of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation unless authorized to do so pursuant to the provision of this Code.

SRCJ 34-107(dd) defines “waters of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation” to include:

“[A]ll waters located upon or bordering the Standing Reservation, whether flowing or stationary, whether above or below the surface of the ground, and whether diffused or contained within a defined water course or water body of any kind;”

For activities that substantially affect waters of the Reservation, the authorization required under SRCJ 34-104 is obtained by filing a Description of Use and Application for Permit pursuant to SRCJ 34-401:

34-401. DESCRIPTION OF USE AND APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT REQUIRED

(a) Within one hundred and eighty (180) days after the enactment of this Code, all persons desiring to continue existing uses or initiate new uses of or to store water or take any other actions substantially affecting the waters of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation must file a Description of Use and Application for Permit with the Water Resources Control Board and Tribal Water Administrators as required by this Chapter. After such date, it shall be unlawful to make any use or take any other actions substantially affecting the waters of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation except as authorized by this Chapter.

If the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Water Resources Control Board and Tribal Administrators determine that a permit is required, such permit is issued pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 6 of the Water Code. Under SRCJ 34-603, “Each water permit issued pursuant to this Code shall contain whatever conditions are necessary to insure adequate quality and quantities of water . . .” Such conditions can include conditions concerning “(h) The quantity, quality and temperature of return flow,” “(m) Provisions for maintaining minimal levels for fish, wildlife, recreational and aesthetic values”, and (r) Provisions designed to minimize pollution and thermal degradation,” among others. *Id.*

The Wulf Cattle Depot has the capacity to hold 12,400 head of cattle and generates approximately 1,428,971 cubic feet/year (10,688,702 gallons/year) of manure, litter and wastewater. The facility has wastewater storage capacity of 3,043,050 cubic feet (22,763,595 gallons) for manure, litter, and process wastewater generated from the feedlot, and owns or leases approximately 7,312 acres of land for land application of the CAFO’s manure, litter, and process wastewater. Given the size of the Wulf Cattle Depot and volumes of wastewater it generates, stores or land applies, it is likely that discharges resulting from this activity substantially affects the waters of the Reservation, including water quality, and would require authorization from the Tribe under SRCJ 34-104.

To address this comment and assure the Permittee will comply with the appropriate water quality requirements of the Standing Rock Code of Justice, the Region has added a CWA § 401 certification condition requiring the Wulf Cattle Depot to file a Description of Use and Application for Permit to the Standing Rock Water Resources Control Board and Tribal Water Administrators for its CAFO operation, pursuant to and in compliance with Chapter 4 of the Tribal Water Code under Part VII of this Permit. Chapter 4 establishes the requirements for filing an application, the procedures by which Tribal water permits are granted, and the contents of those permits. The filing of the application will allow the Board and Water Administrators to determine whether the Wulf Cattle Depot does, in fact, engage in actions that substantially affect waters of the Reservation and issue a Tribal water permit with those conditions they determine “are necessary to insure adequate quality and quantities of water.” Compliance with the § 401 certification condition will be achieved upon filing of the application in accordance with Tribal requirements and submitting a copy of that application to the Region with its next annual report under Part V.1 of this Permit. Should the Board and Water Administrators issue a Tribal water permit, it will not become part of this NPDES permit and will not be enforceable by EPA.

2. “The permit should make clear that references to the S.D. Natural Resources Conservation Service technical standards do not confer authority to the state. The facility is under the jurisdiction of EPA, which directly implements the Clean Water Act on all land and tribally designated waters within the exterior boundaries of the Standing Rock Reservation, pending delegation of primary enforcement authority to the Tribe under section 518 of the Clean Water Act. Similarly, references in the Nutrient Management Plan to county and state law should be deleted.”

Response: The Permit does not confer any authority over the facility to the state of South Dakota. The Permit is issued by EPA, not the state of South Dakota, and includes federal NRCS standards (such as the SD NRCS standards which uses the federal NRCS standards as their basis).

The national NRCS technical standards is very general. The South Dakota NRCS standards take that national standard and adds state specific standards based on South Dakota soil types and conditions, the South Dakota State University Fertilizer Recommendations (EC750), and other input received during the state NRCS technical standard adoption process. EPA believes the South Dakota standards would be better tailored to conditions in South Dakota, so that may provide the better environmental outcome.

Generally, stakeholders that participate in the state technical committee meetings have an interest in these standards in their development. EPA recommends the Tribe participate in the NRCS state technical committee meetings in the standards development process for the state of South Dakota.

EPA added language in Part VI.D.9 of the Permit to clarify that those portions of the SD NRCS Conservation Practice Standard Codes 360 and 590 used for this Permit and the NMP that reference state law and require reporting to the State do not apply.

In addition, Section M of the NMP has been updated by the DGA Consulting Engineers in removing records submittal requirements to SDDENR in Appendix A of the Permit.

3. “Tribal data reveals that mean levels of Escherichia coli in Oak Creek spiked in 2016, indicating a potential discharge from the CAFO. The Tribe was not notified, if in fact there was a discharge event.”

Response: Part IV, A. of the Permit has the notification of discharges resulting from manure, litter, and process wastewater storage, handling, on-site transport and application requirements as follows:

“Notification of Discharges Resulting from Manure, Litter, and Process Wastewater Storage, Handling, On-site Transport and Application

If, for any reason, there is a discharge of pollutants to a water of the United States, the Permittee is required to make immediate oral notification within 24-hours to EPA Region 8, Emergency Management Branch at (303) 293-1788 and notify EPA in writing within five (5) working days of the discharge from the facility...” The EPA Emergency Management Branch or Enforcement Branch did not receive any discharge report for Wulf Cattle Depot in 2016. In addition, no discharges have been reported from this facility over the past 14 years. In the future, EPA strongly encourage the Tribe to inform EPA of any water quality concerns that may cause by this facility as soon as possible. EPA has added a requirement to provide a written notification of any discharges to the Tribe in Part IV.A.

4. “Notices that are required to be provided to EPA under Part VI D. of the permit should also be provided to the Tribe. Tribal notices should be provided to the Department of Water Resources (701) 854-8534; and the Department of Environmental Regulation/EPA (701) 854-3823, Box D Fort Yates, North Dakota 58538. References in the Nutrient Management Plan to reporting requirements to the South Dakota DENR should be deleted.”

Response: EPA added this tribal notice request throughout Part VI.D. of the Permit and clarified appropriate mailing addresses and phone numbers. All NMP reporting requirements to the SD DENR are deleted.

5. “Part VI, A. 15 of the permit should be revised to clarify that the right of entry and inspection of the records maintained by Wulf Cattle Depot extends to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Department of Water Resources and Department of Environmental Regulation/EPA.”

Response: EPA added this request to Part VI. A. 15 to allow the right of entry and inspection of the records maintained by Wulf Cattle Depot extends to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Department of Water Resources and Department of Environmental Regulation/EPA.

6. “The Nutrient Management Plan should provide greater detail in calculating the estimate of solid and liquid manure. It is not clear that the estimates were derived from the methodology prescribed in the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Part 651, Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook (2008), as stated in the plan. The plan may underestimate the quantity of solid and liquid manure at the CAFO.”

Response: The DGA Consulting Engineers hired by the Wulf Cattle Depot modified the NMP with historical records of Wulf Cattle Depot manure production. They have updated the solid manure generated from the facility in Section A-Narrative, (6) and (7) of the NMP in Appendix A of the Permit.

7. “It is unclear whether carcasses of deceased animals are properly disposed of. Sheet 2 in section R, attached to the Nutrient Management Plan, identifies the disposal site east of the CAFO. There is nothing in the record to verify that the site identified for the disposal of animal carcasses complies with Standing Rock Code of Justice section 26-1404(a), the Tribal Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Act, which prescribes the permit requirements for operation of an animal disposal site on the Standing Rock Reservation. The CAFO may be disposing of animal carcasses at an illegal dump. This should not be permitted.”

Response: The facility is using a cremator to dispose of mortalities. Section M of the NMP has been updated by the DGA Consulting Engineers for the cremator information and a map is shown where the cremator is located in Appendix A of the Permit. The Permittee is no longer using the disposal site and just using the cremator. Therefore, no change to the Permit has been made.

8. “The steep incline and draw at the Oak Creek, north and downstream of the CAFO, constitutes habitat for traditional Tribal foods used in ceremony. The permit should prescribe mitigation to protect Tribal gathering practices in the event of a discharge from the CAFO.”

Response: EPA believes that requiring a mitigation plan to protect Tribal gathering practices in the event of a discharge from the CAFO is out of scope of the NPDES permit requirements. EPA recommends Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to work with Wulf Cattle Depot to obtain such mitigation plan.

No change has been made in response to this comment.