

NPDES Permit No. MA0102598 *Draft*  
2008 Reissuance

Page 1 of 14

AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE  
NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

In compliance with the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act as amended, (33 U.S.C. §§1251 et seq.; the "CWA"), and the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act, as amended, (M.G.L. Chap. 21, §§26-53),

**Charles River Pollution Control District**

is authorized to discharge from the facility located at

**Charles River Pollution Control District  
Water Pollution Abatement Facility  
66 Village Street  
Medway, Massachusetts 020053**

to receiving water named

**Charles River (MA 72-05)**

in accordance with effluent limitations, monitoring requirements and other conditions set forth herein.

The Towns of Franklin, Medway, Millis, and Bellingham are co-permittees for specific activities required in Sections I.B -Unauthorized Discharges and I.C - Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System, which include conditions regarding the operation and maintenance of the collection systems. The responsible municipal Departments are:

**Town of Franklin  
Department of Public Works  
150 Emmons Street  
Municipal Building, Lower Level  
Franklin, MA 02038**

**Town of Medway  
Department of Public Services  
155 Village Street  
Medway, MA 02053**

**Town of Millis  
Department of Public Works  
Veterans Memorial Building  
900 Main Street  
Millis, MA 02054**

**Town of Bellingham  
Department of Public Works  
26 Blackstone Street  
Bellingham, MA 02019**

This permit shall become..... (See \*\* below)

This permit and the authorization to discharge expire at midnight on the last day of the month, five (5) years from the effective date.

This permit supersedes the permit issued on September 29, 2000 and modified on April 22, 2002.

This permit consists of 14 pages in Part I including effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, Attachment A, Toxicity Tests Procedures and Protocols; Attachment B, Reassessment of Technically Based Industrial Discharge Limits; Attachment C, Industrial Pretreatment Annual Report; Attachment D, EPA Sludge Guidance; and 25 pages in Part II including General Conditions and Definitions.

Signed this     day of

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director  
Office of Ecosystem Protection  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Boston, MA

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director  
Division of Watershed Management  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Boston, MA

\*\* This permit will become effective on the date of signature if no comments are received during public notice. If comments are received during public notice, this permit will become effective 60 days after signature.

**PART I**

A.1. During the period beginning the effective date and lasting through expiration, the permittee is authorized to discharge treated effluent from outfall serial number 001 to the Charles River. Such discharges shall be limited and monitored as specified below.									
EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC		EFFLUENT LIMITS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
PARAMETER	AVERAGE MONTHLY	AVERAGE WEEKLY	AVERAGE MONTHLY	AVERAGE WEEKLY	MAXIMUM DAILY	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE		
FLOW (October 1 - June 30)	*****	*****	5.7 MGD <sup>2</sup>	*****	Report MGD	Continuous	Recorder		
FLOW (July 1 - September 30)	*****	*****	4.5 MGD <sup>2</sup>	*****	Report MGD	Continuous	Recorder		
CBOD <sub>5</sub> (November 1 - April 30)	570 lbs/day	950 lbs/day	15 mg/l	25 mg/l	Report mg/l <sup>1</sup>	3/week <sup>4</sup>	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
CBOD <sub>5</sub> (May 1 - October 31)	265 lbs/day	380 lbs/day	7 mg/l	10 mg/l	Report mg/l <sup>1</sup>	3/week <sup>4</sup>	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TSS (November 1 - April 30)	570 lbs/day	950 lbs/day	15 mg/l	25 mg/l	Report mg/l <sup>1</sup>	3/week <sup>4</sup>	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TSS (May 1 - October 31)	265 lbs/day	380 lbs/day	7 mg/l	10 mg/l	Report mg/l <sup>1</sup>	3/week <sup>4</sup>	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
pH RANGE <sup>1</sup>	6.5 - 8.3 SU See Permit Page 6, Paragraph I.A.1.b.								
TOTAL CHLORINE RESIDUAL <sup>1,6,7</sup> (March 1 - November 30)	*****	*****	17 ug/l	*****	30 ug/l	2/day	Grab		
FECAL COLIFORM <sup>1,6,7</sup> (March 1 - November 30)	*****	*****	200 cfu/100 ml	*****	400 cfu/100 ml	3/week	Grab		
ESCHERICHIA COLI BACTERIA <sup>1,6,7</sup> (March 1 - November 30)	*****	*****	126 cfu/100 ml	*****	409 cfu/100 ml	3/week	Grab		
DISSOLVED OXYGEN (April 1 - October 31)	Not less than 6 mg/l								
WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY SEE FOOTNOTES 8, 9, 10, and 11	Acute LC <sub>50</sub> ≥ 100% Chronic C-NOEC ≥ 63%								
							Grab or Meter	AR A	
							24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

A.1. During the period beginning the effective date and lasting through expiration, the permittee is authorized to discharge treated effluent from outfall serial number 001 to the Charles River. Such discharges shall be limited and monitored as specified below.									
EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC		EFFLUENT LIMITS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
PARAMETER	AVERAGE MONTHLY	AVERAGE WEEKLY	AVERAGE MONTHLY	AVERAGE WEEKLY	MAXIMUM DAILY	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE <sup>3</sup> TYPE		
TOTAL AMMONIA-NITROGEN, as N (November 1 - March 31)	Report lbs/day	Report lbs/day	Report mg/l	*****	Report mg/l	1/month	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL AMMONIA-NITROGEN, as N (April 1 - April 30)	380 lbs/day	570 lbs/day	10 mg/l	15 mg/l	20 mg/l	1/month	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL AMMONIA-NITROGEN, as N (May 1 - May 31)	190 lbs/day	285 lbs/day	5 mg/l	7.5 mg/l	10 mg/l	3/week	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL AMMONIA-NITROGEN, as N (June 1 - October 31)	38 lbs/day	57 lbs/day	1.0 mg/l	1.5 mg/l	2.0 mg/l	3/week	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL PHOSPHORUS (November 1 - March 31)	*****	*****	1.0 mg/l	*****	*****	1/month	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL PHOSPHORUS (April 1 - October 31)	*****	*****	0.12 mg/l	*****	*****	3/week	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		
TOTAL COPPER	*****	*****	13 ug/l	*****	23 ug/l	1/month	24-Hour Composite <sup>5</sup>		

Footnotes:

1. Required for State Certification.
2. For flow, report annual average, monthly average, maximum and minimum daily rates and total flow for each operating date. This is an annual average limit, which shall be reported as a rolling average. The annual average shall be calculated as the arithmetic mean of the monthly average flow from the reporting month and the monthly average flow from the previous 11 months.
3. All sampling shall be representative of the influent and of the effluent discharged through outfall 001, except whole effluent toxicity samples, shall be collected at the bottom of the cascade steps. Whole effluent toxicity samples shall be collected after filtration and prior to chlorination. A routine sampling program shall be developed in which samples are taken at the same location, same time, and same days of every month. Any deviations from the routine sampling program shall be documented in correspondence appended to the applicable discharge monitoring report submitted to EPA. All samples shall be tested using the analytical methods found in 40 CFR §136, or alternative methods approved by EPA in accordance with the procedures in 40 CFR §136. All samples shall be 24-hour composites unless specified as grab or meter sample in 40 CFR §136.
4. Sampling required for influent and effluent.
5. A 24-hour composite sample will consist of at least twenty four (24) grab samples taken during a consecutive 24-hour period (e.g. 0700 Monday to 0700 Tuesday).
6. The average monthly limits for fecal coliform and E.coli are expressed as geometric means. Samples for fecal coliform bacteria and E.coli shall be taken at the same time as the total residual chlorine sample.

The bacteria limits and monitoring requirements are in effect from March 1 to November 30 after the effective date of this permit. The seasonal monitoring and reporting requirements for E.coli are in effect on the effective date of this permit; the monitoring frequency for E.coli during the first year is 1/month. The following season beginning March 1, the fecal coliform limit and monitoring requirement will end and the E.coli limits will be in effect and the monitoring frequency for E.coli will be 3/week.

Fecal coliform and total residual chlorine monitoring will be conducted during the period March 1 to November 30 to reflect the seasonal chlorination period. Fecal coliform discharges shall not exceed a monthly geometric mean of 200 colony forming units (cfu) per 100 ml, nor shall they exceed 400 cfu per 100 ml as a daily maximum. E.coli discharges shall not exceed a monthly geometric mean of 126 colony forming units (cfu) per 100 ml, nor shall they exceed 409 cfu per 100 ml as a daily maximum. This monitoring shall be conducted concurrently with the TRC sampling described below.

7. The minimum level (ML) for total residual chlorine is defined as 20 ug/l. This value is the minimum level for chlorine using EPA approved methods found in the most currently approved version of Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 20th Edition, Method 4500 CL-E and G, or USEPA Manual of Methods of Analysis of Water and Wastes, Method 330.5. One of these methods must be used to determine total residual chlorine.

For effluent limitations less than 20 ug/l, compliance/non-compliance will be determined based on the ML. Sample results of 20 ug/l or less shall be reported as zero on the discharge monitoring report.

8. The permittee shall conduct chronic (and modified acute) toxicity tests four times per year. The chronic test may be used to calculate the acute LC50 at the 48 hour exposure interval. The permittee shall test the fathead minnows, *Pimephales promelas* and the daphnid, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*. The tests must be performed in accordance with test procedures and protocols specified in **Attachment A, Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol** of this permit. If the results of any acute or chronic tests fail to comply with the LC<sub>50</sub> and Chronic NOEC limits, the permittee must perform an additional tests on an effluent sample obtained within fourteen days of the date on which the failed test sample was collected. Toxicity test samples shall be collected and the results submitted according to the following schedule:

Test Dates second week of	Submit Results By:	Test Species	Acute Limit LC50	Chronic Limit C-NOEC
January	February 28	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>	≥100%	≥ 63%
April	May 31	(daphnid)		
July	August 31	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>		
October	November 30	(fathead minnows)		
		See Attachment A		

9. The LC50 is the concentration of effluent which causes mortality to 50% of the test organisms. Therefore, a 100% limit means that a sample of 100% effluent (no dilution) shall cause no more than a 50% mortality rate.
10. C-NOEC (chronic-no observed effect concentration) is defined as the highest concentration of toxicant or effluent to which organisms are exposed in a life-cycle or partial life-cycle test which causes no adverse effect on growth, survival, or reproduction at a specific time of observation as determined from hypothesis testing where the test results exhibit a linear dose-response relationship. However, where the test results do not exhibit a linear dose-response relationship, the permittee must report the lowest concentration where there is no observable effect. The "63% or greater" limit is defined as a sample which is composed of 63% (or greater) effluent, the remainder being dilution water. This is a maximum daily limit derived as a percentage of the inverse of the dilution factor of 1.59.
11. If toxicity test(s) using receiving water as diluent show the receiving water to be toxic or unreliable, the permittee shall either follow procedures outlined in **Attachment A, Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, Section IV., Dilution Water** in order to obtain an individual approval for use of an alternate dilution water, or the permittee shall follow the Self-Implementing Alternative Dilution Water Guidance which maybe used to obtain automatic approval of an alternate dilution water, including the appropriate species for use with that water. This guidance is found in Attachment G of NPDES Permit Program Instructions for the Discharge Monitoring Forms (DMR) which is sent to all permittees with their annual set of DMRs and may also be found on the EPA Region 1 web site at

<http://www.epa.gov/region1/enforcementandassistance/dmr2007.pdf>. If this guidance is revoked, the permittee shall revert to obtaining approval as outlined in **Attachment A, Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol**.

Any modification or revocation to this guidance will be transmitted to the permittees as part of the annual DMR instruction package. However, at any time, the permittee may choose to contact EPA-New England directly using the approach outlined in **Attachment A, Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol**.

**Part I.A.1. (Continued)**

- a. The discharge shall not cause a violation of the water quality standards of the receiving waters.
- b. The pH of the effluent shall not be less than 6.5 nor greater than 8.3 SU at any time, unless these values are exceeded as a result of an approved treatment process.
- c. The discharge shall not cause objectionable discoloration of the receiving waters.
- d. The effluent shall contain neither a visible oil sheen, foam, nor floating solids at any time.
- e. The permittee's treatment facility shall maintain a minimum of 85 percent removal of both total suspended solids and biochemical oxygen demand. The percent removal shall be based on monthly average values.
- f. The permittee shall minimize the use of chlorine while maintaining adequate bacterial control.
- g. Sample results using EPA approved methods for any parameter above its required frequency must also be reported.
- h. If the average annual flow in any calendar year exceeds 80 percent of the facility's design flow, **the permittee shall submit a report to MassDEP by March 31 of the following calendar year** describing its plans for further flow increases and describing how it will maintain compliance with the flow limit and all other effluent limitations and conditions.

2. All POTWs must provide adequate notice to the Director of the following:

- a. Any new introduction of pollutants into that POTW from an indirect discharger in a primary industry category discharging process water; and
- b. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of issuance of the permit.
- c. For purposes of this paragraph, adequate notice shall include information on:
  - (1) The quantity and quality of effluent introduced into the POTW; and
  - (2) Any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to

be discharged from the POTW.

3. Prohibitions Concerning Interference and Pass-Through:

- a. Pollutants introduced into POTW's by a non-domestic source (user) shall not pass through the POTW or interfere with the operation or performance of the works.
- b. **If, within 30 days after notice of an interference or pass-through violation has been sent by EPA to the POTW**, and to persons or groups who have requested such notice, the POTW fails to commence appropriate enforcement action to correct the violation, EPA may take appropriate enforcement action.

4. Toxics Control

- a. The permittee shall not discharge any pollutant or combination of pollutants in toxic amounts.
- b. Any toxic components of the effluent shall not result in any demonstrable harm to aquatic life or violate any state or federal water quality standard which has been or may be promulgated. Upon promulgation of any such standard, this permit may be revised or amended in accordance with such standards.

5. Numerical Effluent Limitations for Toxicants

EPA or MassDEP may use the results of the toxicity tests and chemical analyses conducted pursuant to this permit, as well as national water quality criteria developed pursuant to Section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), state water quality criteria, and any other appropriate information or data, to develop numerical effluent limitations for any pollutants, including but not limited to those pollutants listed in Appendix D of 40 CFR Part 122.

**B. UNAUTHORIZED DISCHARGES**

The permit only authorizes discharges in accordance with the terms and conditions of this permit and ~~only in accordance with the terms and conditions of this permit and~~ only from the outfall listed in Part I A.1. of this permit. Discharges of wastewater from any other point sources, including sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) are not authorized by this permit and shall be reported in accordance with Section D.1.e. (1) of the General Requirements of this permit (24-Hour Reporting). Notification of SSOs to MassDEP shall be made on its SSO Reporting Form (which includes MassDEP Regional Office telephone numbers). The reporting form and instruction for its completion may be found on-line at <http://www.mass.gov/dep/water/approvals/surffms.htm#sso>.

**C. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SEWER SYSTEM**

Operation and maintenance of the sewer system shall be in compliance with the General Requirements of Part II and the following terms and conditions:

1. Maintenance Staff

The permittee shall provide an adequate staff to carry out the operation, maintenance, repair, and testing functions required to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit.

2. Preventative Maintenance Program

The permittee shall maintain an ongoing preventative maintenance program to prevent overflows and bypasses caused by malfunctions or failures of the sewer system infrastructure. The program shall include an inspection program designed to identify all potential and actual unauthorized discharges.

3. Infiltration/Inflow Control

The permittee shall develop and implement a plan to control infiltration and inflow (I/I) to the separate sewer system. The plan shall be submitted to EPA and MassDEP within six months of the effective date of this permit (see page 1 of this permit for the effective date) and shall describe the permittee's and co-permittees programs for preventing infiltration/inflow related effluent limit violations, and all unauthorized discharges of wastewater, including overflows and by-passes due to excessive infiltration/inflow.

The plan shall include:

- An ongoing program to identify and remove sources of infiltration and inflow. The program shall include the necessary funding level and the source(s) of funding.
- An inflow identification and control program that focuses on disconnecting and redirecting illegal sump pumps, roof downspouts, and storm drains. Priority should be given to removal of public and private inflow sources that are upstream from and potentially contribute to known areas of sewer system backups and/or overflows.
- Identification and prioritization of areas that will provide increased aquifer recharge as the result of reduction/elimination of infiltration and inflow to the system.
- An educational public outreach program for all aspects of I/I control, particularly private inflow.
- The permittee shall require, through appropriate agreements, that all member communities develop and implement infiltration and inflow control plans sufficient to ensure that high flows do not cause or contribute to a violation of the permit effluent limitations, or cause overflows from the permittee's collection system.

Reporting Requirements:

A summary report of all actions taken to minimize I/I during the previous calendar year shall be submitted to EPA and the MassDEP by March 31 each year. The summary report shall, at a minimum, include:

- A map and a description of inspection and maintenance activities conducted and corrective actions taken during the previous year.
- Expenditures for any infiltration/inflow related maintenance activities and corrective actions taken during the previous year.
- A map with areas identified for I/I-related investigation/action in the coming year.
- A calculation of the annual average I/I and the maximum month I/I for the reporting year.
- A report of any infiltration/inflow related corrective actions taken as a result of unauthorized discharges reported pursuant to 314 CMR 3.19(20) and reported pursuant to the Unauthorized Discharges section of this permit.

4. Alternative Power Source

In order to maintain compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit, the permittee shall continue to provide an alternative power source with which to sufficiently operate its treatment works (as defined at 40 CFR §122.2).

**D. CHLORINATION SYSTEM**

Chlorination and dechlorination systems shall include an alarm system for indicating system interruptions or malfunctions. Any interruption or malfunction of the chlorine dosing system that may have resulted in levels of chlorine that were inadequate for achieving effective disinfection or interruptions or malfunctions of the dechlorination system that may have resulted in excessive levels of chlorine in the final effluent shall be reported with the monthly DMRs. The report shall include the date and time of the interruption or malfunction, the nature of the problem, and the estimated amount of time that the reduced levels of chlorine or dechlorination chemicals occurred.

**E. LIMITATIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL USERS**

1. Pollutants introduced into POTWs by a non-domestic source (user) shall not pass-through the POTW or interfere with the operation or performance of the works.
2. The permittee shall develop and enforce specific effluent limits (local limits) for Industrial User(s), and all other users, as appropriate, which together with appropriate changes in the POTW treatment plant facilities or operation, are necessary to ensure continued compliance with the POTW's NPDES permit or sludge disposal practices. Specific local limits shall not be developed and enforced without individual notice to persons or groups who have requested such notice to respond. Within 120 days of the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall prepare and submit a written technical report to EPA analyzing local limits. As part of the evaluation, the permittee shall assess how the POTW performs with respect to influent and effluent of pollutants, water quality concerns, sludge quality, sludge processing concerns/inhibition, activated sludge inhibition, worker health and safety, and collection system concerns. In preparing this evaluation, the permittee shall complete and submit the attached form of **Attachment B** with the technical evaluation to assist in determining whether existing local limits need to be revised. Justifications

and conclusions should be based on actual plant data, if available and should be included in the report. Upon completion of its review, EPA will notify the POTW if the evaluation reveals that the local limits should be revised. Should the local limits need to be revised, the permittee shall complete the revisions within 120 days of notification by EPA and submit the revisions to EPA for approval. The permittee shall carry out the local limits analysis in accordance with EPA's Local Limit Development Guidance (EPA 833-R-04-002A, July 2004).

#### F. INDUSTRIAL PRETREATMENT PROGRAM

1. The permittee shall implement the industrial pretreatment program in accordance with the legal authorities, policies, procedures, and financial provisions described in the permittee's approved Pretreatment Program, and the General Pretreatment Regulations, 40 CFR 403. At a minimum, the permittee must perform the following duties to properly implement the Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP):
  - a. Carry out the inspection, surveillance, and monitoring procedures which will determine, independent of information supplied by the industrial user, whether the industrial user is in compliance with the Pretreatment Standards. At a minimum, all significant industrial users shall be sampled and inspected at the frequency established in the approved IPP but in no case less than once per year and maintain adequate records.
  - b. Issue or renew all necessary industrial user control mechanisms within 90 days of their expiration date or within 180 days after the industry has been determined to be a significant industrial user.
  - c. Obtain appropriate remedies for non-compliance by any industrial user with any pretreatment standard and/or requirement.
  - d. Maintain an adequate revenue structure for continued implementation of the Pretreatment Program.
2. The permittee shall provide the EPA and MassDEP with an annual report in accordance with 40 CFR 403.12(i), describing the permittee's pretreatment program activities for the period from July 1 to June 30. The annual report shall be consistent with the format described in **Attachment C** of this permit and shall be submitted no later than September 1 of each year.
3. The permittee must obtain approval from EPA prior to making any significant changes to the industrial pretreatment program in accordance with 40 CFR 403.18(c).
4. The permittee must assure that applicable National Categorical Pretreatment Standards are met by all categorical industrial users of the POTW. These standards are published in the Federal Regulations at 40 CFR 405 et. seq.
5. The permittee must modify its pretreatment program to conform to all changes in the Federal Regulations that pertain to the implementation and enforcement of the industrial pretreatment program. The permittee must provide EPA, in writing, within 180 days of this permit's effective date proposed changes, if applicable, to the permittee's pretreatment program deemed necessary to assure conformity with current federal regulations. At a minimum, the permittee must address in its written submission the following areas: (1) enforcement response plan; (2) revised sewer

use ordinances; and (3) slug control evaluations. The permittee will implement these proposed changes pending EPA Region I's approval under 40 CFR 403.18. This submission is separate and distinct from any local limits analysis submission described in Part I.E.2.

6. On October 14, 2005 EPA published in the Federal Register final changes to the General Pretreatment Regulations. The final "Pretreatment Streamlining Rule" is designed to reduce the burden to industrial users and provide regulatory flexibility in technical and administrative requirements of industrial users and POTWs. Within 90 days of the effective date of this permit, the permittee must submit to EPA all required modifications of the Streamlining Rule in order to be consistent with the provisions of the newly promulgated Rule. To the extent that the POTW legal authority is not consistent with the required changes, they must be revised and submitted to EPA for review.

#### **G. SLUDGE CONDITIONS**

1. The permittee shall comply with all existing federal and state laws and regulations that apply to sewage sludge use and disposal practices and with the CWA Section-405(d) technical standards.
2. The permittee shall comply with the more stringent of either the state or federal (40 CFR Part 503) requirements.
3. The requirements and technical standards of 40 CFR Part 503 apply to facilities which perform one or more of the following use or disposal practices.
  - a. Land application - the use of sewage sludge to condition or fertilize the soil.
  - b. Surface disposal - the placement of sewage sludge in a sludge only landfill.
  - c. Sewage sludge incineration in a sludge only incinerator.
4. The 40 CFR Part 503 conditions do not apply to facilities which place sludge within a municipal solid waste landfill. These conditions also do not apply to facilities which do not dispose of sewage sludge during the life of the permit but rather treat the sludge (i.e., lagoons-reed beds), or are otherwise excluded under 40 CFR Part 503.6.
5. The permittee shall use and comply with the attached compliance guidance document to determine appropriate conditions. Appropriate conditions contain the following elements:
  - General requirements
  - Pollutant limitations
  - Operational Standards (pathogen reduction requirements and vector attraction reduction requirements)
  - Management practices
  - Record keeping
  - Monitoring
  - Reporting

Depending upon the quality of material produced by a facility, all conditions may not apply to the facility.

6. The permittee shall monitor the pollutant concentrations, pathogen reduction and vector attraction reduction at the following frequency. This frequency is based upon the volume of sewage sludge generated at the facility in dry metric tons per year:

less than 290	1/ year
290 to less than 1500	1 /quarter
1500 to less than 15000	6 /year
15000 +	1 /month

7. The permittee shall sample the sewage sludge using the procedures detailed in 40 CFR 503.8.
8. The permittee shall submit an annual report containing the information specified in the guidance by February 19. Reports shall be submitted to the address contained in the reporting section of the permit. Sludge monitoring is not required by the permittee when the permittee is not responsible for the ultimate sludge disposal. The permittee must be assured that any third party contractor is in compliance with appropriate regulatory requirements. In such case, the permittee is required only to submit an annual report by February 19 containing the following information:
- \* Name and address of contractor responsible for sludge disposal.
  - \* Quantity of sludge in dry metric tons removed from the facility by the sludge contractor.

#### **H. COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE**

The draft permit includes a compliance schedule requiring that the E.coli limit be achieved by March 1, 2010. The current permit limits for fecal coliform are continued as interim limitations until the E.coli limits become effective. The bacteria are seasonal, and the seasons remain the same as in the current permit (March-November).

#### **I. MONITORING AND REPORTING**

1. Reporting  
Monitoring results obtained during each calendar month shall be summarized and reported on Discharge Monitoring Report Form(s) postmarked no later than the 15th day of the following month following the effective date of the permit.

Signed and dated originals of these, and all other reports required herein, shall be submitted to the EPA and MassDEP at the following addresses:

United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Water Technical Unit (SEW)  
P.O. Box 8127  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

NPDES Permit No. MA0102598 *Draft*  
2008 Reissuance

Page 13 of 14

The state agency is:

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Central Regional Office  
Bureau of Resource Protection  
627 Main Street  
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

Signed and dated Discharge Monitoring Report Forms and toxicity test reports required by this permit shall also be submitted to the state at:

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Watershed Management  
Surface Water Discharge Permit Program  
627 Main Street, 2nd Floor  
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

Industrial pretreatment reports required in Parts I.E.2 and I.F.2 shall be submitted to the agencies listed above and to:

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Bureau of Waste Prevention  
Industrial Wastewater Section  
1 Winter Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

and

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Bureau of Waste Prevention  
Industrial Wastewater Section  
627 Main Street, 2nd Floor  
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

## J. STATE PERMIT CONDITIONS

This discharge permit is issued jointly by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) under federal and state law, respectively. As such, all the terms and conditions of this permit are hereby incorporated into and constitute a discharge permit issued by the Commissioner of the MassDEP pursuant to M.G.L. Chap. 21, §43.

Each agency shall have the independent right to enforce the terms and conditions of this permit. Any modification, suspension or revocation of this permit shall be effective only with respect to the agency taking such action, and shall not affect the validity or status of this permit as issued by the other agency, unless and until each agency has concurred in writing with such modification, suspension or revocation.

NPDES Permit No. MA0102598 *Draft*  
Page 14 of 14

2008 Reissuance

In the event any portion of this permit is declared, invalid, illegal or otherwise issued in violation of state law such permit shall remain in full force and effect under federal law as an NPDES permit issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In the event this permit is declared invalid, illegal or otherwise issued in violation of federal law, this permit shall remain in full force and effect under state law as a permit issued by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

NPDES Fact Sheet No. MA 0102598  
2008 Reissuance

Page 1 of 29

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
NEW ENGLAND - REGION I  
ONE CONGRESS STREET  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114-2023**

**FACT SHEET**

**DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT  
TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO  
THE CLEAN WATER ACT (CWA)**

NPDES PERMIT NO.: **MA0102598**

PUBLIC NOTICE DATE:  
NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

**Charles River Pollution Control District  
66 Village Street  
Medway, Massachusetts 02053**

The Towns of Franklin, Medway, Millis, and Bellingham are co-permittees for specific activities required in Sections I.B - Unauthorized Discharges and I.C - Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System of the draft permit. Sections B - Unauthorized Discharges and C - Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System include conditions regarding the operation and maintenance of the collection systems. The responsible municipal departments are:

**Town of Franklin  
Department of Public Works  
150 Emmons Street  
Municipal Building, Lower Level  
Franklin, MA 02038**

**Town of Medway  
Department of Public Services  
155 Village Street  
Medway, MA 02053**

**Town of Millis  
Department of Public Works  
Veterans Memorial Building  
900 Main Street  
Millis, MA 02054**

**Town of Bellingham  
Department of Public Works  
26 Blackstone Street  
Bellingham, MA 02019**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

**Charles River Pollution Control District  
Water Pollution Abatement Facility  
66 Village Street  
Medway, Massachusetts 02053**

RECEIVING WATER: **Charles River (MA 72 - 05)**

CLASSIFICATION: **B (warm water fishery)**

**I. PROPOSED ACTION**

The above named applicant has requested that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) reissue its NPDES permit to discharge into the designated receiving water, the Charles River. The current permit was issued on September 29, 2000, modified October 25, 2000, November 13, 2000, and April 22, 2002. The permit expired September 29, 2004, and was administratively continued. This permit will expire five (5) years from the effective date of the reissued permit.

The applicant filed a complete application for permit reissuance as required by 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 122.6.

**II. TYPE OF FACILITY AND DISCHARGE LOCATION**

The facility is engaged in the collection and treatment of wastewater from the towns of Franklin, Medway, Millis, and central and north Bellingham and serves approximately 28,000 people and four significant industrial users.

The existing permit authorizes a discharge from Outfall 001 to the Charles River as shown on **Figure 1**. The draft permit has been written to reflect the current operation and conditions at the facility.

**III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISCHARGE**

The Charles River Pollution Control District Water Pollution Abatement Facility (CRPCD WPAF) (**Figures 2 and 3**) is an advanced plant providing treatment to domestic, commercial, and industrial wastewater. The plant was expanded and upgraded in 2000 to increase the capacity of the flow from 4.5 to 5.7 MGD. The upgrades included an anoxic biological selector for filamentous bacteria control, two fine bubble diffused aeration basins to increase the aeration capacity, four 12-cloth disk filters to supplement the existing sand filters, and an upgrade to the plants electrical system. In 2003, new piping and pumps for the ferric chloride, ferrous sulfate, and lime systems were installed, and a hydrated lime mixing system was installed to replace the quick lime slaking system.

The unit processes and equipment at the plant now consist of a Parshall flume, two automatic bar racks, three influent pumps (lead/lag/standby), two aerated grit tanks where lime is added for pH control and ferric chloride for phosphorus control, two primary clarifiers, an anoxic selector, two fine bubble aeration chambers, eight mechanical aeration tanks, four secondary clarifiers, and four cloth filter basins. Solids are captured on the filter cloth and backwashed to the headworks, and the filtered water continues to the chlorine contact chamber. There are additional gravity sand filters for high flow periods. The effluent is disinfected in two chlorine contact chambers ( $\text{Cl}_2$  gas), dechlorinated with sodium bisulfate, passes down effluent cascade steps, and flows 3,375 feet through the outfall pipe to the Charles River.

The facility receives approximately 25,000 gallons of septage per day from Franklin, Medway, Millis, Bellingham, Norfolk, Sherborn, Dover, and Wrentham. There are two septage tanks, which are filled and batch discharged by gravity into the headworks. One septage tank is typically all that is needed however, the other tank is available for haulers to discharge into if it is needed. The facility checks the pH of each septage delivery and conducts micro-toxicity testing of the septage tank once per week. Ferrous chloride is added to the wet wells for odor control.

Primary sludge is pumped to a gravity belt thickener. Secondary sludge flows to the wet well and is pumped to the gravity thickener with polymer added to aid thickening. The 7% solids sludge is held in

wet wells and then trucked to the incinerator at Synagro in Woonsocket, RI.

A quantitative description of the discharge in terms of significant effluent parameters based on recent monitoring data is shown in **Fact Sheet Tables 1 and 2**.

#### **IV. LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS**

The effluent limitations and monitoring requirements may be found in the draft NPDES permit.

#### **V. PERMIT BASIS AND EXPLANATION OF EFFLUENT LIMITS DERIVATION**

The Clean Water Act (CWA or the Act) prohibits the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States without an NPDES permit unless such a discharge is otherwise authorized by the Act. An NPDES permit is used to implement technology based and water quality based effluent limitations as well as other requirements including monitoring and reporting. This draft NPDES permit was developed in accordance with statutory and regulatory authorities established pursuant to the Act. The regulations governing the NPDES program are found in 40 CFR Parts 122, 124, and 125.

##### **Regulatory Basis.**

EPA is required to consider technology and water quality requirements when developing permit effluent limits. Technology-based treatment requirements represent the minimum level of control that must be imposed under Sections 402 and 301(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (see 40 CFR 125 Subpart A). For publicly owned treatment works (POTWs), technology based requirements are the effluent limits based on secondary treatment defined in 40 CFR Part 133. EPA regulations require NPDES permits to contain effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits where more stringent limits are necessary to maintain or achieve federal or state water quality standards.

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limits based on water quality standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.00) include requirements for the regulation and control of toxic constituents and also require that EPA criteria, established pursuant to Section 304(a) of the CWA, shall be used unless a site-specific criteria is established. The state will limit or prohibit discharge of pollutants to surface waters to assure that water quality of the receiving waters are protected and maintained, or attained.

The permit must limit any pollutant or pollutant parameter (conventional, non-conventional, toxic, and whole effluent toxicity) that is or may be discharged at a level that caused, or has reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above any water quality criterion [40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)]. An excursion occurs if the projected or actual instream concentrations exceed the applicable criterion. In determining reasonable potential, EPA considers existing controls on point and non-point sources of pollution, variability of the pollutant in the effluent, sensitivity of the species to toxicity and where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.

##### **Waterbody Classification and Usage**

The Charles River is classified as a Class B warm water fishery by the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards [314 CMR 4.05(3)(b)]. Class B waters are designated as habitat for fish, other aquatic life, and wildlife, and for primary and secondary contact recreation. Where designated, they shall be suitable as a source of public water supply with appropriate treatment. They shall be suitable for irrigation and other agricultural uses and for compatible industrial cooling and process uses. These waters shall have consistently good aesthetic value.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to identify those waterbodies that are not expected to meet surface water quality standards after implementation of technology-based controls and as such require the development of total maximum daily loads (TMDL). The CRPCD WPAF discharges into Charles River segment MA 72-05, which extends from below Populatic Pond on the Norfolk/Medway line to the South Natick Dam. The Massachusetts Year 2006 Integrated List of Waters [Section 303(d) list] identifies segment MA-72-05 and segments downstream from the facility as not attaining water quality standards. Segment 72-05 is listed as impaired by unknown toxicity, metals, nutrients, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pathogens, noxious aquatic plants, and turbidity.

EPA and MassDEP have awarded grants to the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) for the Upper Charles River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load Project (# 2001-03/104). Under these grants, CRWA has collected wet and dry weather water quality and flow data, is estimating pollutant loads from sources such as land use, septic systems, atmospheric deposition, sediment resuspension, and point sources, and is determining receiving water concentrations, estimating loading capacity; and establishing load allocations by source category. This information will be used to establish load allocations by source category and will be used by MassDEP to develop a TMDL and to evaluate Water Management Act and groundwater discharge permits for the Charles River watershed.

#### Plant Design Flow

The design flow of the plant is now 5.7 MGD. Plant flow is measured at the influent Parshall flume. The annual average flow rate was 5.16 MGD in 2005, 5.03 MGD in 2006 and 4.36 MGD in 2007. The range of the maximum daily flow rate between January 2005 and December 2007 was 3.55 MGD and 14.38 MGD.

During the 2000 public notice period, the District commented that they would not need the design capacity during the term of the permit in the summer months. The permit issued in 2000 included a monthly average flow limit of 4.5 MGD from July through September and the effluent limits for those months were calculated based on a flow of 4.5 MGD. The table below compares the monthly minimum river flow at the USGS station in Dover and the plant discharge.

*Charles River Minimum Mean Daily Discharge at USGS Gage in Dover  
and Average Monthly Plant Effluent Flow*

Year	July		August		September	
	River Flow, MGD	Plant Flow, MGD	River Flow, MGD	Plant Flow, MGD	River Flow, MGD	Plant Flow, MGD
2000	15.48	3.76	14.19	3.67	9.03	3.62
2001	46.44	4.17	29.67	3.51	19.35	3.35
2002	21.93	3.43	5.87	3.31	10.32	3.51
2003	72.89	4.17	38.70	3.85	36.12	3.74
2004	34.83	3.72	27.74	3.86	34.83	3.98
2005	25.80	3.79	14.19	3.48	11.61	3.55
2006	92.90	4.56	36.77	3.78	30.96	3.77

Because the monthly average flows typically remain below 4.5 MGD during the critical July through September period, EPA and MassDEP have retained the seasonal flow limits in this draft permit. The flow limits in the draft permit are therefore 5.7 MGD as an annual average flow, and 4.5 MGD as a monthly average flow from July 1 to September 30. The monthly average and daily maximum flows shall be reported for all months.

#### River Flow and Dilution Calculation

The receiving water 7Q10, or the 7-day mean stream low flow with 10-year recurrence interval and the treatment plant design flow are used to calculate a dilution factor. A dilution factor is used to establish water quality based effluent limits in the draft permit.

EPA and MassDEP calculated the dilution factor in 2000 using the 7Q10 flow measured at the USGS gage in Dover<sup>1</sup> (01103500), average flows from the wastewater treatment plants discharging into the Charles and Stop Rivers upstream of the Dover gage during the week of August 7 through August 13, 1999, and the drainage areas upstream of the Dover gage and upstream of the CRPCD discharge. The treatment plant flows from this week were used because flows in the Charles River were approximately equal to the 7Q10 flows during this period so the plant discharge flows are representative of flows during a 7Q10 low flow period. EPA and MassDEP believe that this approach is still valid for use in this draft permit. The dilution factor was calculated using 4.5 MGD as the design flow. The dilution factor is 1.59. The calculations are as follows:

#### Dilution Factor Calculation:

**7Q10 at USGS station 0110350 Charles River at Dover = 12.2 cfs**

*Contributing flows from WWTPs upstream of the USGS gage (August 7 - 13, 1999):*

Milford WWTP	3.64 cfs
CRPCD	5.38 cfs
Medfield WWTP	1.11 cfs
Wrentham Developmental Ctr	0.114 cfs
Caritas Southwood Community Hospital <sup>2</sup>	0.015 cfs
MCI-Norfolk WPCF	<u>0.569 cfs</u>
Total	10.83 cfs

Base flow at USGS Dover = (7Q10) - (contributing flows) = 12.2 cfs - 10.83 cfs = 1.37 cfs

Base flow per square mile of drainage area:

The total drainage area upstream of the Dover gage is 183 sq mi, therefore the flow factor for the watershed is:

$$(1.37 \text{ cfs}) / (183 \text{ sq mi}) = 0.0075 \text{ cfs/sq mi}$$

<sup>1</sup> Current 7Q10 at the Dover gage is estimated at 12.9 cfs, only a small change from the estimate in 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Caritas Southwood Community Hospital is included in this calculation of upstream WWTP flow, but the discharge has since been terminated. The calculation have not changed given the minimal flow from this facility.

*Base Flow at CRPCD:*

Using the calculated flow factor for the watershed and the drainage area upstream of CRPCD discharge (66.7 sq mi), the base flow in the Charles River at the discharge point is:

$$(0.0075 \text{ cfs/sq mi}) (66.7 \text{ sq mi}) = 0.5 \text{ cfs}$$

*7Q10 Flow at CRPCD (Base flow at CRPCD plus Milford WWTP flow):*

Adding the base flow and the flow discharged from the Milford WWTP, the only discharge upstream of CRPCD:

$$7Q10 = (0.5 \text{ cfs}) + (3.64 \text{ cfs}) = 4.14 \text{ cfs}$$

*Dilution factor:*

$$\text{CRPCD flow} = 4.5 \text{ MGD} = 6.96 \text{ cfs}$$

$$\text{DF} = \frac{7Q10 + \text{design flow}}{\text{design flow}} = \frac{4.14 \text{ cfs} + 6.96 \text{ cfs}}{6.96 \text{ cfs}} = 1.59$$

**Conventional Pollutants**CBOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS

The seasonal concentration and mass-based effluent limitations for CBOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are the same limits as the current permit and are based on previous waste load allocations<sup>3</sup>, water quality considerations, and state certification requirements. The summer average monthly and average weekly limits are 7 mg/l and 10 mg/l, respectively. The winter average monthly and average weekly limits are 15 mg/l and 25 mg/l, respectively. The monitoring frequency remains the same. These limits were established to achieve the Class B water quality standards in the Charles River.

*CBOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS Mass Loading Calculations:*

$$\text{Average monthly limits} = (\text{concentration}) (\text{design flow}) (8.34) = \text{lbs/day}$$

$$\text{CBOD}_5 \text{ and TSS (summer)} = (7 \text{ mg/l}) (4.5 \text{ MGD}) (8.34) = 265 \text{ lbs/day}$$

$$\text{CBOD}_5 \text{ and TSS (winter)} = (15 \text{ mg/l}) (4.5 \text{ MGD}) (8.34) = 570 \text{ lbs/day}$$

$$\text{Average weekly limits} = (\text{concentration}) (\text{design flow}) (8.34) = \text{lbs/day}$$

$$\text{CBOD}_5 \text{ and TSS (summer)} = (10 \text{ mg/l}) (4.5 \text{ MGD}) (8.34) = 380 \text{ lbs/day}$$

$$\text{CBOD}_5 \text{ and TSS (winter)} = (25 \text{ mg/l}) (4.5 \text{ MGD}) (8.34) = 950 \text{ lbs/day}$$

Between January 2005 and December 2007, the average monthly CBOD<sub>5</sub> ranged from 1.1 to 5.9 mg/l, and the maximum daily ranged from 1.5 to 28 mg/l (Table 1). There were no exceedances of the CBOD<sub>5</sub> average monthly concentration limit.

During the same period, the average monthly TSS concentration ranged from 0.8 to 76 mg/l, and the maximum daily ranged from 1.5 to 509 mg/l. There were four exceedances of the TSS average monthly limit during this period.

The monthly average 85 percent removal requirements for CBOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are based on the provisions of

<sup>3</sup> Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Charles River Basin 1976 Water Quality Management Plan, Report 72 - D-1.

40 CFR §133.102(a)(3) and (b)(3). The limit is carried forward from the current permit. There were no exceedances for the CBOD<sub>5</sub> 85% removal requirement between January 2005 and December 2007. There was one exceedance for the TSS 85% removal requirement in June 2006.

***Fecal Coliform, Escherichia coli (E. coli), Dissolved Oxygen (DO) and pH***

The numerical limitations for fecal coliform, E.coli, dissolved oxygen (DO) and pH are based on state certification requirements under Section 401(a) of the CWA, as described in 40 CFR 124.53 and 124.55, and the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards at 314 CMR 4.05(3)(b). The limits for pH, dissolved oxygen, and fecal coliform will remain unchanged from the limits in the existing permit.

Massachusetts adopted revisions to the State Water Quality Standards on March 26, 2007, which were approved by EPA on September 19, 2007. For Class B waters, the bacteria indicator changed from fecal coliform to E.coli for non-bathing beaches and other waters.

Accordingly, the draft permit contains effluent limits for E.coli. The proposed limits include a monthly geometric mean of 126 colony forming units (cfu)/100 ml and a daily maximum of 409 cfu/100 ml (the daily maximum value is the 90% distribution of the geometric mean of 129 cfu/100 ml).

Because the E.coli limits are new water quality based limits, the Massachusetts Water Quality Standards allow a compliance schedule for achieving them. (see 314 CMR 4.03(1)(b) and Section H in the draft permit). The draft permit includes a compliance schedule requiring that the E.coli limit be achieved by March 2010. The current permit limits for fecal coliform are continued as interim limitations until the E.coli limits become effective. The bacteria limits are seasonal, and the seasons remain the same as in the current permit (March-November).

The fecal coliform and E.coli samples are to be collected at the same time as the total residual chlorine samples.

During the period of January 2005 through December 2007 there were two exceedances of the maximum fecal coliform limits, no exceedances of the maximum pH limit, and one exceedance of the DO requirement.

**Non-Conventional Pollutants**

***Phosphorus***

The existing permit includes a seasonal monthly average effluent limit for total phosphorus of 0.2 mg/l (April 1 through October 31) and a reporting requirement for the remainder of the year (November 1 through March 31). From January 2005 through December 2007, the monthly average phosphorus concentration ranged from 0.07 to 2.9 mg/l in the summer with seven exceedances and 0.09 to 1.4 mg/l in the winter (Table 2).

As discussed earlier, the segment of the Charles River receiving the facility's discharge is not attaining water quality standards and is listed as impaired by unknown toxicity, metals, nutrients, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pathogens, noxious aquatic plants, and turbidity. The Charles River has been included on the 2006 Massachusetts Section 303(d) CWA lists for nutrients because of cultural eutrophication. Phosphorus is an essential nutrient for plant growth and is the limiting nutrient in fresh water ecosystems. Phosphorus discharged by the CRPCD and other sources into the Charles River has the potential to accelerate eutrophication.

MassDEP has not adopted numeric nutrient criteria for phosphorus, but its water quality standards include narrative criteria for nutrients at 314 CMR 4.05(5)(c) specifying that “unless naturally occurring, all surface waters shall be free from nutrients in concentrations that would cause or contribute to impairment of existing or designated uses” and “any existing point source discharge containing nutrients in concentrations that would cause or contribute to cultural eutrophication, including the excessive growth of aquatic plants or algae, in any surface waters shall be provided with the most appropriate treatment as determined by the Department, including, where necessary, highest and best practical treatment (HBPT) for POTWs....”. MassDEP construes “highest and best practical treatment” for POTWs as treatment achieving a monthly average total phosphorus concentration of 0.2 mg/l.

In the absence of a numeric criterion for phosphorus, EPA looks to nationally recommended criteria, supplemented by other relevant materials, such as EPA technical guidance and information published under Section 304(a) of the CWA, peer-reviewed scientific literature and site-specific surveys and data. See 40 CFR §122.44(d)(1)(vi)(B). EPA has produced several guidance documents which set forth total ambient phosphorus concentrations that are sufficiently stringent to control cultural eutrophication and other adverse nutrient-related impacts. These guidance documents present protective in-stream phosphorus concentrations based on two different analytical approaches. An effects-based approach provides a threshold value above which adverse effects (*i.e.*, water quality impairments) are likely to occur. It applies empirical observations of a causal variable (*i.e.*, phosphorus) and a response variable (*i.e.*, chlorophyll *a*) associated with designated use impairments. Alternatively, reference-based values are statistically derived from a comparison within a population of rivers in the same eco-region class. They are a quantitative set of river characteristics (physical, chemical and biological) that represent conditions in waters in that ecoregion that are minimally impacted by human activities (*i.e.*, reference conditions), and thus by definition representative of water without cultural eutrophication. Thus, while reference conditions, which reflect minimally disturbed conditions, will meet the requirements necessary to support designated uses, they may also exceed the water quality necessary to support such requirements.

The 1986 Quality Criteria of Water (commonly known as the “Gold Book”) follows an effects-based approach. It recommends maximum threshold concentrations designed to prevent or control adverse nutrient-related impacts from occurring. Specifically, the Gold Book recommends in-stream phosphorus concentrations of no greater than 0.05 mg/l in any stream entering a lake or reservoir, 0.1 mg/l for any stream not discharging directly to lakes or impoundments, and 0.025 mg/l within the lake or reservoir. A more recent technical guidance manual, the Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual: Rivers and Streams (EPA 2000) (“Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual”), cites a range of values drawn from the peer-reviewed scientific literature to control periphyton and plankton, two types of aquatic plant growth commonly associated with eutrophication. This guidance recommends an in-stream phosphorus concentration from 0.01 mg/l to 0.09 mg/l to control periphyton growth and concentrations from 0.035 mg/l to 0.070 mg/l to control plankton (see Table 4 on page 101).

EPA has also released recommended ecoregional nutrient criteria, established as part of an effort to reduce problems associated with excess nutrients in water bodies in specific areas of the country. The published criteria represent conditions in waters in that ecoregion that are minimally impacted by human activities, and thus free from cultural eutrophication. The CRPCD discharge is within sub-ecoregion 59 of Ecoregion XIV, Eastern Coastal Plains. The total phosphorus criterion for this sub-ecoregion, found in Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria, Rivers and Streams in Ecoregion XIV (2000), is 24 ug/l (0.024 mg/l). The recommended

chlorophyll a criterion for aggregate Ecoregion XIV streams is 3.75 ug/l.

*Phosphorus concentrations in the Charles River Basin*

The impacts associated with the excessive loading of phosphorus are well documented in three recent reports on the Charles River Watershed Basin. The Charles River Basin 2002-2006 Water Quality Assessment Report published by MassDEP in April 2008 and its Appendix B, Technical Memorandum TM 72-9; the Upper Charles River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load Project, project # 2001-03/104, Volume I: Phase I Final Report, dated May 2004, and the Upper Charles River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load, Project # 2001-03/104, Volume I: Phase II Final Report and Phase III Data Report, dated July 2006.

The Charles River Watershed Basin 2002-2006 Water Quality Assessment Report provides data from nine samples collected by the Charles River Watershed Association for total phosphorus both upstream and downstream of the treatment plant's outfall (segment MA72-05) for the months of April through September. The range of phosphorus concentration upstream of the outfall is between 0.0386 to 0.0836 mg/l and the range downstream of the outfall is between 0.043 to 0.0717 mg/l.

The MassDEP Technical Memorandum T72-9, Charles River Watershed DWM Year 2002 Water Quality Monitoring Data – Rivers includes data from sampling locations on the Charles River, upstream of CRPCD's discharge and downstream of the discharge. A range of total phosphorus concentration from April through September measured below the detection limit to 0.055 mg/l upstream of the discharge and below the detection limit to 0.061 mg/l downstream of the discharge.

The Upper Charles River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load, Project # 2001-03/104, Volume I: Phase I Final Report, and Volume I: Phase II Final Report and Phase III Data Report states that every tributary wastewater treatment plant and, all but two main stem sites on the Charles River, (one in Milford and one in Millis) exceed the USEPA recommended action limit for total phosphorus of 0.024 mg/l. Data from dry weather sampling events conducted in August 2002 show that instream concentration of phosphorus downstream from the treatment plant is higher than upstream of the treatment plant and also shows elevated concentrations of chlorophyll a, and dissolved oxygen which are indicative of excessive plant growth. See the Table below.

*Charles River TMDL Water Quality Monitoring Data (mg/l)*

Dry Sampling Date	Total Phosphorus	Orthophosphate	Chlorophyll a	DO	Percent Saturation
Station 184S: USGS Gage Station, upstream of Populatic Pond, Medway					
8/13/2002	0.0472	0.0141	4.92 <sup>1</sup>	9.54 - 9.63 <sup>2</sup>	----
8/24/2005	0.0259	0.016	ND	8.84	----
Station 201S <sup>3</sup> : Outlet of Populatic Pond, Medway					
8/13/2002	0.0632	-----	0.0416	9.2	110
8/24/2005	0.0562	-----	0.022	10.10	120

NPDES Fact Sheet No. MA 0102598  
2008 Reissuance

Page 10 of 29

Station 202W : CRPCD Discharge					
8/13/2002	0.106	-----	0.0416	----	----
8/24/2005	0.0992	-----	0.022	7.7	85
Station 207S: One-half mile downstream of CRPCD outfall, Norfolk					
8/13/2002	0.0717	0.0312	38 <sup>1</sup>	9.85	115
8/24/2005	0.0536	0.0233	12	8.8	105
Station 229S: Two miles downstream of CRPCD, Millis					
8/13/2002	0.0230	0.0219	0.00804 <sup>1</sup>	7.9	----
8/24/2005	0.0375	0.0188	0.007	7.1	----
Station 290S: Nine miles downstream of CRPCD, Medfield (above Medfield WWTP)					
8/13/2002	0.0395/0.0378 <sup>4</sup>	0.00928/0.00943 <sup>4</sup>	0.00946/0.00928 <sup>4</sup>	7.9	----
8/24/2005	0.0415	0.011	0.015	7.2	----
Station 294S: Immediately below Medfield WWTP					
8/13/2002	0.100	0.0622	12.4	8.2	----
8/24/2005	0.041	0.0122	15	7.5	----
Station 318S: Route 27 Bridge, Medfield/Sherborn town line					
8/13/2002	0.0616	0.0187	1.93 <sup>1</sup>	8.83	----
8/24/2005	0.0377	0.0115	9	5.7	----
Station 387S: Cheney Bridge, Wellesley, downstream of South Natick					
8/13/2002	0.0307	0.182	7.48 <sup>1</sup>	5.37	----
8/24/2005	0.0462/0.0504 <sup>4</sup>	0.0137/0.0141 <sup>4</sup>	9/9 <sup>4</sup>	5.3	----
Station 407S: Claybrook Road, Dover					
8/13/2002	0.0384/0.0346 <sup>4</sup>	0.00614/0.00384 <sup>4,5</sup>	30.8/27.4 <sup>1,4</sup>	8.26	----
8/24/2005	0.043	0.0118	13	5.9	----
Station 447S: USGS Gage, Dover					
8/13/2002	0.0372	0.00476	10.7	6.42	----
8/24/2005	0.0572	0.00996	21	6.8	----

<sup>1</sup>Chlorophyll *a* equipment blanks for 8/13/02 are 0.00215 and 0.00301 mg/l.<sup>2</sup>Unstable.

<sup>3</sup> Station 201S is located at the outlet of Populatic Pond upstream of the discharge.

<sup>4</sup> Field Duplicate.

<sup>5</sup> Field Duplicate Relative Percent Difference is greater than acceptable range.

In addition to the data in the tables above, continuous dissolved oxygen data collected in Populatic Pond, just upstream of the discharge, and from the first sampling site downstream of the CRPCD discharge (207S) show large diurnal variations in dissolved oxygen and very high levels of supersaturation (see Figures 2-27 and 2-28, from *Upper Charles River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load Project, Volume I: Phased I Final Report*. This data is indicative of significant photosynthesis-driven fluctuations in dissolved oxygen, an indication large quantities of plant biomass are in the receiving water.

The Charles River Watershed 2002-2006 Water Quality Assessment Report notes a bloom of cyanobacteria algae in this segment of the Charles River in September 2004 and also notes large mats of filamentous algae downstream of Populatic Pond in July 2002.

In summary, the available data shows extremely high productivity in the receiving water upstream and downstream of the discharge as evidenced by high chlorophyll a, large diurnal variation in dissolved oxygen concentration and visible algae mats as noted in field observations.

As discussed previously, the existing permit includes a monthly average total phosphorus limit of 0.2 mg/l, which was based on MADEP's interpretation of highest and best practical treatment for POTWs. However, the receiving water data collected for the TMDL shows that this limit is not sufficiently stringent to achieve water quality standards. Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) (v), where a State has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in the effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits using one or more of the following options:

(A) – Establish effluent limits using a calculated numeric water quality criterion for the pollutant which the permitting authority demonstrates will attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria and will fully protect the designated use. Such a criterion may be derived using a proposed state criterion, or an explicit State policy or regulation interpreting its narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information which may include: EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook, October 1983, risk assessment data, exposure data, information about the pollutant from the Food and Drug Administration, and current EPA criteria documents; or

(B) – Establish effluent limits on a case-by-case basis, using EPA's water quality criteria, published under section 304(a) of the CWA, supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; or

(C) – Establish effluent limitations on an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern.

EPA has produced several guidance documents which contain recommended total phosphorus criteria for receiving waters to which this data may be compared. The 1986 Quality Criteria for Water (EPA 440/5/86-001), commonly known as the "Gold Book", recommends a desired goal of 0.1 mg/l total phosphorus for the prevention of plant nuisances in streams or other flowing waters not discharging directly into lakes or impoundments.

More recently, EPA has released "Ecoregional Nutrient Criteria," established as part of an effort to reduce problems associated with excess nutrients in water in specific areas of the country. The published criteria represent conditions in waters in an ecoregion minimally impacted by human activities, and thus representative of water without cultural eutrophication. CRPCD WPAF is within Ecoregion XIV, Eastern Coastal Plains, Level III Northeastern Coastal Zone. The total phosphorus criteria for this ecoregion, found in Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria, Rivers and Streams in Ecoregion XIV (EPA-822-B-00-022, December 2000), is 24 ug/l (0.024 mg/l). The chlorophyll *a* criteria for the aggregate ecoregion is 3.75 ug/l (0.004 mg/l). The report emphasizes that these values represent a starting point for states to develop more refined nutrient criteria for local conditions.

The current limit is not sufficiently stringent to achieve the Gold book criteria under 7Q10 conditions, or the Ecoregion Criteria under average summer conditions. A more stringent limit, based on the Gold Book criteria is proposed in the draft permit and was calculated as follows:

*Calculation of Summer Phosphorus Effluent Limits based on 1986 Quality Criteria for Water (EPA 440/5/86-001):*

**Average monthly summer total phosphorus limit:**

The effluent limit was calculated to assure that the instream total phosphorus concentration does not exceed 0.1 mg/l under 7Q10 low flow conditions with the treatment plant discharging at a flow of 4.5 MGD (6.96 cfs). A background concentration of 0.06 mg/l was assumed based on the instream data collected at sampling site 201S, just upstream of the discharge. The calculation of the limit is shown below

$$Q_r C_r = Q_d C_d + Q_s C_s$$

Where

$Q_r$  = receiving water flow downstream of the discharge ( $Q_d + Q_s$ ), 11.1 cfs

$C_r$  = total phosphorus concentration in the receiving water downstream of the discharge, 0.1 mg/l

$Q_d$  = discharge flow from the facility, 6.96 cfs

$C_d$  = total phosphorus concentration in the discharge

$Q_s$  = receiving water flow upstream of the discharge, 4.14 cfs

$C_s$  = total phosphorus concentration upstream of the discharge, 0.06 mg/l

Solving for  $C_d$  yields:

$$C_d = \frac{Q_r C_r - Q_s C_s}{Q_d}$$

$$C_d = \frac{(11.1)(0.1) - (4.14)(0.06)}{6.96}$$

$$C_d = 0.12 \text{ mg/l}$$

The draft permit therefore includes a monthly average summer phosphorus limit of 0.12 mg/l. In the future, should MassDEP adopt numeric phosphorus criteria, or a TMDL be approved by EPA, or should additional water quality information shows that a different (more or less stringent) phosphorus limit will

result in attainment of water quality standards, the permit may be modified to include the appropriate limit.

The draft permit also includes a total phosphorus limitation of 1.0 mg/l for the period from November 1 through March 31. The basis for the limit is to protect the Charles River from cultural eutrophication. The discharge of particulate phosphorus from the facility during the winter months to the Charles River has the potential to settle and become incorporated into the bottom sediments within the Charles River system. The potential for particulate phosphorus being stored in the Charles River system is high because of the physical characteristics of the downstream river system, which include low gradient segments, adjacent wetland/marshy areas, and impounded sections along the river (areas upstream of dams). These characteristics result in low flow velocities and long travel times which, allows particulate matter to settle from the water column and become part of the bottom sediments.

The primary concern with phosphorus being stored in the bottom sediments is that it may become available for algal and macrophyte growth during the summer growing season. Depending on water column conditions, sediment-bound phosphorus may be released to the water column. This is particularly true for impounded portions of the river that become stratified during the summer months and have low DO in the lower water column. Low DO at the sediment water interface promotes mobilization of phosphorus from the sediments to the water column. A limit of 1.0 mg/l from November 1 through March 31 will require removal of most of the particulate-bound phosphorus in the discharge. This will presumably allow the dissolved portion to pass out of the system during the winter and spring when flows are higher and plant uptake is low. Orthophosphorus will be monitored during the winter months to determine the bioavailable concentration of phosphorous in the water column.

In summary, the draft permit total phosphorus limit for the summer months is 0.12 mg/l and the winter limit is 1.0 mg/l. The monitoring frequency for the summer is 3/week, and the winter monitoring frequency is 1/month.

### *Ammonia*

Ammonia can impact the receiving stream's dissolved oxygen concentration and can be toxic at elevated levels. The ammonia limits are based on previous waste load allocations and water quality considerations. These limits have been established to achieve dissolved oxygen water quality standards for a Class B receiving water. The effluent limitations in the draft are the same as the limits in the existing permit. The average monthly, average weekly, and maximum daily concentration limits for the month of April are 10 mg/l, 15 mg/l, and 20 mg/l and for May the limits are 5 mg/l, 7.5 mg/l and 10 mg/l. The average monthly, average weekly, and maximum daily concentration limits for the months of June through October are 1 mg/l, 1.5 mg/l, and 2 mg/l.

During the winter months, ammonia limits may not be necessary to ensure compliance with water quality standards given the higher receiving water flows, reduced rates of biological degradation of ammonia and, higher instream concentrations of dissolved oxygen. However, winter limits may be necessary to ensure that ammonia toxicity does not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. The facility reports average monthly and maximum daily ammonia limits from November 1 through March 31 once per month. See Table 2 for total ammonia data reported on the facility's discharge monitoring report from January 2005 through December 2007.

In order to determine if there is a reasonable potential for the CRPCD discharge to cause a violation of the

water quality standards, the potential winter limits were calculated as follows:

#### Winter Ammonia Limits Calculations:

The winter ammonia instream criteria is dependent on pH and temperature, as explained in 1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia (EPA-822-R-99-014), and Federal Register Vol. 64, No. 245, pgs. 71973 - 71980, December 22, 1999. The recommended chronic ammonia criteria is established as a 30-day concentration, therefore the monthly average limit has been calculated using a dilution factor based on 30-day mean low flow with a recurrent interval of 10 years (30Q10) and the discharge design flow.

*Estimation of 30Q10 for period of November 1 to March 31:*

#### **Charles River 30Q10 at USGS station 0110350 Charles River at Dover = 72.1 cfs**

The contributing flows for the 30Q10 estimate are based on the design flows, in contrast to the 7Q10 estimate, where the flows were based on the actual discharge volumes during a period when 7Q10 conditions existed in the river.

Contributing flows from upstream WWTPs:

Milford WWTP	4.3 MGD	6.6 cfs
CRPCD	4.5 MGD	6.96 cfs
Medfield WWP	1.52 MGD	2.35 cfs
Wrentham Developmental Ctr	0.454 MGD	0.70 cfs
Caritas Southwood Hospital	0.055 MGD	0.085 cfs
MCI-Norfolk	0.484 MGD	0.749 cfs
Total contributing flows		17.4 cfs

\* Base flow at USGS Dover = (30Q10) - (contributing flows) = 72.1 cfs - 17.4 cfs = 54.7 cfs

*Base flow per square mile of drainage area (base flow factor):*

$(54.7 \text{ cfs}) / (183 \text{ sq mi}) = 0.298 \text{ cfs/sq mi}$

\* 30Q10 estimate at CRPCD:

$(\text{base flow factor}) (\text{drainage area}) + (\text{Milford flow}) = (0.29) (66.7 \text{ sq mi}) + (6.6 \text{ cfs}) = 26.47 = 26.5 \text{ cfs}$

*Instream dilution based on 30Q10:*

$$DF = \frac{30Q10 + \text{design flow}}{\text{design flow}} = \frac{26.5 + 6.96}{6.96} = 4.8$$

#### *Calculation of Ammonia Criteria:*

Temperature and pH data collected by the Charles River Watershed Association from 2000 through 2002 at station 165S, Shaw Street Bridge, Medway/Franklin ([www.crwa.org](http://www.crwa.org)), were reviewed to determine the pH and temperature values needed to calculate the ammonia criteria. On occasion, the pH in the winter months was below the minimum water quality standard of 6.5.

The CRWA data on the ammonia criteria for each sampling data are tabulated below. Based on this information, a criteria value of 4.36 mg/l based on a pH of 7.5 and temperature of 1<sup>0</sup> C was selected to be protective of the river during cold weather conditions.

*Calculation of Ammonia Criteria*

Month	pH	Temperature, °C	Instream Criteria, mg/l
March 2002	6.9	3.0	6.12
February 2002	7.4	2.0	4.73
November 2001	7.5	1.0	4.36
March 2001	6.7	0.5	6.44
November 2000	6.8	3.5	6.29
March 2000	7.3	0.0	5.08
February 2000	6.3	1.0	6.67
December 2000	6.9	---	6.12
November 2000	6.0	3.5	6.67

Average monthly winter ammonia limit = (ammonia criteria) (30Q10 DF) = (4.36 mg/l) (4.8) = 21 mg/l

The weekly average ammonia criteria should be no more than twice the monthly average limit:

Weekly average winter ammonia limit = (average monthly limit) (2) = (21 mg/l) (2) = 42 mg/l

The average monthly and maximum daily ammonia concentrations reported on the monthly discharge monitoring reports are listed in Table 2. Based on these calculations, reasonable potential of ammonia concentration in the effluent exceeding water quality criteria does not exist. Therefore winter ammonia limits are not required at this time. The reporting requirement and 1/month winter sampling frequency are carried over from the current permit.

***Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)***

The effluent is seasonally disinfected with chlorine gas and dechlorinated with sodium bisulfate. The chlorine is delivered by a vacuum-solution feed chlorinator. The chlorine feed rate and pounds remaining in the cylinder are checked every morning. In the event of loss of injector water, the chlorinator will respond to the loss of vacuum and automatically discontinue flow of chlorine gas supplied by the cylinder. The daily maximum concentration reported for effluent monitoring over the past two years ranged from below the detection limit of 0.05 mg/l to 0.9 mg/l, with four exceedances. Table 1 shows the TRC values recorded on the monthly discharge monitoring report.

Chlorine and chlorine compounds produced by the chlorination of wastewater can be extremely toxic to aquatic life. The draft permit includes total residual chlorine limits based on Massachusetts Water Quality Standards [314 CMR 4.05(5)(e)] and the Massachusetts Implementation Policy for the Control of Toxic Pollutants in Surface Waters, February 23, 1990. The instream criteria for chlorine are found in the updated compilation of the National Recommended Water Quality Criteria: 2002 (EPA 822-R-02-047). The calculations for water quality based limits are as follows:

*National Recommended Water Quality Criteria 2002 (EPA 822-R-02-047):*

Chronic criteria (CCC) = 11 ug/l

\*Average monthly limit = (CCC) x (DF) = (11 ug/l) (1.59) = 17 ug/l

Acute criteria (CMC) = 19 ug/l

$$\text{*Maximum daily limit} = (\text{CMC}) \times (\text{DF}) = (19 \text{ ug/l}) (1.59) = 30 \text{ ug/l}$$

A monitoring frequency of 2/day for chlorine is the minimum frequency authorized in the permit. The minimum detection level (ML) for TRC has been lowered to 20 ug/l in the draft permit. This level may be obtained using the EPA methods specified in the permit. The average monthly TRC limit in the permit is below the analytical detection limit for this pollutant. In these situations, EPA Region I is following guidance set forth in Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control (EPA 505/2-90-001, March 1991, page 111), which recommends that "the compliance level be defined in the permit as the minimum level (ML)." Therefore, the limit at which compliance determinations will be based is the ML. For this permit, the ML for total residual chlorine is defined at 20 ug/l and any value below 20 ug/l shall be reported as zero on the Discharge Monitoring Report. The ML value may be reduced by permit modification as EPA and the State approves more sensitive tests.

The E.coli bacteria samples shall be collected at the same time and location as the TRC sample.

#### ***Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing***

Under Section 301(b)(1) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on water quality standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards [314 CMR 4.05(5)(e)], include the following narrative statements and require that EPA criteria established pursuant to Section 304(a)(1) of the CWA be used as guidance for interpretation of the following narrative criteria:

*"All surface waters shall be free from pollutants in concentrations or combinations that are toxic to humans, aquatic life or wildlife. Where the State determines that a specific pollutant not otherwise listed in 314 CMR 4.00 could reasonably be expected to adversely affect existing or designated uses, the State shall use the recommended limit published by EPA pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1251 §304(a) as the allowable receiving water concentrations for the affected waters unless a site-specific limit is established. Site specific limits, human health risk levels and permit limits will be established in accordance with 314 CMR 4.05(5)(e)(1)(2)(3)(4)".*

National studies conducted by the EPA have demonstrated that domestic sources contribute toxic constituents to POTWs above those which may be contributed from industrial users. These pollutants include metals, chlorinated solvents, aromatic hydrocarbons and other constituents. As a result, EPA Region I and MassDEP have developed toxicity control policies. These policies require wastewater treatment facilities to perform toxicity bioassays on their effluent. Discharges that have a dilution of less than 10:1 require acute and chronic toxicity limits.

Based on the potential for toxicity resulting from domestic sewage, and in accordance with EPA regulations and policy, the draft permit includes chronic and acute toxicity limitations and monitoring requirements. (See, e.g. Policy for the Development of Water Quality-Based Permit Limitations for Toxic Pollutants", 50FR30784 (July 25, 1985); see also EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control," (EPA/505/2-90-001, September 1991).

The principal advantages of biological techniques are: (1) the effects of complex discharges of many known and unknown constituents can be measured only by biological analysis; (2) bioavailability of pollutants after discharge is measured by toxicity testing including any synergistic effect of pollutants; and (3) pollutants for which there are inadequate analytical methods or criteria can be addressed. Therefore,

toxicity testing is being used in connection with pollutant-specific control procedures to control the discharge of toxic pollutants.

The chronic no observed effect concentration (C-NOEC) whole effluent toxicity limit is calculated using the instream waste concentration (IWC) of the WPAF effluent. The IWC is the inverse of the dilution (1.59 cfs).

$$C\text{-NOEC} = 1/\text{dilution factor} = 1/1.59 = 0.63 = 63 \%$$

Toxicity test requirements in the draft permit are the same as in the existing permit. The permittee shall test two species, the daphnid, Ceriodaphnia dubia and the fathead minnows, Pimephales promelas. The toxicity tests shall be conducted in the months of January, April, July and October to be consistent with other facilities in the Charles River watershed. The draft permit requires that if any future toxicity test should fail to comply with the permit limits, the permittee must retest the effluent within fourteen days of the original test.

See Permit **Attachment A**, Freshwater Chronic Toxicity Test Procedure and Protocol, for a description of the testing requirements.

#### Toxic Pollutants

Relatively low concentrations of trace metals in receiving waters can be toxic to resident aquatic life species. EPA is required to limit any pollutant that is, or may be discharged at a level that caused, or has reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above any water quality criterion. Sec 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi). Effluent metals data submitted with toxicity tests results and discharge monitoring reports were reviewed to determine if any of the metals in the discharge have the potential to exceed aquatic life criteria in the Charles River.

The EPA recommended approach to set and measure compliance with water quality standards is to use dissolved metals, because dissolved metals more closely approximates the bioavailable fraction of metal in the water column than does total recoverable metal. Most toxicity to aquatic organisms is by adsorption or uptake across the gills which would require the metal to be in dissolved form. When toxicity tests were originally conducted to develop EPA's Section 304(a) metals criteria, the concentrations were expressed as total metals. Subsequent testing determined the percent of the total metals that is dissolved in the water column. The calculations that follow use the freshwater conversion factors to calculate the dissolved acute and chronic water quality criteria for metals (EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria: 2002, Appendix A).

However, the regulations in 40 CFR 122.45(c) require that the permit limits be based on total recoverable metals. The chemical differences between the effluent and the receiving water may cause changes in the partitioning between dissolved and particulate forms of metals. As the effluent mixes with the receiving water, adsorbed metals from the discharge may dissolve in the water column.

In this case, measuring dissolved metals would underestimate the impact on the receiving water, and an additional calculation, using a site-specific translator would determine total metal criteria. Based on EPA's Metals Translator: Guidance for Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit from a Dissolved Criterion (EPA-823-B-96-007), the conversion factor is equivalent to the translator if site-specific studies for partitioning have not been conducted. In subsequent calculations, conversion from dissolved metals to total recoverable metals have been done using the conversion factor for the particular metal found in

Appendix A of National Recommended Water Quality Criteria: 2002, in lieu of a translator.

**Copper** - The current permit includes an average monthly total recoverable copper limitation of 10 ug/l and a maximum daily total recoverable copper limitation of 14 ug/l. These limits were calculated using the EPA 1998 National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for Copper, using a hardness of 60 mg/l as  $\text{CaCO}_3$ , which resulted in a total recoverable chronic criteria of 6 ug/l and a total recoverable acute criteria of 8.6 ug/l. These criteria were then multiplied by the dilution factor of 1.59 to calculate the limits.

The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards were revised in December 2006 to include site-specific criteria for copper that were developed for specific receiving waters where national criteria are invalid due to site-specific physical, chemical, or biological considerations, and do not exceed the safe exposure levels determined by toxicity testing [314 CMR 4.05(5)(e) Table 28]. EPA approved an acute criterion of 25.7 ug/l and chronic criterion of 18.1 ug/l for the Charles River on March 26, 2007.

Antibacksliding requirements found at CWA 402(o) and 40 CFR 122.44(l) generally prohibit relaxation of effluent limits. Water quality-based effluent limits can only be relaxed if one of the exceptions found at CWA 402(o)(2) is met or if the requirements of CWA 303(d)(4) are met. In this case, the requirements in CWA 303(d)(4) apply.

CWA 303(d)(4) requires that a determination be made whether the receiving water is attaining the applicable water quality standard. If the receiving water is in attainment of the standard, a relaxation of the limit would be allowed subject to the state antidegradation policy. If the receiving water is not in attainment of the applicable standard, the existing limit must be based on a wasteload allocation or a total maximum daily load, and the relaxed limit is only allowed if attainment of water quality standards is ensured.

The segment of the Charles River receiving the discharge from CRPCD is listed on the Massachusetts Integrated List of Waters as not attaining water quality standards, and metals is listed as one of the pollutants causing nonattainment. However, to the extent that copper is one of the metals in nonattainment, this listing is based on the earlier copper criteria, which, as has been discussed, is about three times more stringent than the site-specific criteria.

The existing instream concentration of copper downstream of the discharge under critical low flow conditions was estimated using upstream copper concentrations obtained from the dilution water samples from CRPCD's WET tests, the effluent concentration of copper from DMR data, the facility design flow and receiving water 7Q10. The estimates were made using the equation below.

$$Q_r C_r = Q_d C_d + Q_s C_s$$

$Q_r$  = receiving water flow downstream of the discharge (7Q10 + plant flow)

$C_r$  = copper concentration in the receiving water downstream of the discharge

$Q_d$  = design flow of the discharge

$C_d$  = copper concentration in the discharge

$Q_s$  = receiving water flow upstream of the discharge

$C_s$  = copper concentration in the receiving water upstream of the discharge

The upstream total copper concentration, as measured in the dilution water for the whole effluent toxicity

tests, averaged 4.5 ug/l, with a maximum concentration of 7.5 ug/l. The discharge monitoring reports show that the total copper concentration in the treatment plant discharge averaged 6.9 ug/l over the past two years, with a maximum monthly average of 12.9 ug/l and a maximum daily discharge of 22.4 ug/l.

Using the treatment plant design flow, the 7Q10 flow and the maximum concentrations ( $Q_r = 7.18$  MGD,  $Q_d = 4.5$  MGD,  $C_d = 12.9$  ug/l – chronic and 22.4 ug/l acute,  $Q_s = 2.68$  MGD, and  $C_s = 7.5$  ug/l) the resulting instream chronic concentration downstream of the discharge is estimated to be 11 ug/l and maximum (acute) concentration is 17 ug/l.

$$C_r = \frac{Q_d C_d + Q_s C_s}{Q_r}$$

Where:

$$Q_s = 2.68 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_s = 7.5 \text{ ug/l}$$

$$Q_d = 4.5 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_d = 12.9 \text{ ug/l chronic, } 22.4 \text{ ug/l acute}$$

$$Q_r = 7.18 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_r(\text{chronic}) = \frac{(4.5)(12.9) + (2.68)(7.5)}{7.18} = 10.8 \text{ ug/l}$$

$$C_r(\text{acute}) = \frac{(4.5)(22.4) + (2.68)(7.5)}{7.18} = 16.8 \text{ ug/l}$$

Comparing these calculated values (11 ug/l chronic, 17 ug/l acute) to the site-specific criteria (18 ug/l chronic, 25.7 ug/l acute), it can be seen that under critical conditions the instream concentration of copper would be less than the site-specific water quality criteria, meaning that the Charles River is a high quality water for copper, and a relaxation of the limits can be considered pursuant to the state's antidegradation policy.

Using the above equation, effluent limitations can be calculated which would result in an instream concentration equal to the new criteria. Using an upstream concentration of 7.5 ug/l ( $C_s$ ), the treatment plant design flow 4.5 MGD ( $Q_d$ ), the upstream 7Q10 flow of 2.68 MGD ( $Q_s$ ), the downstream flow of 7.18 ( $Q_r$ ), and downstream concentration equal to the criteria ( $C_r = 18.1$  ug/l- chronic, and 25.7 ug/l - acute) the monthly average and daily maximum total copper effluent limitations would be 24.4 ug/l – chronic and 36.5 ug/l- acute.

$$C_d = \frac{Q_r C_r - Q_s C_s}{Q_d}$$

Where:

$$Q_s = 2.68 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_s = 7.5 \text{ ug/l}$$

$$Q_d = 4.5 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_r = 18.1 \text{ ug/l chronic, } 25.7 \text{ ug/l acute}$$

$$Q_r = 7.18 \text{ MGD}$$

$$C_d(\text{chronic}) = \frac{(7.18)(18.1) - (2.68)(7.5)}{4.5} = 24.4 \text{ ug/l}$$

$$C_d(\text{acute}) = \frac{(7.18)(22.4) - (2.68)(7.5)}{4.5} = 31.2 \text{ ug/l}$$

However, because the Charles River would be considered a high quality water for copper based on the new site-specific criteria, Tier 3 of the antidegradation review procedure must be followed, which requires that high quality waters be maintained at existing quality.

The effluent data submitted by the permittee for the period from January 2004 through December 2006 shows that the maximum daily discharge concentration of total recoverable copper ranged from 3 ug/l to 22.4 ug/l and the monthly average discharge concentration ranged from 2 ug/l to 12.9 ug/l. Therefore, based on this data we have included a monthly average limit of 13 ug/l and a maximum daily limit of 23 ug/l in the draft permit.

#### Hardness Dependent Metals

EPA's Office of Water - Office of Science and Water Technology stated in a letter dated July 7, 2000 that: "The hardness of water containing the discharged toxic metal should be used for determining the applicable criterion. Thus the downstream hardness should be used. The hardness of the Charles River downstream of the treatment plant was calculated based on ambient and effluent hardness data collected for the whole effluent toxicity test from 2001 through 2005.

#### Calculation of hardness of the receiving water:

##### *Calculation of hardness in the receiving water:*

In order to determine the hardness downstream of the treatment plant during the critical low flow periods, the effluent and ambient hardness values from whole effluent toxicity tests conducted in July and October were calculated using mass balance equations:

$$C_r = \frac{Q_d C_d + Q_s C_s}{Q_r}$$

Where:

- $Q_s$  = 7Q10 river flow upstream of plant = 4.14 cfs = 2.68 MGD
- $Q_d$  = Discharge flow from plant = 4.5 MGD
- $Q_r$  = Combined river flow (7Q10 + plant flow)
- $C_s$  = Upstream hardness concentration
- $C_d$  = Plant discharge hardness concentration
- $C_r$  = Receiving water hardness concentration

*Calculation of Downstream Hardness at CRPCD*

WET Test Date	Effluent Hardness, mg/l	Ambient Hardness, mg/l	Calculated Downstream Hardness, mg/l
10/05	180	36	126
07/05	190	44	135
10/04	170	72	133
07/04	150	62	117
10/03	136	72	112
07/03	124	60	100
10/02	208	100	168
07/02	104	72	92
10/01	161	84	132
08/01	177	70	137

Example calculation:

$$C_r = \frac{Q_d C_d + Q_s C_s}{Q_T} = \frac{(4.5 \text{ MGD})(104 \text{ mg/l}) + (2.68 \text{ MGD})(72 \text{ mg/l})}{(4.5 \text{ MGD} + 2.68 \text{ MGD})} = 92 \text{ mg/l}$$

The lowest downstream hardness of 92 mg/l from the above table was selected, as this would be the most protective of aquatic life.

Water Quality Criteria for hardness-dependent metals (see equations below):

Chronic criteria (dissolved) =  $\exp\{m_c [\ln(\text{hardness})] + b_c\}$  (CF)

Where :  
 $m_c$  = pollutant-specific coefficient  
 $b_c$  = pollutant-specific coefficient  
 $h$  = hardness of the receiving water = 92 mg/l as  $\text{CaCO}_3$   
 $\ln$  = natural logarithm  
 CF = pollutant specific conversion factor used to convert total recoverable to dissolved metal

Acute criteria (dissolved) =  $\exp\{m_a [\ln(\text{hardness})] + b_a\}$  (CF)

Where:  
 $m_a$  = pollutant-specific coefficient  
 $b_a$  = pollutant-specific coefficient  
 $h$  = hardness of the receiving water = 92 mg/l as  $\text{CaCO}_3$   
 $\ln$  = natural logarithm  
 CF = pollutant specific conversion factor used to convert total recoverable to dissolved

*Metal Parameters for Calculating Freshwater Dissolved Metals Criteria That Are Hardness Dependent*

Chemical	$m_A$	$b_A$	$m_C$	$b_C$	Freshwater Conversion Factors (CF)	
					CMC	CCC
Lead	1.273	-1.460	1.273	-4.705	0.803	0.803
Nickel	0.8460	2.255	0.8460	0.0584	0.998	0.997
Cadmium	1.0166	-3.924	0.7409	-4.715	0.947	0.912
Zinc	0.8473	0.884	0.8473	0.884	0.978	0.986

Lead

$CCC = \text{Chronic lead criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{1.273 [\ln(92)] - 4.705\} (0.803) = 2.3 \text{ ug/l}$

Average Monthly Effluent limitation: (CCC) (dilution factor) = (2.3 ug/l) (1.59) = 3.7 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $3.7 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.803) = 4.6 \text{ ug/l} = 5 \text{ ug/l}$

$CMC = \text{Acute lead criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{1.273 [\ln(92)] - 1.460\} (0.803) = 59 \text{ ug/l}$

Maximum Daily Effluent limitation: (CMC) (dilution factor) = (59 ug/l) (1.59) = 94 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $94 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.803) = 117 \text{ ug/l}$

Lead is monitored as part of the chemical analysis in quarterly toxicity testing. The concentration of lead in the effluent has been consistently below the minimum detection level (ML) of 0.0050 mg/l. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for a violation of the water quality standards and no limit is required.

Nickel

$CCC = \text{Chronic nickel criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{0.8460 [\ln(92)] + 0.0584\} (0.997) = 48 \text{ ug/l}$

Average Monthly Effluent limitation: (CCC) (dilution factor) = (48 ug/l) (1.59) = 76 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $76 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.997) = 76 \text{ ug/l}$

$CMC = \text{Acute nickel criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{0.8460 [\ln(92)] + 2.255\} (0.998) = 436 \text{ ug/l}$

Maximum Daily Effluent limitation: (CMC) (dilution factor) = (436 ug/l) (1.59) = 693 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $693 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.998) = 694 \text{ ug/l}$

Nickel is monitored as part of the chemical analysis in quarterly toxicity testing. The concentration of nickel in the effluent has been below the minimum detection level (ML) of 0.004 to 0.007 mg/l. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for a violation of the water quality standards and no limit is required.

Cadmium

$CCC = \text{Chronic cadmium criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{0.7409 [\ln(92)] - 4.72\} (0.912) = 0.23 \text{ ug/l}$

Average Monthly Effluent limitation: (CCC) (dilution factor) = (0.23 ug/l) (1.59) = 0.36 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $0.36 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.912) = 0.4 \text{ ug/l}$

$CMC = \text{Acute cadmium criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{1.0166 [\ln(92)] - 3.924\} (0.947) = 2 \text{ ug/l}$

Maximum Daily Effluent limitation: (CMC) (dilution factor) = (2 ug/l) (1.59) = 3.2 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $3.2 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.947) = 3.4 \text{ ug/l}$

Cadmium is monitored as part of the chemical analysis in quarterly toxicity testing. The concentration of cadmium has been below the minimum detection (ML) of 10 ug/l. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for a violation of the water quality standards and no limit is required.

#### Zinc

$CCC = \text{Chronic zinc criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{0.8473 [\ln(92)] + 0.884\} (0.986) = 110 \text{ ug/l}$

Average Monthly Effluent limitation: (CCC) (dilution factor) = (110 ug/l) (1.59) = 175 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $175 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.986) = 177 \text{ ug/l}$

$CMC = \text{Acute zinc criteria (dissolved)} = \exp\{0.8473 [\ln(92)] + 0.884\} (0.978) = 109 \text{ ug/l}$

Maximum Daily Effluent limitation: (CMC) (dilution factor) = (109 ug/l) (1.59) = 173 ug/l (dissolved)

Total recoverable limit =  $173 \text{ ug/l} \div (0.978) = 177 \text{ ug/l}$

Zinc is monitored as part of the chemical analysis in quarterly toxicity testing. The concentration of zinc in the effluent ranged from 0.017 to 0.031 mg/l. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for a violation of the water quality standards and no limit is required.

#### Aluminum

The aluminum criterion is expressed in terms of total recoverable metal in the water column and is not hardness-dependent.

$CCC = \text{Chronic aluminum criteria} = 87 \text{ ug/l}$

Average monthly effluent limitation: (CCC) (dilution factor) = (87 ug/l) (1.59) = 0.14 mg/l

$CMC = \text{Acute aluminum criteria} = 750 \text{ ug/l}$

Maximum daily effluent limitation: (CMC)(dilution factor) = (750 ug/l) (1.59) = 1.2 mg/l

At the CRPCD WPAF, ferric chloride, rather than alum, is used for phosphorus control. The current permit includes a report only requirement, and the concentration of aluminum in the effluent has ranged from below detection to 0.03 mg/l (Table 2). Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for a violation of water quality standards and the effluent reporting requirement for aluminum has been eliminated. Aluminum will still be monitored as part of the chemical analysis in quarterly toxicity testing.

## **VI. UNAUTHORIZED DISCHARGES**

The permittee and co-permittees are authorized to discharge only in accordance with the terms and conditions of this permit and only from the outfall(s) listed in Part I.A.1 of this permit. Discharges of wastewater from any other point sources, including sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) are not authorized by the permit and shall be reported in accordance with Section D.1.e (1) of the General Requirements of the permit (Twenty-four hour reporting).

Notification of SSOs to MassDEP shall be made on its SSO Reporting Form which includes MassDEP Regional Office telephone numbers. The reporting form and instructions for its completion may be found online at <http://www.mass.gov/dep/water/approvals/surffms.htm#sso>.

## **VII. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SEWER SYSTEM**

The Towns of Franklin, Medway, Millis, and Bellingham own and operate their portions of the sewer

collection system that transports sewage to the treatment plant. The draft permit includes these towns as co-permittees for the operation and maintenance of each town's separate sewer system. The CRPCD and the towns are each required to comply with Part I.B, Unauthorized Discharges and I.C, Operation and Maintenance of the Sewer System.

#### Infiltration/Inflow Requirements

The draft permit includes requirements for the permittee and co-permittees to control infiltration and inflow (I/I). Infiltration is groundwater that enters the collection system through physical defects such as cracked pipes or deteriorated joints. Inflow is extraneous flow entering the collection system through point sources such as roof leaders, yard and area drains, sump pumps, manhole covers, and cross connections from storm water systems. Significant I/I in a collection system may displace sanitary flow, reducing the capacity and the efficiency of the treatment works, and may cause bypasses to secondary treatment. It greatly increases the potential for sanitary sewer overflows (SSO) in separate systems.

The 2007 Infiltration/Inflow report submitted by CRPCD estimated daily infiltration/inflow to the facility at an average of 0.28 MGD. The report states that CRPCD, Bellingham, Franklin, Medway, and Millis did not have any unauthorized discharges from their sewer systems.

In March 2002, CRPCD conducted TV inspections of the District's Charles River Interceptor, Chicken Brook Connector, and a portion of the Shepard's Brook Connector. The District wanted to determine if significant infiltration was present in its collection systems at the three river crossings and the interceptor adjacent to the Charles River. Seven locations with infiltration were found and sealed in July 2002 resulting in an estimated reduction of 50,000 gpd of infiltration.

***From 2002 to 2005, CRPCD assisted Franklin with TV inspections of 14,464 feet of sewer lines, and 11,166 feet were surveyed in Millis.***

During 2005, Franklin lined 10,774 feet of sewer pipe; tested and sealed 18,623 feet; and rehabilitated 74 manholes. Also, 34 spot repairs were performed by a curing-in-place process. An estimated 500,000 gpd were eliminated from the sewer system. In 2007, the Town inspected approximately 500 sewer manholes, performed flow isolation in four sub areas, identified and eliminated four direct sources of inflow, evaluated flows through two sewer pump stations to assess the magnitude of wet weather/dry weather flow and installed a flow meter in the Beaver Street Interceptor to provide monitoring of wet weather/dry weather flow.

In 2007, Medway continued to inspect manholes and has compiled a list for remedial action. The Town found no unauthorized discharges in 2007. In prior years Medway has repaired sewer connections and manholes to eliminate an estimated 288,000 gpd of I/I.

In 2007 Bellingham hired a consultant to study and overhaul the Stanwood Circle meter before the end of fiscal year 2008. The Town is also planning to install remote monitoring equipment within the sewer system which is expected to further efforts to identify areas with I/I. Bellingham completed a two-year program to continuously monitor pump station operation and meter readings, inspect and repair manholes, drop structures, and pipe lines in the Stanwood Meter (Pilgrim Village), North Main Street Pump Station (Wethersfield), and Mechanic Street Pump Station sub-systems. As a result, 20,000 gpd were eliminated. Bellingham has added a line item to their sewer enterprise fund to continue their efforts to reduce I/I.

removal program. The program was expected to begin in the spring. The Town has estimated the cost over a three year period to be \$400,000. In prior years, the Town has replaced several cracked and broken sewer manhole covers and rims and required a sewer contractor to repair a leaking newly installed sewer line extension.

The permit requirements for infiltration/inflow have been updated, and the permittee is required to submit a plan for controlling inflow/infiltration to the sewer system with the cooperation of the communities who are co-permittees in the District within six months of the effective date of the permit, and an annual report by March 31 of each year. The permittee and co-permittees shall develop an I/I removal program commensurate with the severity of the I/I in the collection system. Where portions of the collection system have little I/I, the control program will logically be scaled down. Significant I/I in a collection system may displace sanitary flow, reduce the capacity and the efficiency of the treatment works, and may cause bypasses at the treatment plant.

The permit standard conditions for 'Proper Operation and Maintenance' are found at 40 CFR §122.41(c). These require proper operation and maintenance of permitted wastewater systems and related facilities to achieve permit conditions. Similarly, the permittee and co-permittees have a 'duty to mitigate' as stated in 40 CFR §122.41 (d). This requires the permittee and co-permittees to take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. EPA and MassDEP maintain that an I/I removal program is an integral component to insuring permit compliance under both of these provisions. MassDEP has stated that inclusion of the I/I conditions in the draft permit shall be a standard State Certification requirement under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR 124.55(b).

#### **VIII. PRETREATMENT**

CRPCD receives process discharges from 4 significant industrial users. Garelick Farms discharges 300,000 gpd; ANP Bellingham Energy Company discharges 5500 gpd; and Castronics, Inc. and SMTC Manufacturing Corporation both contribute very small process and non-process flows.

The permittee is required to administer a pretreatment program based on the authority granted under 40 CFR 122.44(j), 40 CFR Part 403, and Section 307 of the Clean Water Act. The permittee's pretreatment program received EPA approval on April 24, 1995, and as a result, the appropriate pretreatment program requirements were incorporated into the previous permit with that approval and the federal pretreatment regulations in effect when the permit was issued.

The federal pretreatment regulations in 40 CFR 403 require the permittee to: (1) evaluate and enforce EPA approved specific effluent limits (technically based local limits); (2) revise the local sewer-use ordinance or regulation, as appropriate, to be consistent with federal regulations; (3) develop an enforcement response plan; (4) implement a slug control evaluation program; (5) track significant noncompliance for industrial users; and (6) establish a definition of and track significant industrial users. The permit requires the permittee to submit to EPA, within 90 days of the effective date of the permit, all required modifications of the Streamlining Rule in order to be consistent with the provisions of the newly promulgated Rule. To the extent the Permittee's legal authority is not consistent with the required changes, they must be revised and submitted to EPA for review.

These requirements are necessary to ensure continued compliance with the POTW's permit and its sludge use or disposal practices.

On January 4, 2006, EPA approved a report entitled "Charles River Pollution Control District Reevaluation of Local Limits (November 2005)." The revised local limits went into effect April 1, 2006. However, if other changes to the permittee's pretreatment program are deemed necessary to assure conformity with current federal pretreatment regulations, the draft permit requires the permittee to provide EPA in writing within 180 days of the permit's effective date, a description of proposed changes to the permittee's pretreatment program deemed necessary to assure conformity with current federal regulations. These requirements may be new to this draft permit and are commensurate with current EPA New England pretreatment policy. In addition, the permittee must continue to submit by **September 1**, an annual pretreatment report detailing the activities of the program for the period from July 1 to June 30.

Based on the potential for toxicity as a result of industrial discharges to the POTW, and as discussed previously the draft permit includes effluent toxicity limitations and requires the performance of effluent toxicity tests. These tests will assist in assessing the effectiveness of the permittee's pretreatment program and also may be used as a basis for development or revision of specific numerical pretreatment limits.

#### **IX. SLUDGE CONDITIONS**

Sludge is thickened with a belt thickener to 7% solids, and stored in two 75,000 gallon sludge holding tanks. In 2007 Synagro, Inc. pumped and transported on average 15 loads of sludge per week, equivalent to 3,761,000 total dry metric tons per year, to their incinerator in Woonsocket, RI. The grit and screenings are now trucked away by BFI, now that the on-site landfill has reached full capacity. A feasibility study for closing the landfill has been completed, but no date for implementation has been set.

Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act requires that sludge conditions be included in all POTW permits. The sludge conditions in the draft permit satisfy this requirement and are taken from EPA's standards for disposal of sewage sludge.

#### **X. MONITORING & REPORTING**

The effluent monitoring requirements have been specified in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41(j), 122.44(i), and 122.48 to yield data representative of the discharge.

#### **XI. ANTI-BACKSLIDING**

A permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified with less stringent limitations or conditions than those contained in the previous permit unless in compliance with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA. The anti-backsliding provisions found in 40 CFR 122.44 (l) restrict the relaxation of permit limits, standards and conditions. Therefore, the technology-based effluent limits in a reissued permit must be at least as stringent as those in the previous permit. Relaxation is only allowed when cause for permit modification is met (see 40 CFR 122.62). Effluent limits based on water quality and state certification requirements must also meet the anti-backsliding provisions found under Section 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA, as described in 40 CFR 122.44(l).

The effluent limits for copper have been relaxed slightly. The relaxation of these limits are permissible under the anti-backsliding provisions found in 402(o) of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR 122.44(l). Specifically, Section 402(o) specifies that water quality based effluent limits may be relaxed only in compliance with water quality standards and anti-degradation. For specific reasons discussed earlier in the fact sheet, EPA and MassDEP believe that these less stringent limitations are allowable. The monitoring requirement for aluminum has been eliminated from the draft permit. Although this does

not constitute anti-backsliding, it is based on new information from effluent monitoring results that do not show a reasonable potential for water quality violations. Aluminum is also one of the parameters that is analyzed as part of toxicity testing.

## **XII. ANTI-DEGRADATION REVIEW**

The Massachusetts anti-degradation regulations (314 CMR 4.04) require that all existing uses of the Charles River must be protected. MassDEP has indicated that it believes there will be no lowering of water quality and/or no loss of existing water uses for this segment of the River and that no additional anti-degradation review is warranted.

## **XIII. ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT DETERMINATION**

Under the 1996 Amendments (PL 104-267) to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C § 1801 et seq.(1998)), EPA is required to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) if EPA's action or proposed actions that it funds, permits, or undertakes, "may adversely impact any essential fish habitat," 16 U.S.C. §1855(b).

The Amendments broadly define "essential fish habitat" (EFH) as "waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity," 16 U.S.C. § 1802(10). "Adverse impact" means any impact which reduces the quality and/or quantity of EFH, 50 C.F.R. §600.910(a). Adverse effects may include direct (e.g., contamination or physical disruption), indirect (e.g., loss of prey, reduction in species' fecundity), site specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions. Id.

Essential fish habitat is only designated for fish species for which federal Fisheries Management Plans exist. 16 U.S.C. § 1855 (b)(1)(A). EFH designations for New England were approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 3, 1999.

There is no "habitat of particular concern," as defined under §600.815 (a)(9) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, designated for this site.

EPA and MassDEP have determined that a formal EFH consultation with NMFS for this discharge is not required. The proposed discharge permit is developed to meet State Surface Water Quality Standards and will not adversely impact EFH.

## **XIV. STATE PERMIT CONDITIONS**

This NPDES permit is issued jointly by the U.S. Environmental Agency and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) under federal and state law, respectively. As such, all the terms and conditions of the permit are incorporated into and constitute a discharge permit issued by the MassDEP Commissioner, who designates signature authority to the Director of the Division of Watershed Management pursuant to M.G.L Chap. 21, §43.

## **XV. STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

EPA may not issue a permit unless the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP), the state agency with jurisdiction over the receiving waters, certifies that the effluent limitations contained in the permit are stringent enough to assure that the discharge will not cause the receiving water to violate State Water Quality Standards. The staff of MassDEP has reviewed the permit and advised EPA that the limitations are adequate to protect water quality. EPA has requested permit

certification by the state and expects that the permit will be certified.

**XVI. COMMENT PERIOD, HEARING REQUESTS, and PROCEDURES FOR FINAL DECISIONS**

All persons, including applicants, who believe any condition of the Draft Permit is inappropriate must raise all issues and submit all available arguments and all supporting material for their arguments in full by the close of the public comment period, to Betsy Davis, U.S. EPA, Office of Ecosystem Protection, Municipal Permits Branch, 1 Congress Street, Suite 1100, Boston, Massachusetts 02114-2023. Any person, prior to such date, may submit a request in writing for a public hearing to consider the Draft Permit to EPA and the State Agency. Such requests shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. A public meeting may be held if the criteria stated in 40 C.F.R. § 124.12 are satisfied. In reaching a final decision on the Draft Permit, the EPA will respond to all significant comments and make these responses available to the public at EPA's Boston office.

Following the close of the comment period, and after any public hearings, if such hearings are held, the EPA will issue a Final Permit decision and forward a copy of the final decision to the applicant and each person who has submitted written comments or requested notice. Within 30 days following the notice of the Final Permit decision, any interested person may submit a petition for review of the permit to EPA's Environmental Appeals Board consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 124.19.

A similar request for a hearing should also be filed with the Director of the Massachusetts Division of Watershed Management in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Administrative Procedures Act, the Division's Rules for the Conduct of Adjudicatory Proceedings, and the Timely Action Schedule and Fee Provisions. The Adjudicatory hearing request should be sent to:

Docket Clerk  
Office of Administrative Appeals  
Department of Environmental Protection  
One Winter Street, Second Floor  
Boston, MA 02108

The hearing request and a valid check for \$100 payable to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts must be mailed by the end of the comment period to:

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Department of Environmental Protection  
P.O. Box 4062  
Boston, MA 02211

The hearing request to the Commonwealth will be dismissed if the filing fee is not paid, unless the appellant is exempt or granted a waiver.

The filing fee is not required if the appellant is a city, town (or municipal agency), county, district of the Commonwealth, or a municipal housing authority. The Department may waive the hearing filing fee for a permittee who shows that paying the fee will create undue financial hardship. A permittee seeking a waiver must file, along with the hearing request, an affidavit setting forth the facts believed to support the claim of undue financial hardship.

NPDES Fact Sheet No. MA 0102598  
2008 Reissuance

Page 29 of 29

claim of undue financial hardship.

Following the close of the comment period, and after a public hearing, if such hearing is held, the Regional Administrator of EPA and the Director of MassDEP/DWM will issue a final permit decision and forward a copy of the decision to the applicant and each person who has submitted written comments or requested notice.

#### **XVI. EPA AND MassDEP CONTACTS**

Additional information concerning the permit may be obtained between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays, from:

Betsy Davis  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
1 Congress Street  
Suite 1100 (CMA)  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114-2023  
Telephone: (617) 918-1576  
Fax: (617) 918-0565  
Email: davis.betsy@epamail.epa.gov

or

Kathleen Keohane  
MA Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Watershed Management  
627 Main Street  
Worcester, MA 01608  
Telephone: (508) 767-2856  
Fax: (508) 791-4131  
Email: kathleen.keohane@state.ma.us

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Stephen S. Perkins, Director\*  
Office of Ecosystem Protection  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Comments should be addressed to both Betsy Davis and Kathleen Keohane, not Stephen S. Perkins.





- Legend**
- Public Water Supply (Well)
  - DEP Solid Waste Facilities
  - ▭ Pond, Lake or River
  - ➔ Flow Direction
  - ▨ Wetland (marsh / swamp)
  - ▭ CRPCD Treatment Plant Property Boundary

# Charles River Pollution Control District Wastewater Treatment Facility Location Plan



0 1,500 3,000 Feet

Figure 1

May 2004


CDM

- [1] No wells or springs have been identified within 1/4-mile of the treatment plant.  
[2] Four Public wells and no springs have been identified within 1-mile of the treatment plant.



Figure 2

Charles River Pollution Control District  
Wastewater Treatment Facility  
Process Flow Schematic  
May 2004








Figure 3

8 AUG 71



Table 1  
Effluent Data - January 2005 to December 2007  
Charles River Pollution Control District WPAF - MA 0102598

Date	Rolling Annual Ave. Flow, MGD	Daily Max. Flow, MGD	CBOD, ave mo., mg/l	CBOD, max daily mg/l	TSS, ave mo., mg/l	TSS, max daily mg/l	TRC, max. daily, mg/l	Fecal Coliform, ave. mo., cfu/100 ml	Fecal Coliform, max daily, cfu/100 ml	pH, S.U. min	pH, S.U. max
1/05	4.65	8.47	3.8	6.6	6.6	12.6	---	---	---	7.1	7.6
2/05	4.79	7.47	5.1	28	20	171	---	---	---	7.0	7.5
3/05	4.94	10.05	3.8	20	16	116	0	21	290	7.0	7.4
4/05	4.93	11.75	1.3	1.7	2	3.3	0.9	2	10	6.9	7.3
5/05	4.96	6.40	1.3	2.0	1.1	1.7	0	1	2	7.2	7.4
6/05	4.99	5.61	1.4	1.9	1.2	2.3	0	1	2	6.8	7.6
7/05	5.00 (3.79)	4.20	1.8	4.8	2.4	13.8	0.20	8	89	7.0	7.6
8/05	4.97 (3.48)	3.75	1.4	1.8	1.2	1.8	0	18	240	7.1	7.8
9/05	4.93 (3.55)	3.88	1.1	1.6	0.8	1.5	0.30	6	42	7.1	7.5
10/05	5.04	11.8	1.4	2.0	0.9	2.1	0.15	3	250	7.0	7.6
11/05	5.15	6.66	1.4	3.0	2.4	13.4	0	2	4	7.0	7.4
12/05	5.16	6.60	1.1	1.6	1.5	2.1	---	---	---	6.9	7.5
1/06	5.16	7.55	2.3	13.8	19	220	---	---	---	7.1	7.5
2/06	5.20	8.21	2.0	3.6	4.8	6.1	---	---	---	7.1	7.7
3/06	5.06	4.91	1.6	2.0	2.0	3.1	0	26	1,200	7.1	7.5
4/06	4.86	4.52	1.2	1.5	1.1	2.0	0	2	4	7.1	7.5
5/06	4.84	7.41	1.1	1.6	1.1	2.1	0	2	7	7.0	7.5
6/06	5.12	14.38	5.9	24	76	509	0	13	270	6.9	7.5
7/06	5.19 (4.56)	5.70	1.4	1.8	1.1	2.2	0	3	10	6.8	7.5
8/06	5.21 (3.78)	3.97	1.1	1.7	1.6	3.1	0	1	2	7.1	7.6
9/06	5.23 (3.77)	4.09	2.2	3.2	6.4	9.2	0	5	4,300	7.2	7.4
10/06	5.09	5.17	1.6	2.3	2.9	4.4	0	2	14	7.2	7.4
11/06	5.08	7.28	1.4	1.9	2.6	3.2	0	5	52	7.1	7.5
12/06	5.03	5.69	1.3	3.0	2.1	3.0	---	---	---	7.1	7.4

Notes: --- = no sampling required      ? (xxx) = monthly average flow

Table 1  
Effluent Data - January 2005 to December 2007  
Charles River Pollution Control District WPAF - MA

Date	Rolling Annual Ave. Flow, MGD	Daily Max. Flow, MGD	CBOD, ave mo., mg/l	CBOD, max daily mg/l	TSS, ave mo., mg/l	TSS, max daily mg/l	TRC, max. daily, mg/l	Fecal Coliform, ave. mo., cfu/100 ml	Fecal Coliform, max daily, cfu/100 ml	pH, S.U. min	pH, S.U. max
1/07	4.88	5.02	1.4	1.7	2.0	3.5	---	---	---	7.2	7.4
2/07	4.73	4.3	1.7	2.7	3.0	4.1	---	---	---	7.0	7.6
3/07	4.79	6.84	2.1	4.2	5.4	22	0	10	44	7.0	7.4
4/07	5.04	10.7	2.7	13.6	12	84	0	1	5	6.8	7.2
5/07	5.04	6.67	1.6	4.9	5.2	36	0	2	12	6.9	7.3
6/07	4.76	5.18	1.5	2.6	3.2	8.6	0	2	6	7.1	7.4
7/07	4.69 (3.63)	3.87	1.7	2.3	3.2	5.6	0	3	8	7.1	7.5
8/07	4.66 (3.45)	3.55	1.5	2.2	2.1	2.7	0	3	9	7.4	7.7
9/07	4.63 (3.44)	3.66	1.4	1.8	2.1	2.5	0	3	41	7.3	7.7
10/07	4.6	3.6	1.4	1.9	2.4	3.9	0	19	57	7.3	7.4
11/07	4.46	3.89	1.8	3.0	2.4	5.8	0	15	110	7.3	7.7
12/07	4.36	4.4	3.0	8.8	2.1	3.0	---	---	---	7.3	7.7

Table 2  
Effluent Data - January 2005 to December 2007  
Charles River Pollution Control District WPAF - MA 0102598

Date	Phosphorus, ave. mo., mg/l	Copper, ave. mo., ug/l	Aluminum, ave. mo., mg/l	Dissolved Oxygen, mg/l	Ammonia, ave. mo., mg/l	Ammonia, max, daily, mg/l	Ceriodaphnia WET Acute	Chronic	Pimephales WET Acute	Chronic
1/05	0.32	3.7	<0.005	8.8	5.1	6.3	>100	100	>100	100
2/05	0.28	4.0	<0.009	9.8	0.81	3.2	---	---	---	---
3/05	0.45	7.6	<0.005	9.0	0.25	0.58	---	---	---	---
4/05	0.13	4.0	<0.005	9.0	0.17	0.46	>100	100	>100	100
5/05	0.07	9.8	<0.01	9.4	0.1	0.1	---	---	---	---
6/05	0.08	9.4	<0.005	8.6	0.11	0.18	---	---	---	---
7/05	0.12	<7.5	<0.1	8.6	0.44	4.0	>100	100	>100	100
8/05	0.13	9.5	<0.05	7.7	0.30	2.7	---	---	---	---
9/05	0.09	8.2	0.007	7.5	0.37	2.5	---	---	---	---
10/05	0.12	8.2	<0.005	7.3	0.45	2.7	>100	100	>100	100
11/05	1.0	7.4	<0.005	8.5	0.11	0.15	---	---	---	---
12/05	0.60	6.0	0.10	9.0	0.15	0.29	---	---	---	---
1/06	0.56	4.7	<0.005	5.5	0.45	1.2	>100	100	>100	100
2/06	0.84	4.2	<0.005	10.0	0.67	1.1	---	---	---	---
3/06	0.38	7.6	<0.005	9.9	0.28	0.48	---	---	---	---
4/06	0.32	10.2	0.014	9.6	0.22	0.66	>100	100	>100	100
5/06	0.10	12.9	0.013	9.1	0.17	0.42	---	---	---	---
6/06	2.9	3.2	<0.01	7.8	1.1	5.0	---	---	---	---
7/06	0.09	7.3	0.037	8.3	0.17	0.28	---	---	---	---
8/06	0.16	6.2	0.096	7.9	0.14	0.25	>100	100	>100	100
9/06	1.2	8.0	0.051	7.6	3.2	14.6	---	---	---	---
10/06	0.14	6.7	0.011	8.1	0.13	0.19	>100	100	>100	100

Date	Phosphorus, ave. mo., mg/l	Copper, ave. mo., ug/l	Aluminum, ave. mo., mg/l	Dissolved Oxygen, mg/l	Ammonia, ave. mo., mg/l	Ammonia, max. daily, mg/l	Ceriodaphnia WET Acute	Chronic	Pimephales WET Acute	Chronic
11/09	0.09	7.5	<0.01	8.5	0.27	0.93	---	---	---	---
12/06	0.64	11.5	18	8.6	0.14	0.20	na	na	na	na
11/07	0.1	6.3	0.1	9.4	0.12	0.16	>100	100	>100	100
2/07	0.17	9.9	0.1	9.9	0.12	0.13	---	---	---	---
3/07	0.62	7.9	0.01	9.6	0.13	0.16	---	---	---	---
4/07	0.51	6.7	0.02	9.4	0.44	1.6	26	25	>100	100
5/07	0.33	6.3	0.1	9.1	0.14	0.2	---	---	---	---
6/07	0.39	3.6	0.01	8.3	0.46	1.0	---	---	---	---
7/07	0.26	10.1	0.01	8.0	0.19	0.33	---	---	---	---
8/07	0.13	2.8	0.02	7.7	0.16	0.33	>100	100	>100	100
9/07	0.11	3.4	0.01	7.9	0.2	0.71	---	---	---	---
10/07	0.11	3.9	0.01	8.0	0.14	0.17	>100	100	>100	100
11/07	0.14	4.9	0.01	8.0	0.2	0.42	---	---	---	---
12/07	1.4	4.0	0	8.6	6.0	13.9	na	na	na	na

Notes: 1 — - no sampling required 2 na - results not available

**Table 3**  
**Summary of NPDES Reporting Dates**  
**Charles River Pollution Control District WPAF (MA0102598)**

<b>Permit Page</b>	<b>Requirement and Dates</b>	<b>Submit to:</b>
4	Whole Effluent Toxicity Tests results are conducted the second week in January, April, July, and October and due <b>February 28, May 31, August 31, and November 30</b> of each year. See footnote # 9.	EPA/MassDEP
7	The permittee and co-permittees shall develop and implement a plan to control infiltration and inflow (I/I) to the separate sewer system. This plan shall be submitted to EPA and MassDEP <b>within six months of the effective date of the permit.</b> See Part I.C.3.	EPA/MassDEP
8	A summary report of all actions taken to minimize I/I during the previous calendar year shall be submitted to EPA and MassDEP by <b>March 31</b> each year. See Part I.C.3.	EPA/MassDEP
10	The permittee shall submit an annual report by <b>September 1</b> describing the permittee's pretreatment activities for the twelve month period from July 1 to June 30. See Part I.E.2.	EPA/MassDEP
10	The permittee shall submit proposed changes to the pretreatment program <b>within 180 days of the permit's effective date, if applicable.</b> See Part I.E.5.	EPA/MassDEP
11	The permittee shall submit an annual report containing information specified in the sludge guidance on or before <b>February 19.</b> See Part I.F.	EPA/MassDEP
12	Monitoring results obtained during the previous month shall be submitted for each month and reported on separate Discharge Monitoring Reports postmarked <b>no later than the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the month following the effective date of the permit.</b> See Part I.G	EPA/MassDEP

Table 3  
Summary of PDE Reporting Dates  
Columbia River Pollution Control District W-1, M-10102508

Reporting Date	Assignment and Dates	Reporting Date
12/31/2017	1. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2017, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2018. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2018.	12/31/2017
12/31/2018	2. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2018, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2019. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2019.	12/31/2018
12/31/2019	3. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2019, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2020. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2020.	12/31/2019
12/31/2020	4. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2020, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2021. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2021.	12/31/2020
12/31/2021	5. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2021, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2022. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2022.	12/31/2021
12/31/2022	6. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2022, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2023. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2023.	12/31/2022
12/31/2023	7. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2023, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2024. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2024.	12/31/2023
12/31/2024	8. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2024, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2025. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2025.	12/31/2024
12/31/2025	9. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2025, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2026. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2026.	12/31/2025
12/31/2026	10. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2026, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2027. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2027.	12/31/2026
12/31/2027	11. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2027, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2028. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2028.	12/31/2027
12/31/2028	12. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2028, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2029. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2029.	12/31/2028
12/31/2029	13. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2029, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2030. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2030.	12/31/2029
12/31/2030	14. Annual Report: This report is due on or before December 31, 2030, and shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2031. The report shall be submitted to the District Office by January 15, 2031.	12/31/2030