ADEQ Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

DRAFT FACT SHEET

ARIZONA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (AZPDES)

This document gives pertinent information concerning the reissuance of the AZPDES permit listed below. This facility is a chlorinated water supply pumping station and is considered to be a minor industrial facility under the NPDES program. The effluent limitations contained in this permit will maintain the Water Quality Standards listed in Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) R18-11-101 et. seq. This permit is proposed to be issued for a period of 5 years.

Permittee's Name:	United States Department of the Interior- National Park Service
Permittee's Mailing Address:	P. O. Box 129 Grand Canyon, AZ 86023-0129
Facility Name:	Indian Gardens Potable Water Pump Station
Facility Address or Location:	2.5 miles north of Grand Canyon South Rim Village
Contact Person(s): Phone/e-mail address	Brenna White, Park Engineer (928) 638-7906
AZPDES Permit Number:	AZ0023621
Inventory Number:	102469

I. STATUS OF PERMIT(s)	
AZPDES permit applied for:	Renewal
Date application received:	**November 23, 2015**
Date application was determined administratively complete:	**January 5, 2016**
Previous permit expiration date:	May 9, 2016

The National Park Service has the following permits issued by ADEQ applicable to the Indian Gardens Pump Station:		
Type of Permit	**Permit Number**	**Purpose**

Aquifer Protection Permit (APP)	N/A	Regulates discharges to the local aquifer
Reuse Permit	N/A	Regulates the practice of reusing treated wastewater for beneficial purposes
Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP)	N/A	Regulates stormwater discharge

II. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION	
Type of Facility:	Potable water pumping station
Facility Location Description:	Approximately 2.5 miles north of Grand Canyon South Rim Village
Estimated Discharge Flow	Approximately 1.25 MGD
County:	Coconino
Treatment Processes	Chlorinated groundwater from Roaring Springs is pumped via the Transcanyon Pipeline to a settling tank for sedimentation and distribution to Grand Canyon South Rim Village. Overflow of unused potable water from the settling tank is de-chlorinated using sodium sulfite.
Nature of facility discharge:	Treated groundwater for water supply.
Reuse / irrigation or other disposal method(s):	N/A
Continuous or intermittent discharge:	Continuous
Discharge pattern summary:	Flow varies depending upon whether potable water pumps are on or not.

III. RECEIVING WATER	
The State of Arizona has adopted water quality standards to protect the designated uses of its surface waters. Streams have been divided into segments and designated uses assigned to these segments. The water quality standards vary by designated use depending on the level of protection required to maintain that use.	
Receiving Water :	Garden Creek, tributary to Pipe Creek, eventual tributary to the Colorado River.
River Basin:	Upper Colorado River Basin
Outfall Location(s):	Outfall 001: Township 31 N, Range 2 E , Section 13 Latitude 36° 04’ 30” N, Longitude 112° 07’ 04” W
The outfall discharges to, or the discharge may reach, a surface water listed in Appendix B of A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1.	
Designated uses for the receiving water listed above:	Aquatic and Wildlife warm water (A&Ww) Full Body Contact (FBC) Fish Consumption (FC)

Is the receiving water on the 303(d) list?	No, and there are no TMDL issues associated.

Given the uses stated above, the applicable narrative water quality standards are described in A.A.C. R18-11-108, and the applicable numeric water quality standards are listed in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and in Appendix A thereof. There are two standards for the Aquatic and Wildlife uses, acute and chronic. In developing AZPDES permits, the standards for all applicable designated uses are compared and limits that will protect for all applicable designated uses are developed based on the standards.

In addition to the above, the Colorado River has a salinity standard. Per A.A.C. R18-11-110, the flow-weighted average annual concentration of total dissolved solids shall not exceed 723 milligrams per liter (mg/L) in the river below Hoover Dam and above Parker Dam. In order to meet this standard, discharges must meet the plan of implementation requirements developed by the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum (CRSCF). The Indian Gardens Pumping Station is listed in the most recent triennial review of CRSCF facilities as an industrial user in compliance with Forum policy. Most recent data submitted for this facility indicates an average discharge TDS concentration of 166 mg/L, or 0.785tons/day, which conforms to current forum criteria that no industrial user discharges more than 1.00 ton/day.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF DISCHARGE

Because the facility is in operation and discharges have occurred, effluent monitoring data are available. The following is the measured effluent quality reported in the application.

Parameters	Units	Effluent (Discharge) Maximum
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	µg/L	40
Total Disolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	262
Phosphorous	mg/L	<0.05

V. STATUS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE EXISTING AZPDES PERMIT

Date of most recent inspection:	January 14, 2015; Missing DMR for October 2014.
DMR files reviewed:	January 2011 through December 2015.
Lab reports reviewed:	January 2010 through December 2015.
Exceedances:	Total Residual Chlorine- Maximum concentration exceedance February 2012 and May 2015.
NOVs issued:	August 22, 2013, for TRC concentration exceedance.
NOVs closed:	February 10, 2014
Compliance orders:	None

VI. PROPOSED PERMIT CHANGES

The following table lists the major changes from the previous permit in this draft permit.

Parameter	Existing Permit	Proposed permit	Reason for change

Copper	Monitoring with limits	Limits removed	Data submitted indicated no reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard.
Chromium (total & VI), Silver	Monitoring with Assessment Levels	Effluent Characterization monitoring	Data submitted indicated no reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard.
Oil & Grease	Effluent Characterization monitoring	Not required	BPJ- Not expected to be present in discharge of disinfected groundwater
Reporting Location	Mail in hard copies of DMRs and other attachments	Mail in hard copies of DMRs and other attachments or submit by an alternative mode as specified by ADEQ	Language added to support the NPDES electronic DMR reporting rule that became effective on December 21, 2015.

Anti-backsliding considerations – "Anti-backsliding" refers to statutory (Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act) and regulatory (40 CFR 122.44(l)) requirements that prohibit the renewal, reissuance, or modification of an existing NPDES permit that contains effluent limits, permit conditions, or standards that are less stringent than those established in the previous permit. The rules and statutes do identify exceptions to these circumstances where backsliding is acceptable. This permit has been reviewed and drafted with consideration of anti-backsliding concerns.

Limits for copper have been removed from the permit because evaluation of current data allows the conclusion that no reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard exists.

This is considered allowable backsliding under 303(d)(4). The effluent limitations in the current permit for copper were based on state standards, the respective receiving waters are in attainment for these parameters, and the revisions are consistent with antidegradation requirements. See Section XII for information regarding antidegradation requirements.

VII. DETERMINATION OF EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS and ASSESSMENT LEVELS

When determining what parameters need monitoring and/or limits included in the draft permit, both technology-based and water quality-based criteria were compared and the more stringent criteria applied.

Technology-based Limitations: As outlined in 40 CFR Part 133:
There are no applicable technology-based limitations for this type of discharge.

Numeric Water Quality Standards: As outlined in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and Appendix A:
Per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(ii), (iii) and (iv), discharge limits must be included in the permit for parameters with "reasonable potential" (RP), that is, those known to be or expected to be present in the effluent at a level that

could potentially cause any applicable numeric water quality standard to be exceeded. RP refers to the possibility, based on the statistical calculations using the data submitted, or consideration of other factors to determine whether the discharge may exceed the Water Quality Standards. The procedures used to determine RP are outlined in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD)* (EPA/505/2-90-001). In most cases, the highest reported value for a parameter is multiplied by a factor (determined from the variability of the data and number of samples) to determine a "highest estimated value". This value is then compared to the lowest applicable Water Quality Standard for the receiving water. If the value is greater than the standard, RP exists and a water quality-based effluent limitation (WQBEL) is required in the permit for that parameter. RP may also be determined from BPJ based on knowledge of the treatment facilities and other factors. The basis for the RP determination for each parameter with a WQBEL is shown in the table below.

It is assumed that RP exists for exceedance of water quality criteria for total residual chlorine (TRC) if chlorine or bromine is used in the treatment process. TRC has been shown through extensive monitoring to fluctuate greatly and thus is not conducive to exclusion from limitation due to a lack of RP. Therefore, the draft permit contains WQBEL for TRC.

The proposed permit limits were established using a methodology developed by EPA. Long Term Averages (LTA) were calculated for each designated use and the lowest LTA was used to calculate the average monthly limit (AML) and maximum daily limit (MDL) necessary to protect all uses. This methodology takes into account criteria, effluent variability, and the number of observations taken to determine compliance with the limit and is described in Chapter 5 of the TSD. Limits based on A&W criteria were developed using the "two-value steady state wasteload allocation" described on page 99 of the TSD. When the limit is based on human health criteria, the monthly average was set at the level of the applicable standard and a daily maximum limit was determined as specified in Section 5.4.4 of the TSD.

Mixing Zone: The limits in this permit were determined without the use of a mixing zone. Arizona state water quality rules require that water quality standards be achieved without mixing zones unless the permittee applies for and is approved for a mixing zone. Since a mixing zone was not applied for or granted, all water quality criteria are applied at end-of-pipe.

Assessment Levels (ALs): ALs are listed in Part I.B of the permit. An AL differs from a discharge limit in that an exceedance of an AL is not a permit violation. Instead, ALs serve as triggers, alerting the permitting authority when there is cause for re-evaluation of RP for exceeding a water quality standard, which may result in new permit limitations. The AL numeric values also serve to advise the permittee of the analytical sensitivity needed for meaningful data collection. Trace substance monitoring is required when there is uncertain RP (based on non-detect values or limited datasets) or a need to collect additional data or monitor treatment efficacy on some minimal basis. A reopener clause is included in the draft permit should future monitoring data indicate water quality standards are being exceeded.

The requirement to monitor for these parameters is included in the draft permit according to A.A.C. R18-11-104(C) and Appendix A. ALs listed for each parameter were calculated in the same manner that a limit would have been calculated (see Numeric Water Quality Standards Section above).

Hardness: The permittee is required to sample hardness as $CaCO_3$ at the same time the trace metals are sampled because the water quality standards for some metals are calculated using the water hardness values. The hardness value of 161 mg/L (the average hardness of the effluent as supplied in the application) was used to calculate the applicable water quality standards and any assessment levels or limits for the hardness dependent metals

(cadmium, chromium III, copper, lead, nickel, silver and zinc).

Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET): WET testing is required in the draft permit (Parts I.C and IV) to evaluate the discharge according to the narrative toxic standard in A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(5), as well as whether the discharge has RP for WET per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(iv).

WET testing for chronic toxicity shall be conducted using the following three surrogate species:

- *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (water flea) – for evaluating toxicity to invertebrates
- *Pimephales promelas* (fathead minnow) – for evaluating toxicity to vertebrates
- *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* (formerly known as *Selenastrum capricornutum or Raphidocelis subcapitata)* (a green alga) – for evaluating toxicity to plant life

ADEQ does not have a numeric standard for Whole Effluent Toxicity. However, ADEQ adopted the EPA recommended chronic toxicity benchmark of 1.0 TUc for a four day exposure period. Using this benchmark, the action levels for WET included in the draft permit were calculated in accordance with the methods specified in the *TSD*. The species chosen for WET testing are as recommended in the *TSD* and in *Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Programs*.

An exceedance of an action level will trigger follow-up testing to determine if effluent toxicity is persistent. If toxicity above an action level is found in a follow-up test, the permittee will be required to conduct a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) and possibly a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) to identify the source of toxicity and reduce toxicity. These conditions are required to ensure that toxicants are not discharged in amounts that are toxic to organisms [A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(5)]. A reopener clause is included in accordance with 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124 and AAC R18-9-B906.

The draft permit requires discrete samples be collected for WET testing. A discrete sample type was chosen over the suggested 24-hour composite for WET testing in order to have consistency with the type of sample required for other parameters requiring monitoring in this permit. WET sampling must coincide with testing for all the parameters in Parts I.A and B of the draft permit, when testing of those parameters is required, to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity if toxicity is detected. Additional procedural requirements for the WET test are included in the proposed permit.

The required WET monitoring frequency for this facility is consistent with the WET testing frequency required for facilities with a similar design flow. The draft permit requires WET test results to be reported on discharge monitoring reports and submittal of the full WET lab report to ADEQ.

Discharge Characterization (DC): In addition to monitoring for parameters assigned either a limit or an AL, sampling is required to assess the presence of pollutants in the discharge at certain minimum frequencies for additional suites of parameters, whether the facility is discharging or not. This monitoring is specified in Tables 3.a. and 3.b., *Effluent Characterization Testing,* as follows:

• Table 3.a. – General Chemistry and Microbiology: ammonia, dissolved oxygen, total residual chlorine (TRC), pH, temperature, total dissolved solids (TDS),
• Table 3.b. – Selected Metals, Hardness, Cyanide, and WET

NOTE: Some parameters listed in Tables 3.a. and 3.b. are also listed in Tables 1 or 2. In this case, the data from monitoring under Tables 1 or 2 may be used to satisfy the requirements of Tables 3.a. and / or 3.b., provided the specified sample types are the same. In the event the facility does not discharge to a water of the U.S. during the life of the permit, DC monitoring of representative samples of the effluent is still required.

The purpose of DC monitoring is to characterize the effluent and determine if the parameters of concern are present in the discharge and at what levels. This monitoring will be used to assess RP per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(iii)). DC monitoring is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.43(a), 40 CFR 122.44(i), and 40 CFR 122.48(b) as well as A.R.S. §49-203(A)(7). If pollutants are noted at levels of concern during the permit term, this permit may also be reopened to add related limits or conditions.

Permit Limitations and Monitoring Requirements:
The table that follows summarizes the parameters that are limited in the permit and the rationale for that decision. Also included are the parameters that require monitoring without any limitations or that have not been included in the permit at all and the basis for those decisions. The corresponding monitoring requirements are shown for each parameter. In general, the regulatory basis for monitoring requirements is per 40 CFR §122.44(i) *Monitoring requirements*, and 40 CFR §122.48(b), *Required monitoring*; all of which have been adopted by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905, *AZPDES Program Standards*.

Parameter	Lowest Standard/ Designated Use	Maximum Reported Daily Value	No. of Samples	Estimated Maximum Value	RP Determination	Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1)
Flow	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	Discharge flow is to be monitored on a continual basis using a flow meter.
Chlorine, Total Residual (TRC)	11 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	40 µg/L	80	N/A	RP Exists	TRC is to be monitored as a discrete sample and a limit is set. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that discrete samples must be collected for chlorine. At least one sample per month must coincide with WET testing to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity if toxicity is detected.
pH	Minimum: 6.5 Maximum: 9.0 A&Ww and FBC A.A.C.R 18-11-109 (B)	7.92	3	N/A	N/A	pH is to be monitored using a discrete sample of the effluent. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that grab samples must be collected for pH. At least one sample must coincide with WET testing to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity if toxicity is detected. pH sampling must also coincide with ammonia sampling when required.
Temperature	No applicable standard	18º C	3	N/A	N/A	Effluent temperature is to be monitored by discrete sample. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that discrete samples must be collected for temperature. At least one sample must coincide with WET sampling to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity, if toxicity is detected. Temperature sampling must also coincide with ammonia sampling when required.
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	Colorado River Salinity Forum requirements	262 mg/L	9	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required to determine compliance with Colorado River Salinity Control Forum.
Ammonia	Standard varies with temperature and pH	<1 mg/L	5	N/A	No RP	Ammonia is to be monitored for effluent characterization by discrete sample. One sample must coincide with WET sampling to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity, if toxicity is detected.
Nitrogen	No Applicable Standards	<1 mg/L	5	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Phosphorous	No Applicable Standards	<0.05 mg/L	5	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Antimony	30 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	<0.5 µg/L	3	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Arsenic	30 µg/L/ FBC	<1 µg/L	3	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Beryllium	5.3 ug/L A&Ww chronic	<2 µg/L	3	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Cadmium (2)	3.18 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	<0.1 µg/L	3	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Chromium (Total)	100 ug/L FBC	<5 µg/L	8	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization as an indicator parameter for chromium VI.
Chromium VI	11 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	N/A	0	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required if total chromium is detected above 8 ug/L.
Copper (2)	13.5 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	2 µg/L	8	7 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Cyanide	9.7 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic	<3µg/L	8	NA	RP Indeterminate (High LOQ)	Monitoring required and an Assessment Level remains.

Parameter	Lowest Standard/ Designated Use		Maximum Reported Daily Value	No. of Samples	Estimated Maximum Value	RP Determination	Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1)
Hardness	No Applicable Standard. Hardness is used to determine standards for specific metal parameters.		167 mg/L	10	N/A	N/A	A&W standards for cadmium, chromium III, copper, lead, nickel, silver and zinc used for RP determinations were based on the average hardness value of 161 mg/L. Monitoring for hardness is required whenever monitoring for hardness dependent metals is required.
Hydrogen Sulfide	2 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic		<0.04 µg/L	7	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization. If sulfide is detected, monitoring for hydrogen sulfide is required for the remainder of the permit term.
Lead (2)	4.2 µg/L / A&Ww chronic		<1 µg/L	2	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Mercury	0.01 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic		<0.2 µg/L	8	N/A	RP Indeterminate (High LOQ)	Monitoring required and an Assessment Level remains.
Nickel (2)	77.8 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic		4 µg/L	2	29.6 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Selenium	2 µg/L/ A&Ww chronic		<2 µg/L	8	N/A	RP Indeterminate (High LOQ)	Monitoring required and an Assessment Level remains.
Silver (2)	7.30 µg/L/ A&Ww acute		<0.1 µg/L	8	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Sulfides	No Applicable Standard		<0.04 µg/L	7	N/A	N/A	Indicator parameter for hydrogen sulfide. Monitoring required for effluent characterization. If sulfide is detected, monitoring for hydrogen sulfide is required for the remainder of the permit term.
Thallium	7.2 µg/L/ FC		<0.5 µg/L	2	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Zinc (2)	175 µg/L/ A&Ww acute & chronic		<0.02 µg/L	2	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	No toxicity (A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(6)	*Selenastrum capricornutum (3)*	1.0 TUc	1	N/A	RP Indeterminate	Monitoring is required and an action level is set.
		Pimephales promelas	1.0 TUc	1	N/A	RP Indeterminate	Monitoring is required and an action level is set.
		Ceriodaphnia dubia	1.0 TUc	1	N/A	RP Indeterminate	Monitoring is required and an action level is set.

Footnotes:

(1) The monitoring frequencies above are required when the facility is discharging through Outfall 001. If there is no discharge, monitoring shall be conducted as shown in Part 1.D of the permit. (Exception: Discharge Flow metering should remain operational during periods of no discharge.) The resulting data will be needed to characterize the effluent and plant performance.

(2) The standard for this parameter is based on a hardness value of 220 mg/ L.

(3) Also known as *Raphidocelis subcapitata*.

VIII. NARRATIVE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

All narrative limitations in A.A.C. R18-11-108 that are applicable to the receiving water are included in Part I, Sections D and E of the draft permit.

IX. MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (Part II of Permit)

Section 308 of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR Part 122.44(i) require that monitoring be included in permits to determine compliance with effluent limitations. Additionally, monitoring may be required to gather data for future effluent limitations or to monitor effluent impacts on receiving water quality.

Monitoring frequencies are based on the nature and effect of the pollutant, as well as a determination of the minimum sampling necessary to adequately monitor the facility's performance. Monitoring frequencies for some parameters may be reduced in second term permits if all monitoring requirements have been met and the limits or ALs for those parameters have not been exceeded during the first permit term.

Discrete (i.e., grab) samples are specified in the permit for all parameters. The quality of the discharge is not expected to be highly variable.

Monitoring locations are specified in the permit (Part I.A and Part I.I) in order to ensure that representative samples of the influent and effluent are consistently obtained.

The requirements in the permit pertaining to Part II, Monitoring and Reporting, are included to ensure that the monitoring data submitted under this permit is accurate in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41(e). The permittee has the responsibility to determine that all data collected for purposes of this permit meet the requirements specified in this permit and is collected, analyzed, and properly reported to ADEQ.

The permit (Part II.A.2) requires the permittee to keep a Quality Assurance (QA) manual at the facility, describing sample collection and analysis processes; the required elements of the QA manual are outlined.

Reporting requirements for monitoring results are detailed in Part II, Sections B.1 and 2 of the permit, including completion and submittal of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) and AZPDES Flow Record forms. The permittee is responsible for conducting all required monitoring and reporting the results to ADEQ on DMRs or as otherwise specified in the permit.

Electronic reporting. The US EPA has published a final regulation that requires electronic reporting and sharing of Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program information instead of the current paper-based reporting (Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 204, October 22, 2015). Beginning December 21, 2016 (one year after the effective date of the regulation), the Federal rule requires permittees to make electronic submittals of any monitoring reports and forms called for in their permits. ADEQ will provide advance notification about specific requirements and procedures for electronic reporting before these requirements take effect.

Requirements for retention of monitoring records are detailed in Part II.D of the permit.

X. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (Part V in Permit)

Operation

This permit condition requires the permittee to ensure that the WWTP has an operator who is certified at the appropriate level for the facility, in accordance with A.A.C. R18-5-104 through -114. The required certification level for the WWTP operator is based on the class (Wastewater Treatment Plant) and grade of the facility, which is determined by population served, level of treatment, and other factors.

Permit Reopener

This permit may be modified based on newly available information; to add conditions or limits to address demonstrated effluent toxicity; to implement any EPA-approved new Arizona water quality standard; or to re-evaluate reasonable potential (RP), if assessment levels in this permit are exceeded [A.A.C. R18-9-B906 and 40 CFR Part 122.62 (a) and (b)].

XI. ANTIDEGRADATION

Antidegradation rules have been established under A.A.C. R18-11-107 to ensure that existing surface water quality is maintained and protected. The discharge from the Indian Gardens Pumping Station will be to a perennial water with Tier 2 antidegradation protection. This is a renewal permit for an existing facility with no new or expanded discharge, and the existing uses have been maintained. Therefore, an antidegradation review is not required at this time. Effluent quality limitations and monitoring requirements have been established under the proposed permit to ensure that the discharge will meet the applicable water quality standards. As long as the permittee maintains consistent compliance with these provisions, the designated uses of the receiving water will be presumed protected, and the facility will be deemed to meet currently applicable antidegradation requirements under A.A.C. R18-11-107.

XII. STANDARD CONDITIONS

Conditions applicable to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR, Part 122 are attached as an appendix to this permit.

XIII. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Public Notice (A.A.C. R18-9-A907)

The public notice is the vehicle for informing all interested parties and members of the general public of the contents of a draft AZPDES permit or other significant action with respect to an AZPDES permit or application. The basic intent of this requirement is to ensure that all interested parties have an opportunity to comment on significant actions of the permitting agency with respect to a permit application or permit. This permit will be public noticed in a local newspaper after a pre-notice review by the applicant and other affected agencies.

Public Comment Period (A.A.C. R18-9-A908)

Rules require that permits be public noticed in a newspaper of general circulation within the area affected by the facility or activity and provide a minimum of 30 calendar days for interested parties to respond in writing to ADEQ. After the closing of the public comment period, ADEQ is required to respond to all significant comments at the time a final permit decision is reached or at the same time a final permit is actually issued.

Public Hearing (A.A.C R18-9-A908(B))

A public hearing may be requested in writing by any interested party. The request should state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised during the hearing. A public hearing will be held if the Director determines there is a significant amount of interest expressed during the 30-day public comment period, or if significant new issues arise that were not considered during the permitting process.

EPA Review (A.A.C. R18-9-A908(C))

A copy of this draft permit and any revisions made to this draft as a result of public comments received will be sent to EPA Region 9 for review. If EPA objects to a provision of the draft, ADEQ will not issue the permit until the objection is resolved.

XIV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information relating to this proposed permit may be obtained from:

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Water Quality Division – AZPDES Individual Permits Unit
Attn: Richard Mendolia
1110 West Washington Street – Mail Code 5415B-3
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Or by contacting Richard Mendolia at (602) 771 – 4374 or by e-mail at rjm@azdeq.gov.

XV. INFORMATION SOURCES

While developing effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and special conditions for the draft permit, the following information sources were used:

1. AZPDES Permit Application Forms 1 and 2C, received November 9, 2015, along with supporting data, facility diagram, and maps submitted by the applicant with the application forms.

2. ADEQ files on Indian Gardens Pumping Station

3. ADEQ Geographic Information System (GIS) Web site.

4. Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1, *Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters,* adopted January 31, 2009.

5. A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 9, Article 9. *Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System* rules.

6. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40:
   Part 122, *EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.*
   Part 124, *Procedures for Decision Making*.

7. EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control dated March 1991.

8. *Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Programs*, US EPA, May 31, 1996.

9. *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms* (EPA /821-R-02-013).

10. U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual, September 2010.