UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NEW ENGLAND
1 CONGRESS STREET, SUITE 1100
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114-2023

FACT SHEET

DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

NPDES PERMIT NO.: **MA0026182**
NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

Wheaton College
East Main Street
Norton, MA 02766

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

Wheaton College
East Main Street
Norton, MA 02766

RECEIVING WATER: **Rumford River (Taunton River Watershed - MA62)**

CLASSIFICATION: **Class B - Warm Water**

I. PROPOSED ACTION

The above named applicants have applied to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for re-issuance of their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to discharge into the designated receiving water. The current permit expired on July 1, 1980. A re-application was submitted December 18, 1980 and an updated re-application was received March 20, 2004. This permit, after it becomes effective, will expire four (4) years from the effective date. The four year permit term makes this permit expiration coincide with other NPDES permits in the Taunton River Watershed.

II. TYPE OF FACILITY, AND DISCHARGE LOCATION

The facility is engaged in the collection and treatment of wastewater. The discharge is from the Wastewater Treatment Plant. The effluent is discharged to the Rumford River (See Figure 1).

The facility's discharge outfall is listed below:

Outfall	Description of Discharge	Outfall Location
001	Treated Effluent	Rumford River

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISCHARGE

A quantitative description of the effluent data can be found in Attachment A of this fact sheet.

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 LIMITATION DERIVATION

A. PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The treatment facility is a secondary treatment, extended aeration package wastewater plant (See Figure 2). The facility's design flow is 120,000 gallons per day (gpd) on an annual average. The maximum daily design flow is 160,000 gpd. The major treatment units consist of a pump station, grinder, aeration tanks, clarifiers, flow meters and chlorine contact tanks.

Wastewater generated on campus is conveyed to a wet well equipped with two (2) submersible pumps. The wet well is located just outside the machinery building of the wastewater treatment plant. The wastewater enters the plant through a 4-inch force main leading from the submersible pumps to a grinder to shred incoming solid material. The wastewater then passes through a manifold system where flow is diverted to one of two treatment units via 6-inch force mains.

Each treatment unit is comprised of a circular, peripheral aeration tank surrounding an inner circular clarifier. Air for the aeration tanks is supplied by three blowers connected to drop pipes with diffusers. For aeration tank A, waste sludge is pumped via an overhead pipe to the sludge storage tank in tank B. Wasted sludge is periodically removed by a septage hauling truck.

Flow enters the clarifier through a submerged pipe located in the center of each treatment unit. The clarified effluent is discharged over a v-notch weir into the effluent channel where flow from each unit is measured separately. The flow meter for Treatment Unit A is located in the meter chamber located adjacent to the control building. The meter for Treatment Unit B is located in a chamber between the treatment unit and the chlorine contact chamber.

Flow in the metering chambers combines in a single 8-inch pipe and then enters the underground chlorine contact tank. Effluent is disinfected in 2-1,500 gallon septic tanks with sodium hypochlorite. Flow is then discharged to the Rumford River via a 1,100 foot long pipe to a ten inch submerged outfall.

B. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

1. <u>Overview of Federal and State Regulations</u>

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 Act (see 40 CFR 125 Subpart A) to meet Best Practicable Control Technology Currently Available (BPT), Best Conventional Control Technology (BCT) for conventional pollutants and Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BAT) for toxic pollutants.

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.

The Wheaton College Wastewater Treatment Facility is similar to Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) which are subject to the secondary treatment requirements set forth at 40 CFR 133.102 (b)(1), (2) and 40 CFR 122.45 (f). In the absence of specific national standards for non-POTW secondary treated domestic wastewater discharges, limitations may be established on a case-by-case basis using Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) pursuant to Section 401 (a) (1) of the CWA.

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on Water Quality Standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards include the 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 site specific criteria are established. The State will limit or prohibit discharges of pollutants to surface waters to assure that surface water quality standards 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, has reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above any water quality criterion [40 CFR §122.44(d)]. 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.

2. <u>Water Quality Standards; Designated Uses; Outfall 001</u>

The receiving water, the Rumford River, has been classified as Class B - Warm Water in the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards, 314 CMR 4.05(4)(a). Class B waters are designated as a habitat for fish, other aquatic life, and wildlife, and for primary and secondary contact recreation. They shall be suitable for irrigation and other agricultural uses and for compatible industrial cooling and process uses. The waters should have consistently good aesthetic value.

A warm water fishery is defined in the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.02) as waters in which the maximum mean monthly temperature generally exceeds 20° Celsius during the summer months and are not capable of supporting a year-round population of cold water stenothermal aquatic life.

The Rumford River is listed in the <u>Massachusetts Year 2002 Integrated List of Waters</u> as a “waters requiring a TMDL” (Total Maximum Daily Loading study). The pollutants causing the impairment are listed as pesticides, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, and pathogens.

<u>Available Dilution</u>

Water quality based limitations are established with the use of a calculated available dilution. Title 314 CMR 4.03(3)(a) requires that effluent dilution be calculated based on the receiving water 7Q10. The 7Q10 is the lowest observed mean river flow for 7 consecutive days, recorded over a 10-year recurrence interval. Additionally, the 7Q10 flow is used to calculate available effluent dilution.

The facility design flow is 120,000 gallons per day (0.120 mgd). There are no available stream flow statistics for the Rumford River. Complicating matters, the Rumford River flows out of the Norton Reservoir approximately two miles upstream of the point of discharge. Flow from the reservoir is controlled by a dam which is operated by the Town of Norton. Little information was available from the Town about the operation of the dam.

The Rumford River joins with the Wading River approximately 1.5 miles downstream from the Wheaton College discharge to form the Threemile River. The drainage area contributing at the point of confluence is 65.6 square miles. Previous studies have determined that the 7Q10 flow of the Threemile River at Crane Street, approximately 1 mile down stream of the confluence, is 5.9 cfs (3.8 mgd). Using the drainage-area ratio method, the 7Q10 for the Threemile River just after the point of confluence is 5.4 cfs (3.5 mgd).

$$\frac{5.9 \text{ cfs}}{71.8 \text{ sq. miles}} = \frac{x}{65.6 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = \frac{(5.9 \text{ cfs})(65.6 \text{ sq. miles})}{71.8 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = 5.4 \text{ cfs } (3.5 \text{ mgd})$$

The USGS operates a long-term gaging station on the Wading River (01090004). The 7Q10 flow at this station is 2.2 cfs (1.42 mgd). The contributing drainage area is 43.3 square miles. Using the drainage-area ratio method, the 7Q10 for the Wading River just prior to the point of confluence is 2.25 cfs (1.4 mgd).

$$\frac{2.2 \text{ cfs}}{43.3 \text{ sq. miles}} = \frac{X}{44.3 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = \frac{(2.2 \text{ cfs})(44.3 \text{sq. miles})}{43.3 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = 2.25 \text{ cfs } (1.4 \text{ mgd})$$

Assuming that the 7Q10 flow of the Rumford River accounts for the difference between the 7Q10 flows of the Wading and Threemile Rivers, the 7Q10 flow of the Rumford, just prior to the point of confluence, is 2.1 mgd.

5.4 cfs (7Q10 of the Threemile River)- 2.25 cfs (7Q10 of the Wading River) = 3.15 cfs (2.1 mgd)

Again by using the drainage area ratio method, it is possible to calculate the 7Q10 flow at the point of discharge which has a drainage area of 20.8 square miles. The estimated 7Q10 flow at the point of discharge is 1.9 mgd.

$$\frac{3.15 \text{ cfs}}{22.3 \text{ sq. miles}} = \frac{X}{20.8 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = \frac{(3.15\text{cfs})(20.8\text{sq. miles})}{22.3 \text{ sq. miles}}$$

$$x = 2.9 \text{ cfs } (1.9 \text{ mgd})$$

Therefore, the dilution factor for the Wheaton College discharge is 17:1.

$$\frac{\text{River flow (7Q10) + Daily average design effluent flow}}{\text{Daily average design effluent flow}} = \text{Dilution Factor}$$

$$\frac{1.9 \text{ mgd} + .120 \text{ mgd}}{0.120 \text{ mgd}} = 17$$

FLOW

The design flow rate (average monthly) is 120,000 gallons per day (gpd). The draft permit maintains the average monthly flow limit of 120,000 gallons per day (gpd) from the previous permit. The measurement frequency continues to be continuous.

OUTFALL 001 - CONVENTIONAL POLLUTANTS

Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD_5) - The discharge is similar to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) which are subject to the secondary treatment requirements set forth at 40 CFR 133.102 (b)(1), (2) and 40 CFR 122.45 (f). In the absence of specific national standards for non-POTW secondary treated domestic wastewater discharges, limitations may be established on a case-by-case basis using Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) pursuant to Section 401 (a) (1) of the CWA. The secondary treatment limitations are a monthly average BOD_5 concentration of 30 mg/l and a weekly average concentrations of 45 mg/l. The monthly average of 30 mg/l was required under the previous permit, as was a maximum daily BOD_5 concentration of 50 mg/l, which has been changed to a report-only requirement. A weekly average of 45 mg/l is a new requirement. The mass limitations for BOD are based on a 120,000 gallon per day design flow.

Total Suspended Solids (TSS) - The discharge is similar to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) which are subject to the secondary treatment requirements set forth at 40 CFR 133.102 (b)(1), (2) and 40 CFR 122.45 (f). In the absence of specific national standards for non-POTW secondary treated domestic wastewater discharges, limitations may be established on a case-by-case basis using Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) pursuant to Section 401 (a) (1) of the CWA. The secondary treatment limitations are a monthly average TSS concentration of 30 mg/l and a weekly average concentration of 45 mg/l. The monthly average of 30 mg/l was required under the previous permit, as was a maximum daily TSS concentration of 50 mg/l, which has been changed to a report-only requirement. A weekly average of 45 mg/l is a new requirement. The mass limitations for TSS are based on a 120,000 gallon per day design flow.

BOD_5 and TSS Mass Loading Calculations:

Calculations of maximum allowable loads for average weekly, and average monthly BOD_5 and TSS are based on the following equation:

L = C x DF x 8.34 or L = C x DF x 3.79 where:

L = Maximum allowable load in lbs/day.
C = Maximum allowable effluent concentration for reporting period in mg/l. Reporting periods are average monthly and weekly.
DF = Design flow of facility in MGD.
8.34 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/l and design flow in MGD to lbs/day.
3.79 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/l and design flow in MGD to kgs/day.

(Concentration limit) [45] X 8.34 (Constant) X 0.120 (design flow) = 45 lb/day

(Concentration limit) [45] X 3.79 (Constant) X 0.120 (design flow) = 20 kg/day

(Concentration limit) [30] X 8.34 (Constant) X 0.120 (design flow) = 30 lb/day

(Concentration limit) [30] X 3.79 (Constant) X 0.120 (design flow) = 14 kg/day

Eighty-Five Percent (85%) BOD_5 and TSS Removal Requirement - the provisions of 40 CFR §133.102(3) requires that the 30 day average percent removal for BOD and TSS be not less than 85%.

pH - The draft permit includes proposed pH limitations which are required by state water quality standards, and are at least as stringent as pH limitations set forth at 40 CFR 133.102(c). Class B waters shall be in a range of 6.5 through 8.3 standard units and not more than 0.5 standard units outside of the background range. There shall be no change from background conditions that would impair any use assigned to this class.

Fecal Coliform Bacteria - The numerical limitations for fecal coliform are based on state certification requirements under Section 401(a)(1) of the CWA, as described in 40 CFR 124.53 and 124.55. These limitations are also in accordance with the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards 314 CMR 4.05 (4)(a)4.a.

The proposed limits in the draft permit are 200 colony forming units (cfu)/100 ml average monthly and 400 cfu/100 ml maximum daily. These limits are seasonal and apply during the period beginning April 1 through October 31, annually. The monitoring frequency for fecal coliform has been increased to once (1) per week and must be collected concurrent with sampling for Total Residual Chlorine.

Settleable Solids - The monitoring requirements for settleable solids have been removed from this permit. They are no longer required as a condition for state certification under Section 403 of the CWA.

OUTFALL 001 - NON-CONVENTIONAL POLLUTANTS

Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) - Chlorine is a toxic chemical. The draft permit includes total residual chlorine limitations which are based on state water quality standards [Title 314 CMR 4.05(5)(e)] and *the State's Implementation Policy for the Control of Toxic Pollutants in Surface Waters, February 23, 1990*. Chlorine compounds produced by the chlorination of wastewater can be extremely toxic to aquatic life. As such, the permittee should evaluate chlorination alternatives such as ultraviolet disinfection, as well as state of the art chlorination facilities which enable adequate control over chlorine dosing levels. Given the limitation of grab samples for ensuring that chlorine limits are complied with at all times, future permits may require continuous chlorine monitoring to assure that toxic levels are not discharged to the receiving water.

The water quality standards for chlorine defined in the 1998 EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for freshwater are 19 ug/l daily maximum and 11 ug/l monthly average in the receiving water. Given the dilution factor of 17, total residual chlorine limits have been calculated as 0.32 mg/l maximum daily and 0.19 mg/l average monthly. One sample per week must be collected concurrent with the once per week Fecal Coliform Bacteria sample. The monitoring frequency for Total Residual Chlorine has been increased to twice daily with one sample collected in the early morning hours before the start of classes and the other sample should be collected in the mid-afternoon. These limits are seasonal and apply during the period beginning April 1 through October 31, annually.

Total Residual Chlorine Limitations:

(acute criteria * dilution factor) = Acute (Maximum Daily)
(19 ug/l x 17)= 323 ug/l = 0.32 mg/l

(chronic criteria * dilution factor) = Chronic (Monthly Average)
(11 ug/l x 17) = 187 ug/l = 0.19 mg/l

Total Phosphorus - The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.00) do not contain numerical criteria for total phosphorus. The criteria for nutrients is found at 314 CMR 4.05(5)(c), which states that nutrients “shall not exceed the site specific limits necessary to control accelerated or cultural eutrophication”. The Water Quality Standards also require that “any existing point source discharges containing nutrients in concentrations which encourage eutrophication or the growth of weeds or algae shall be provided with the highest and best practicable treatment to remove such nutrients (314 CMR 4.04). MADEP has established that a monthly average total phosphorus limit of 0.2 mg/l represents highest and best practical treatment for POTWs.

EPA has produced several guidance documents which contain recommended total phosphorus criteria for receiving waters. The 1986 Quality Criteria of Water (“the Gold Book”) recommends in-stream phosphorus concentrations of 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 impounds, and 0.025 mg/l within the lake or reservoir.

More recently, EPA has released “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 each specific ecoregion which are minimally impacted by human activities, and thus representative of waters without cultural eutrophication. Norton, MA is within Ecoregion XIV, Eastern Coastal Plains. The total phosphorus criteria for this Ecoregion XIV is 24 ug/l (0.024 mg/l) and can be founded in the Ambient Water Quality Criteria

Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria, Rivers and Streams in Ecoregion XIV, published in December 2000.

The total phosphorus concentration reported in the 2004 application was 7.1 mg/l. Therefore, the calculated instream contribution from Wheaton College is 0.42 mg/l (7.1 mg divided by the dilution factor of 17). Instream water quality data for the Rumford River in the vicinity of the discharge is absent. However, the Rumford River is listed as requiring a TMDL due to organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen among other pollutants.

Given the above facts, EPA has included an average monthly effluent limit of 1 mg/l in this permit. The permittee shall sample and report total phosphorus concentrations once (1) per week. If the effluent monitoring results indicate that the total phosphorus concentration exceed criteria and contribute to eutrophication a limit of 0.2 mg/l may be included in the next permit issuance.

Nitrogen - Extensive water quality monitoring in Mount Hope Bay has shown a system that is highly eutrophic, with dissolved oxygen concentrations in the bottom waters frequently dropping below 2 mg/l for extended periods over a large area of the bay (New England Power Company data, 1998). The mouth of the Taunton River, of which the Three Mile River is a tributary, is on the Massachusetts 303(d) list for organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen. In marine systems, discharges of nitrogen are typically the cause of such conditions. The monitoring data collected by the permittee, along with data from other discharges to the Taunton River are necessary for the future completion of a TMDL.

Copper - Certain metals in water can be toxic to aquatic life. There is a need to limit toxic metal concentrations in the effluent where aquatic life may be impacted. There is no available data regarding copper concentrations in the effluent at this facility. Therefore, copper should be sampled as part of Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing.

EPA is required to limit any pollutant or pollutant parameter that is or may be discharged at a level that caused, has reasonable potential to cause or contributes to an excursion above any water quality criterion. If copper is determined to be a problem as a result of WET testing, effluent limits for copper will be set in the future.

Chronic (chronic criteria * dilution factor) = Chronic (Monthly Average)
(3.1 ug/l * 17) = 52.7 ug/l = 0.053 mg/l

Acute (acute criteria * dilution factor) = Acute (Maximum Daily)
(4.8 ug/l * 17) = 81.6 ug/l = 0.082 mg/l

OUTFALL 001 - WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET)

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on water quality standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards include the following narrative statement and requires 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.

National studies conducted by the EPA have demonstrated that domestic sources contribute toxic constituents. These constituents include metals, chlorinated solvents, aromatic hydrocarbons and others. The Region's current policy is to include toxicity testing requirements in all permits, while

Section 101(a)(3) of the CWA specifically prohibits the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts.

Based on the potential for toxicity resulting from domestic sewage, and in accordance with EPA national and regional 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", 50 Fed. Reg. 30,784 (July 24, 1985); see also, EPA's "Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control", September, 1991.)

Pursuant to EPA Region I policy, a minor discharge having a dilution ratio between 10:1 and 20:1 requires 7-day chronic and modified acute testing four times per year. 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 analyses; (2) bioavailability of pollutants after discharge is best measured by toxicity testing including any synergistic effects of pollutants; and (3) pollutants for which there are inadequate chemical analytical methods or criteria can be addressed. Therefore, toxicity testing is being used in conjunction with pollutant specific control procedures to control the discharge of toxic pollutants.

The draft permit requires that the permittee conduct 7-day chronic and modified acute WET testing for the Outfall 001 effluent four times per year (once per quarter) and that each test include the use of Ceriodaphnia dubia and Pimephales promelas in accordance with EPA Region I protocol to be found in permit Attachment A. A permit limit is set only for the acute test.

VI. SLUDGE CONDITIONS

Section 405(d) of the CWA requires that EPA develop technical regulations regarding the use and disposal of sewage sludge. These regulations are found at 40 CFR part 503 and apply to any facility engaged in the treatment of domestic sewage. The CWA further requires that these conditions be implemented through permits.

The Wheaton College WWTF generates 32 dry metric tons gallons of sewer sludge per year. The sludge is trucked off-site for to treatment by Mass Environmental Services. Solids are then sent to a landfill in Rochester, NH.

VII. ANTI-BACKSLIDING

Anti-backsliding as defined at 40 CFR §122.44(l)(1) requires reissued permits to contain limitations as stringent or more stringent than those of the previous permit unless the circumstances allow application of one of the defined exceptions to this regulation. Anti-backsliding does not apply when changes to limits are based on new information not available at the time of the previous permit reissuance [40 CFR §122.44(l)(2)(i)(B)(1)] or when limits are changed as a result of material and substantial additions or alterations to the permitted facility which occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of less stringent limitations, as defined at 40 CFR § 122.44(l)(2)(i)(A).

VIII. ANTI-DEGRADATION

The Massachusetts Anti-degradation Policy is found at Title 314 CMR 4.04. All existing uses of the Rumford River must be protected. This draft permit has discharge limits as or more stringent than the current permit with the exception of a maximum daily limit for BOD and TSS, which is now a report-only requirement and a limit for settleable solids which has been eliminated from the permit because MADEP no longer requires it as a condition for obtaining state certification. There has been no change in the outfall location.

IX. STATE PERMIT CONDITIONS

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

X. STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The staff of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection ("MADEP") has reviewed the draft permit. EPA has requested permit certification by the State pursuant to 40 CFR § 124.53 and expects that the draft permit will be certified.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PROCEDURES FOR FINAL DECISION

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 the U.S. EPA, Office of Ecosystem Protection, MA Unit, One Congress Street, Suite-1100, Boston, Massachusetts 02114. 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. Public hearings may be held after at least thirty days public notice whenever the Regional Administrator finds that response to this notice indicates a significant public interest. In reaching a final decision on the draft permit, the Regional Administrator 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 a public hearing, if such a hearing is held, the Regional Administrator 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.

XII. EPA CONTACT

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

Michele Cobban Barden, Environmental Scientist
Office of Ecosystem Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
One Congress Street, Suite-1100 (CPE)
Boston, MA 02114-2023
Telephone: (617) 918-1539

November 1, 2004
Date

Linda M. Murphy, Director
Office of Ecosystem Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency