

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
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

DATE OF PUBLIC NOTICE:

NPDES PERMIT NO.: **MA0004081**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

**Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel, Inc.
6 Adams Street
Burlington, MA**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

**Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel, Inc.
6 Adams Street
Burlington, MA**

RECEIVING WATERS: **Vine Brook (Basin Code MA83-06) to Butterfield Pond (Basin Code MA83003), Shawsheen Watershed**

CLASSIFICATION: **Class B**

I. Proposed Action, Type of Facility, and Discharge Location

The above named applicant has requested from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP) a reissuance of its NPDES permit to discharge into the designated receiving waters.

The Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel Burlington facility, located at 6 Adams Street in Burlington, MA, is a stone and gravel crushing and washing facility. Established in 1941 by Thomas Quinn, today it is owned by E.H. Perkins Construction, Inc. and operated by Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel, Inc.. Although the facility remains open year round for the sale of materials, the processing of sand and gravel occurs only from the spring through fall, or 6 to 9 months of the year. Raw material, including stones and gravel are not excavated on site, but instead delivered to the site.

Material is deposited into the primary crusher, crushed and then transported to the secondary

crusher screen deck where it is separated into two (2) groups based on particle size. Under sized material is carried by conveyor to the wet screen tower, while oversized material is crushed by secondary crusher, returned to the secondary crusher screen deck, and finally carried to the wet screen tower. Once material is collected at the wet screen tower, it is washed and screened. The end products include two classifications of sand, as well as material consisting of various sizes of stone. The materials are sorted, dropped into holding bins located at the bottom of the wet screen tower, and then loaded directly onto trucks to be sold immediately, or stockpiled at the site for future sale. (See Attachment A for on-site locations of the various materials stockpiles and facility layout).

The site is comprised of approximately 9 acres, which historically was quarried down to the current operating grade of the facility. However, there is no longer any quarrying activity being performed on site. A truck weighing station is located at the northwest entrance. Large piles of processed and washed sand, pond tailings, raw demolition material (stones, concrete, brick) and processed demo material are located in large piles around the site. (See Attachment A). The rock crushing machines are located in the west side of the plant site. The Wash Sand and Gravel Plant, located in the center of the site, receives process water from Butterfield Pond via a pump that is located at the northeast corner of the site. A sluiceway carries the process waste water from west to east across the site where it discharges into settling pond #1 located in the southeast portion of the site.

The entire site drains to several low points where storm water collects. Whatever does not evaporate or percolate into the ground at these low points is pumped to a storm water collection pit where it percolates, infiltrates and evaporates resulting in no discharge of storm water from the site.

The site has 2 settling ponds that operate in series and are located on the southeast side of the site bordering an unnamed wetland and Butterfield Pond. The process wastewater flows to these settling ponds where silts and solids are allowed to settle out. The settling ponds are dredged using an on-site crane, on an as-needed basis and solids are reused to produce a dense graded material. The materials that are dredged from the pond are stored on site and sold. Settling pond #1 is dredged about once a month to capture the fine sediment that settles out from the process wastewater. Settling pond #2 has not needed to be dredged in the last several years.

II. Description of Discharge.

Process water

Quinn-Perkins draws water, approximately 210,000 gpd, (based on a pump rate of 350 gpm running for 10 hours per day per a discussion with the permittee's engineer/consultant) from the adjacent Butterfield Pond for use in washing operations. Water is pumped (see Attachment B) from the pond through a 6" water line to the top of the wet screen tower where it is used to wash sand and gravel. The wastewater, approximately 202,000 gpd, (assumes 4% water loss to washing process and evaporation) is conveyed from the wet screen tower via a sluiceway and discharged into settling pond #1, where the majority of the solids settle out. From there, the wastewater flows through a 24" corrugated metal pipe into the second settling pond where further settling occurs and then ultimately discharges through a 12" concrete culvert (Outfall

002) into Vine Brook. Vine Brook eventually flows into Butterfield Pond approximately 100 feet downstream. (See Attachment B)

The original permit stated that the discharge from Outfall 002 was to Butterfield Pond. However, the actual discharge occurred into an unnamed wetland which bordered Vine Brook. The environment bordering Vine Brook has changed in the past year due to the presence of a family of beavers that have built a large dam just downstream from Outfall 002. This has submerged the low wetland area bordering Vine Brook and created a small pond. The current discharge is to this ponded area.

Storm water

Storm water flows to a low point at the facility and is then pumped to a storm water collection pit where it evaporates and infiltrates, resulting in no discharge of storm water from the site.

Outfall 001

Outfall 001 is an internal outfall located at the end of the sluiceway where process wastewater discharges into settling pond #1 prior to any treatment. Since outfall 001 is located prior to treatment, no sampling or limits are required in this draft permit. Additionally, past monitoring has adequately characterized the process water for TSS, Turbidity and Total Iron prior to effluent monitoring.

Receiving Water and Dilution

The discharge from Outfall 002 goes to Vine Brook and eventually flows into Butterfield Pond approximately 100 feet downstream. Due to the close proximity of the discharge to Butterfield Pond and discussions with MA DEP, no dilution factor will be used in the calculation of effluent limits for this draft permit.

Water Quality Standards and Designated Uses

The facility's discharge (Outfall 002) location into the newly created beaver pond is within 50 feet of the original streambed of Vine Brook. The close proximity of the discharge to both Vine Brook and Butterfield Pond requires that the potential impacts to both water bodies be addressed in this draft permit.

Vine Brook (Segment MA83-06) is approximately 6.8 miles in length and is listed as a Category 4a water. Butterfield Pond (MA83003) is approximately 7 acres in size and is listed as a Category 5 water.

Under Section 303(d) of the CWA, states are required to develop information on the quality of their water resources and report this information to the EPA, the U. S. Congress, and the public. In Massachusetts, the responsibility for monitoring the waters within the State, identifying those waters that are impaired, and developing a plan to bring them into compliance with the Massachusetts Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.0) resides with the MADEP. The MADEP evaluated and developed a comprehensive list of the assessed waters and the most recent list was published in the *Massachusetts Year 2002 Integrated List of Waters* (MADEP, September 2003). The list identifies both Vine Brook and Butterfield Pond as waterways within the State of Massachusetts that are considered impaired. The impairment, as identified by the MADEP, is

related to the presence of the following “pollutants”, which were not considered to be naturally occurring: pathogens (Vine Brook), noxious aquatic plants and turbidity (Butterfield Pond).

The MADEP is required under the CWA to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for a water body once it is identified as impaired. A TMDL is essentially a pollution budget designed to restore the health of a water body. A TMDL typically identifies the source(s) of the pollutant from direct and indirect discharges, determines the maximum amount of pollutant, including a margin of safety, that can be discharged to a specific water body while maintaining water quality standards for designated uses, and outlines a plan to meet the goal. A TMDL has been developed for Vine Brook. It is not anticipated that the discharge from the permittee’s site will add to or affect the impairment due to there being no sewage in their discharge.

To date, a TMDL has not been developed for Butterfield Pond. In the interim, EPA is developing the conditions for this permit based on a combination of water quality-based standards and best professional judgement. Should a TMDL be developed in the future, and if that TMDL identifies that the discharge from the facility is causing or contributing to the impairment of Butterfield Pond, then the permit may be re-opened.

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection’s 1998 Water Quality Assessment (WQA) for the Shawsheen River describes several possible sources of pollutants that may contribute to the impairments of Vine Brook and Butterfield Pond.

Regarding the pathogen impairment of Vine Brook, the discharge for Quinn-Perkins does not have a reasonable potential to contribute to the bacterial (pathogen) impairment because the discharge is not believed to contain treated or untreated sewage. EPA has no reason to believe that the discharge would contain pathogenic bacteria, and thus no waste load allocation was given to the Quinn-Perkins point source discharge in the recently developed bacterial TMDL. (ref: “Bacteria TMDL for the Shawsheen River Basin”, Report MA83-01-2002-24, approved by EPA letter dated September 12, 2002).

Regarding the noxious aquatic plants and turbidity impairments to Butterfield Pond, these impairments are listed for numerous lakes and ponds on Massachusetts and typically are due to eutrophic conditions in the water body. Phosphorous is likely the pollutant that will contribute most significantly to a eutrophic related impairment. DEP has developed numerous TMDLs for lakes in Massachusetts with these impairments which call for phosphorous load allocations and reductions. Based on the facility’s operations and waste streams covered by this permit, phosphorous is not expected in the Quinn-Perkins discharge. However, excessive TSS in the discharge may independently contribute to turbidity in Butterfield Pond. Thus, the TSS limits that are included in the permit address the possibility that the Quinn-Perkins discharge contributes to the impairment. High TSS discharges also can be an indication of unexpected phosphorous loading. In addition, as described in Part I.A.1.b, turbidity monitoring is required in the draft permit to assess the discharge’s potential contribution to turbidity in Butterfield Pond. The permittee will be required to monitor and sample for turbidity at the discharge (outfall 002), at a point in Vine Brook upstream from the discharge from Outfall 002 and downstream, just prior to Vine Brook entering Butterfield Pond.

In the 2002 Water Quality Assessment Report for the Shawsheen River Watershed, both Vine Brook and Butterfield Pond have been classified as Class B waters under the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards. Title 314 Code of Massachusetts Regulations ("CMR") 4.05(3)(b) states that Class B waters have the following designated uses: *These 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.*

A summary of the discharges based on the last several years of discharge monitoring data for Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel is shown on Attachment C. Data was collected under the terms of the existing permit and the data summary was reviewed and used to develop this draft permit.

III. Limitations and Conditions

Effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and implementation schedule (if required) may be found in the draft NPDES permit.

IV. Permit Basis and Explanation of Effluent Limit Derivation

a. NPDES Permit History

Quinn-Perkins Sand & Gravel, Inc. of Arlington, Massachusetts discharges treated process water from their facility located in Burlington, Massachusetts. The seasonal facility (9 months) was established in 1941 by Thomas Quinn. EPA first issued a permit to Thomas Quinn Company, Incorporated at 20 Hobbs Court in Arlington, MA on June 24, 1974. The original permit expired on May 1, 1979. The permittee submitted a permit renewal application on May 13, 1981. EPA reviewed the application, requested further information, and after receipt and review of that information, sent a letter dated June 4, 1981 stating that the permit renewal application appeared to be complete. The ownership of the company has changed since the issuance of the initial permit. In 1979, the original permittee, Thomas Quinn Company, was purchased by E.H. Perkins Construction, Inc. and the company is currently held and operated under the name Quinn-Perkins Sand and Gravel, Inc. No permit has been issued since then and the permittee has continued to operate and discharge under the terms and conditions of the original permit.

b. General Requirements

The Clean Water Act (CWA) prohibits the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States without a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit unless such a discharge is otherwise authorized by the CWA. The NPDES permit is the mechanism used to implement technology and water quality-based effluent limitations and other requirements including monitoring and reporting. This draft NPDES permit was developed in accordance with various statutory and regulatory requirements established pursuant to the CWA and any applicable State regulations. The regulations governing the EPA NPDES permit program are generally found in 40 CFR Parts 122, 124, 125, and 136.

EPA is required to consider (a) technology-based requirements, (b) water quality-based requirements, and (c) all limitations and requirements in the existing permit, when developing permit limits. These requirements are described in the following paragraphs.

c. Explanation of Effluent Limitation Derivation:

Technology-Based Requirements

Section 301(b)(2)(A) and (E) of the CWA provides that by July 1, 1984, industry must meet limitations based on Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BAT) for toxic pollutants and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) for conventional pollutants (BOD, TSS, pH, Oil & Grease and Fecal Coliform). In the absence of technology-based guidelines, EPA is authorized to use Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) to establish effluent limitations, in accordance with Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA.

Best Available Technology Economically Achievable/Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BAT/BCT)

On July 12, 1977, EPA promulgated technology-based effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) for the Mineral Mining and Processing Point Source Category, 40 CFR Part 436, Subpart C - Construction Sand and Gravel Subcategory which are applicable to the operations at this site and represent the minimum level of control required for this facility. The promulgated ELGs contained limitations on the discharge of pH 6.0 to 9.0 Standard Units (S.U.) and TSS of 25 mg/l for the average monthly and of 45 mg/l for the maximum daily. However, on June 18, 1979, the TSS limits for the crushed stone (Subpart B) and construction sand and gravel (Subpart C) categories were remanded by Court Order to EPA for reconsideration and, as of this writing, have not been re-proposed. The current ELGs for these categories, therefore, only contain discharge limitations for pH as mentioned above.

In the absence of published technology-based effluent limitations, the permit writer is authorized under Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA to establish effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis using Best Professional Judgement (BPJ).

Best Professional Judgement (BPJ)

EPA can impose technology based treatment requirements on a case-by-case basis under Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) to the extent that EPA-promulgated effluent limitations are inapplicable. The authority for BPJ is contained in Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA, which authorizes the EPA Administrator to issue a permit containing “such conditions as the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act.” The NPDES regulations in 40 CFR §125.3(c)(2) state that permits developed on a case-by-case basis under Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA must consider (i) the appropriate technology for the category class of point sources of which the applicant is a member, based on available information, and (ii) any unique factors relating to the applicant.

Water Quality-Based Requirements

Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA requires that effluent limitations based on water quality considerations be established for point source discharges when such limitations are necessary to meet state or federal water quality standards that are applicable to the designated receiving water. This is necessary when technology-based limitations would interfere with the attainment or maintenance of water quality in the receiving water.

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA and EPA regulations, NPDES permits must contain effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits where more stringent limits are necessary to maintain or achieve state or federal water quality standards.

Water quality standards consist of three parts: (1) beneficial designated uses for a water-body or a segment of a water-body; (2) numeric and/or narrative water quality criteria sufficient to protect the assigned designated use(s); and (3) anti-degradation requirements to ensure that once a use is attained it will not be degraded. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards, found at 314 CMR 4.00, include these elements. 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. These standards also include requirements for the regulation and control of toxic constituents and require that EPA criteria, established pursuant to Section 304(a) of the CWA, shall be used unless a site specific criteria is established.

The draft permit must limit any pollutant or pollutant parameter (conventional, non-conventional, and toxic) that is or may be discharged at a level that causes or has the "reasonable potential" to cause or contribute to an excursion above any water quality standard (40 CFR §122.44(d)). An excursion occurs if the projected or actual in-stream concentration exceeds an applicable water quality criterion. In determining "reasonable potential", EPA considers: (1) existing controls on point and non-point sources of pollution; (2) pollutant concentration and variability in the effluent and receiving water as determined from the permit's re-issuance application, monthly discharge monitoring reports (DMRs), and State and Federal Water Quality Reports; (3) sensitivity of the indicator species used in toxicity testing; (4) known water quality impacts of processes on waste waters; and (5) where appropriate, dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.

Effluent Limit Derivation

From a review of the permit application and the manufacturing process, pollutants anticipated in the discharge include total suspended solids (TSS), turbidity, pH, and oil and grease. The effluent limits and monitoring requirements are described below.

Flow - Report (MGD)

Quinn-Perkins utilizes process water from Butterfield Pond at a rate of approximately 210,000 gpd. This is based on a pump rate of 350 gpm running for 10 hours per day. The estimated process wastewater going into settling pond #1 is approximately 202,000 gpd. This assumes a 4% water loss from the washing process and evaporation.

TSS - 20 mg/l monthly avg and 45 mg/l max daily

Prior sampling results collected under the current permit indicate high TSS levels in the effluent. The effluent limits for TSS will remain unchanged from the current permit limits of 20 mg/l monthly average and 45 mg/l maximum daily. Anti-backsliding provisions (40 CFR §122.44(l)(1)) prevent EPA from relaxing the TSS limits for this facility. The effluent limits for TSS in the current permit were derived using BPJ as there are no ELGs for TSS. In the absence of published technology-based effluent limitations, the permit writer is authorized under Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA to establish effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis using Best Professional Judgement (BPJ).

The October 30, 2000 Multi Sector General Permit (MSGP) for Storm Water was reviewed to determine the technology-based limitations for this industrial category. Sector J of the MSGP contains effluent limitations for mine dewatering activities at crushed stone mining facilities, as well as benchmark monitoring concentrations for storm water discharges. The limitations for mine dewatering activities include monthly average TSS limits of 25 mg/l, maximum daily limits of 45 mg/l and pH limits of 6-9 standard units. The benchmark monitoring concentration for storm water is 100 mg/l for TSS.

EPA also reviewed other permits issued to crushed stone activities in Massachusetts. These facilities included BPJ limits for TSS of between 20-25 mg/l for monthly average limits and 40-45 mg/l for daily maximum for discharges of commingled storm water, mine dewatering, and wash water treated through settling basins.

We expect that these limitations are adequate to achieve state water quality standards and that the state will certify the draft permit.

Oil and Grease - 15 mg/l

The maximum daily limit for oil and grease is based on Massachusetts Water Quality Standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards, 314 Code of Massachusetts Regulations ("CMR") 4.05(3)(b)(7), state: *These waters shall be free from oil, grease and petrochemicals that produce a visible film on the surface of the water, impart an oily taste to the water or an oily or other undesirable taste to the edible portions of aquatic life, coat the banks or bottom of the water course, or are deleterious or become toxic to aquatic life.* A concentration of 15 mg/l is recognized as the level at which many oils produce a visible sheen and/or cause an undesirable taste in fish (EPA Water Quality Criteria, 1972). An Oil and Grease limit of 15 mg/l has been included in this draft permit for Outfall 002. The maximum daily limit for oil and grease of 15 mg/l is included to ensure compliance with state water quality standards. This limit has been included for similar facilities in Massachusetts.

pH - range 6.5 - 8.3 standard units (S.U.)

The applicable ELGs found in 40 CFR Part 436 - Mineral Mining and Processing, Subpart B and Subpart C require a pH limit range of 6.0 to 9.0 S.U., However, the MA Surface Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.05(3)(a)3) for a Class B water which require a pH limit range of "between 6.5 and 8.3 S.U., but not more than 0.5 units outside the background range." are more stringent and therefore apply.

Turbidity - Report

Due to the nature of operation, which involves the treatment of fine solids washed from the rock, there is reasonable potential for turbidity in the discharge. Turbidity of water is related to the amount of suspended and colloidal material present in the water column. Aside from the aesthetic problems of color that a turbid discharge can create, turbidity reduces water clarity; therefore, the penetration of light into that water column is reduced, negatively impacting the growth and life cycles of various aquatic species (plants and animals). Butterfield Pond is impaired due to noxious aquatic weeds and turbidity. In order to ensure that the discharge does not add to or contribute to the existing turbidity problem and to ensure compliance with state water quality standards pertaining to aesthetics (see 314 CMR 4.05.(3)(b)), EPA will require the permittee to monitor and report turbidity levels. The effluent limits for TSS will help ensure low levels of turbidity in the discharge and should not adversely affect the turbidity of the receiving water.

Due to the close proximity of Butterfield Pond to outfall 002, monitoring will be required both upstream and downstream of outfall 002 to determine whether the discharge is adding to or creating the high turbidity levels in the pond. The upstream monitoring will be taken far enough upstream to remain outside of the influence of the discharge and the downstream monitoring will be taken at a point in Vine Brook, just prior to entering Butterfield Pond.

Effluent Limit Summary

EPA has determined that these limitations satisfy the technology and water quality requirements of the CWA mentioned above. The limitations are also consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(1) of EPA's regulations which require that the limitations of a reissued permit be at least as stringent as the limitations of the prior permit.

d. Storm water

The permittee has stated that the portion of storm water that does not infiltrate or evaporate off the site is pumped to a central collection pit and subsequently infiltrates and evaporates from that pond, resulting in no discharge of storm water from the site. Therefore, this draft permit does not include authorization to discharge storm water from the site.

e. Effluent Monitoring

The effluent monitoring requirements have been established to yield data representative of the discharge under authority of Section 308(a) of the CWA in accordance with 40 CFR §§122.41 (j), 122.44 (l) and 122.48.

f. Other Requirements

The remaining conditions of this permit are based on the NPDES regulations 40 CFR Parts 122 through 125 and consist primarily of management requirements common to all permits.

V. Essential Fish Habitat Determination

Under the 1996 Amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, EPA is required to consult with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's

National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) if EPA's actions or proposed actions that it permits may adversely impact any essential fish habitat (EFH). The Amendments broadly define EFH as: "waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." Adversely impact means any impact which reduces the quality and/or quantity of EFH.

EFH is only designated for species for which federal Fisheries Management Plans exist. A NOAA Fisheries website (See <http://www.nero.noaa.gov/hcd/webintro.html>) contains maps of designated EFH. In some cases, a narrative identifies rivers and other waterways that should be considered EFH due to present or historic use by federally managed species such as Atlantic salmon.

EPA's review of available EFH information indicates that Vine Brook and Butterfield Pond are not designated EFH for any federally managed species. As such, EFH consultation with NOAA Fisheries is not required.

VI. Anti-backsliding

Anti-backsliding as defined in 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. As explained above, anti-backsliding applies to limits contained in this permit and, therefore, these limits are continued in the draft permit. Anti-backsliding is not triggered in this permit.

VII. Anti-degradation

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts' anti-degradation provisions found in 314 CMR 4.04 ensure that provisions in 40 CFR Section 131.12 are met. These provisions ensure that all existing uses in the receiving water, along with the level of water quality necessary to protect those existing uses, are maintained and protected. This draft permit is being reissued with some effluent limits (pH and Oil and Grease) stricter than the current permit. The new effluent limits should ensure that provisions in 314 CMR 4.04 are met. The State is also asked to certify that the anti-degradation provisions in State law are met.

VIII. State Certification Requirements

EPA may not issue a permit unless the MA DEP either certifies that the effluent limitations contained in this permit are stringent enough to assure that the discharge will not cause the receiving water to violate State Water Quality Standards or waives its right to such certification. EPA has requested that MA DEP certify the permit. Under Section 401 of the CWA, EPA is required to obtain certification from the state in which the discharge is located which determines that all water quality standards, in accordance with Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, will be satisfied. Regulations governing state certification are set forth in 40 CFR §124.53 and §124.55. EPA regulations pertaining to permit limits based upon water quality standards and state requirements are contained in 40 CFR §122.44(d). EPA expects that the permit will be certified.

IX. Public Comment Period, Public Hearing; 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: Mr. Stuart F. Gray, NPDES Industrial Permit Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (Mail Code: CMA), 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-New England and the State Agency. Such requests shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. A public hearing may be held after at least thirty (30) days public notice whenever the Director finds that response to this notice indicates 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-New England's Boston office.

Following the close of the comment period, and after a public hearing, if such hearing is held, the Director 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.

X. EPA and MA DEP 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:

Stuart F. Gray
Office of Ecosystem Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 1
1 Congress Street, Suite 1100 (CIP)
Boston, MA 02114-2023
Tel: (617) 918-1302
Email: gray.stuart@epa.gov

Paul M. Hogan
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Watershed Management
627 Main Street
Worcester, MA 01608
Tel: 508/767-2796
Email: paul.hogan@state.ma.us

Date

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

