

**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 THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES**

NPDES NO: MA0100102

DATE OF PUBLIC NOTICE:

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

Board of Sewer Selectmen
Town of Hardwick
Hardwick – Gilbertville Water Pollution Control Facility
P.O. Box 117
Gilbertville, MA 01301

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

Hardwick – Gilbertville Water Pollution Control Facility
Old Mill Road
Gilbertville, Massachusetts 01031

RECEIVING WATER: Ware River (Segment MA 36-05)
(Chicopee River Basin)

CLASSIFICATION: B (Warm Water Fishery)

LATITUDE: 42°21' 9" N

LONGITUDE: 72°12' 47" W

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

The above named applicant has requested that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reissue its NPDES permit to discharge into the designated receiving waters, the Ware River.

The 0.23 mgd Hardwick – Gilbertville Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF) located in the village of Gilbertville provides secondary treatment to domestic wastewater and up to 40,000 gpd of landfill leachate. The treatment facility consists of bar racks, grit removal, a holding tank for the leachate, aeration tanks with mechanical aeration, secondary clarifiers and disinfection

with chlorine gas. Sludge is pumped to a holding tank and trucked to the East Fitchburg Wastewater Treatment Plant for incineration. The location of the facilities is shown in Figure 1.

II. Description of Discharge

A quantitative description of the discharge in terms of significant effluent parameters based on recent monitoring data is shown in Attachment 1.

III. Permit Limitations and Conditions.

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

IV. Permit Basis and Explanation of Effluent Limitation Derivation

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

Under Section 301(b)(1)(B) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW's) were required to achieve effluent limitations based upon secondary treatment by July 1, 1977. The secondary treatment requirements are set forth in 40 CFR Part 133 and include effluent limitations for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), and pH. The "Average Monthly" and "Average Weekly" BOD₅ and TSS limitations are based on the requirements of 40 CFR §133.102. Numerical limitations for pH and fecal coliform are based on state certification requirements under Section 401(a)(1) of the CWA as described in 40 CFR §124.53 and state water quality standards in 314 CMR 4.05 (b) 3 and 4, respectively.

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, 314 CMR 4.00, include requirements for the regulation and control of toxic constituents and also require that EPA criteria, established pursuant to Section 304(a) of the CWA, shall be used unless 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.

The permit must also limit any pollutant or pollutant parameter (conventional, non-conventional, toxic, and whole effluent toxicity) that is or may be discharged at a level that caused, or has reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above any water quality criterion [40 CFR §122.44(d)(1)]. An excursion occurs if the projected or actual instream concentrations exceed the applicable criterion. In determining reasonable potential, EPA considers existing

controls on point and non-point sources of pollution, variability of the pollutant in the effluent, sensitivity of the species to toxicity and, where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.

Also note that according to EPA regulations 40 CFR § 122.44(l), when a permit is reissued, effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards or conditions in the previous permit, unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued. In addition, in accordance with regulations found at 40 CFR Section 131.12, Mass DEP has developed and adopted a statewide antidegradation policy to maintain and protect existing in-stream water quality. The Massachusetts Antidegradation Provisions are found at Title 314 CMR 4.04. No lowering of water quality compared to the previous permit is allowed, except in accordance with the antidegradation provisions.

The limits in the draft permit are based upon information in the application, the existing permit, a site visit, discharge monitoring reports, and toxicity test results.

Waterbody Classification and Usage

The Ware River is classified as a Class B (Warm Water Fishery) waterbody. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards (314 CMR 4.05(3)(b)) state that Class B waters shall 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.”

The *Chicopee River Basin 1998 Water Quality Assessment Report (Report Number: 36-AC-2)* indicates that the aquatic life use in river segment receiving the Hardwick – Gilbertville WPCF’s discharge is threatened due to effluent toxicity. The aesthetic use is supported for this segment with other uses not assessed. This river segment does not appear on the *Massachusetts Year 2002 Integrated List of Waters* [Clean Water Act, Section ‘303(d) list’] as requiring a Total Maximum Daily Loading (TMDL).

The limits in the draft permit are based on information in the application, the existing permit, discharge monitoring reports, and a site visit.

Flow and Dilution Factor

The 7Q10, or the 7-day mean stream low flow with a 10-year recurrence interval, is used to calculate the effluent limits in the draft permit. The 7Q10 flow at the discharge is developed by obtaining the 7Q10 flow measured at the nearest USGS gaging station (Ware River at Gibbs Crossing; USGS Gage No. 01173500) and calculating a flow for the point of discharge in the same proportion as the respective drainage areas. An examination of the flow data indicates that

the 7Q10 of 22.37 cfs at the gage station used in the previous Fact Sheet is still valid.

The resulting 7Q10 flow and dilution factor calculations are below.

Drainage Area @ outfall: 160 square miles
 Drainage Area @ Gage Station: 197 square miles
 7Q10 @ Gage Station: 22 cubic feet /second (cfs)
 7Q10 @ outfall: $160/197 \times 22 \text{ cfs} = 17.9 \text{ cfs}$
 Design flow = 0.23 mgd (0.36 cfs).

Dilution Factor = $(\text{River 7Q10 @ Discharge} + \text{Design Flow}) \div \text{Design Flow}$
 Dilution Factor = $(17.9 \text{ cfs} + (0.36 \text{ cfs})) \div 0.36 \text{ cfs} = 51$

The summer and winter 30Q10 flows are the 30-day mean stream low flow with a 10-year recurrence interval for a specified period within the year. The 30Q10 flows and resulting dilution factors are used in calculating potential ammonia limits. These calculations are as follows.

Summer 30Q10 @ gage station = 27.1 cfs
 Summer 30 Q10 @ outfall = 22.0 cfs
 D. Factor = $(22 \text{ cfs} + 0.36 \text{ cfs}) \div 0.36 \text{ cfs} = 62$

Winter 30Q10 @ gage station = 54.8 cfs
 Winter 30Q10 @ outfall = 44.5 cfs
 D. Factor = $(44.5 + 0.36) \div 0.36 = 125$

BOD and TSS

Under Section 301(b)(1)(B) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW's) were required to achieve effluent limitations based upon secondary treatment by July 1, 1977. The secondary treatment requirements for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) are set forth in 40 CFR Part 133. The 30-day average percent removal limit of at least 85% for BOD₅ and TSS is based on the requirements in 40 CFR §133.102.

The mass limits calculations for BOD₅ and TSS are below.

<u>mass limits</u>	<u>Flow x Concentration x Conversion Factor = lbs/day</u>
average monthly	$0.23 \text{ mgd} \times 30 \text{ mg/l} \times 8.34(\text{lb})(1)/(\text{mg})(\text{million gal}) = 58 \text{ lbs/day}$
average weekly	$0.23 \text{ mgd} \times 45 \text{ mg/l} \times 8.34(\text{lb})(1)/(\text{mg})(\text{million gal}) = 86 \text{ lbs/day}$

The data in Attachment 1 indicates frequent violations of the average monthly concentration limit of 30 mg/l. Consequently, this draft permit increases the sampling frequency to twice per week to further refine the scope of the problem.

pH and Fecal Coliform

The limitations for pH and fecal coliform are based upon the Massachusetts state certification requirements under Section (401) (a) (1) of the Clean Water Act, as defined in 40 CFR§124.53 and water quality standards.

Chlorine

Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) water quality criteria are established in the Gold Book and the subsequent 2002 update and are adopted into the State Water Quality Standards. The instream criteria shall not exceed 11 ug/l for chronic toxicity and 19 ug/l for acute toxicity to protect aquatic life. Allowing for available dilution at the annual monthly average flow, the TRC permit limit calculations are shown below.

Chronic chlorine limit	$11 \text{ ug/l} * 51 = 561 \text{ ug/l} = 0.6 \text{ mg/l}$
Acute chlorine limit	$19 \text{ ug/l} * 51 = 969 \text{ ug/l} = 1.0 \text{ mg/l}$

The months of the year during which the limits are in effect are at the discretion of the MA DEP. Because chlorine and chlorine compounds can be extremely toxic to aquatic life, it is preferable to limit the discharge of chlorine to the receiving water to those months when primary and secondary contact recreational activities may occur. Consequently, the draft permit maintains the current permit limits but reduces the chlorination period from year-round to seasonal.

Nitrogen

Ammonia nitrogen can negatively impact dissolved oxygen levels in the receiving water and also be toxic to aquatic life at elevated levels. The *1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia* established instream criteria for toxicity dependent upon the pH and temperature of the receiving water. The Federal Register, Volume 64, No. 245 published on December 22, 1999, recommended a 30Q10 flow to generate the average monthly concentration limits.

For the summer months, a pH of 6.7 and an estimated temperature of 24° C are used to determine the instream criteria and the summer permit limit is calculated as follows.

$$3.5 \text{ mg/l (instream criteria)} * 62 \text{ (30Q10 dilution factor)} = 217 \text{ mg/l}$$

For the winter months, a pH of 6.7 and an estimated temperature of 0° C are used to determine the instream criteria and the winter permit limit is calculated as follows.

$$6.44 \text{ mg/l (instream criteria)} * 125 \text{ (30Q10 dilution factor)} = 805 \text{ mg/l}$$

The limited data from the chemical analyses performed during WET testing indicated that ammonia levels in the discharge do not have the reasonable potential to exceed the water quality criteria. Consequently, ammonia limits are not necessary at this time.

The Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) identifies excessive discharges of nitrogen from sewage treatment plants as the primary cause of low dissolved oxygen levels in the Sound. This condition is the most serious water quality impairment in the Sound and reduces the viable habitat to support fish. The EPA is presently

requiring total nitrogen monitoring for all facilities which ultimately discharge to Long Island Sound. The development of nitrogen loadings of all tributaries to the Sound will be part of the

Agency's approach to establish a nitrogen control strategy. To this end, the permit continues to require semiannual reporting of total nitrogen as Kjeldahl nitrogen and nitrite and nitrate nitrogen.

The information submitted by the permittee will help establish a database of nitrogen loadings which can be used to assess the impact of nitrogen loadings to Long Island Sound.

Phosphorus

State water quality standards require any existing point source discharge containing nutrient in concentrations which encourage eutrophication or growth of weeds or algae shall be provided with the highest and best practicable treatment to remove such nutrients. Phosphorus interferes with water uses and reduces instream dissolved oxygen. Two downstream impoundments, Diamond International Impoundment on the Ware River and Red Bridge impoundment on the Chicopee River, are potentially affected in this way by the year-round accumulation of phosphorus. The accumulated phosphorus can be released during warmer water temperatures and contribute to algal growth.

EPA has published national guidance documents which contain recommended total phosphorus criteria and other indicators of eutrophication. EPA's *Quality Criteria for Water 1986* (the Gold Book) recommends, in order to control eutrophication, that in-stream phosphorus concentrations should be less than 100 ug/l (0.100 mg/l) in streams or other flowing waters not discharging directly to lakes or impoundments. Using the dilution factor of 51 and the Gold Book criteria, the phosphorus limit would be:

$$100 \text{ ug/l} * 51 = 5,100 \text{ ug/l} = 5.1 \text{ mg/l}$$

More recently, EPA 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 ecoregion-specific criteria represent conditions in waters minimally impacted by human activities, and thus representative of water without cultural eutrophication. The Hardwick-Gilbertville Water Pollution Control Facility is within Ecoregion XIV, Eastern Coastal Plain, Northeastern Coastal Zone. Recommended criteria for this ecoregion is found in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria, Rivers and Streams in Ecoregion XIV*, published in December, 2001, and includes a total phosphorus criteria of 23.75 ug/l (0.024 mg/l).

Using the ecoregion criteria, the phosphorus limit would be:

$$24 \text{ ug/l} * 51 = 1,224 \text{ ug/l} = 1.2 \text{ mg/l}$$

The permit for the Town of Hardwick's other facility, Wheelright (NPDES No MA 0102431), is being issued concurrently with this permit. As discussed in the Fact Sheet for that permit, because the design and actual flow from that facility is so small, the total phosphorus loading

from both facilities will be considered when setting the phosphorus limit for this larger facility. Data from the *Chicopee River Basin 1998 Water Quality Assessment Report* indicates instream phosphorus concentrations 0.04 to 0.08 mg/l downstream in the Ware River which are greater than the recommended water quality criteria. With the exception of Hardwick-Gilbertville, other facilities, such as Barre, Ware, and Palmer, upstream and downstream of the Gilbertville WPCF discharging to the Ware River have a 1 mg/l phosphorus limit. Consequently, the draft permit includes a phosphorus limit of 1 mg/l which is more stringent than the above water quality criteria calculated values.

The draft permit will have a three year implementation period for phosphorus control. Three years is considered reasonable, especially for small facilities, to obtain funding at Town Meeting or from other sources, and design, construct and initiate operations of the winterized, phosphorus control facilities.

Whole Effluent Toxicity

National studies conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency have demonstrated that domestic sources contribute toxic constituents to POTWs. These constituents include metals, chlorinated solvents and aromatic hydrocarbons among others. The Region's current policy is to include toxicity testing requirements in all municipal 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 and industrial contributions, and in accordance with EPA regulation and policy, the draft permit includes 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). EPA Region I has developed a toxicity control policy which requires wastewater treatment facilities to perform toxicity bioassays on their effluents. This draft permit requires acute toxicity testing twice per year on the daphnid, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*, as in the current permit.

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.

V. Sludge

The draft permit prohibits sludge discharges through the outfall. Section 405(d) of the CWA requires that sludge conditions be included in all POTW permits. However, the permittee's practice of contracting out the sludge disposal is not regulated by the National Sewage Sludge

Program. If the permittee changes to a method of sludge disposal that is regulated, then the permittee must comply with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 503.

VI. State Certification Requirements

EPA may not issue a permit unless the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (Mass DEP) certifies that the effluent limitations included in the permit are stringent enough to assure that the discharge will not cause the receiving water to violate State Water Quality Standards. The Mass DEP has reviewed the draft permit and advised EPA that the limitations are adequate to protect water quality and continue to meet the requirements of the antidegradation policy. EPA has requested permit certification by the State pursuant to 40 CFR §124.53 and expects the draft permit will be certified.

VI. Essential Fish Habitat

Under the 1996 Amendments (PL 104-267) to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. §1801 et seq. (1998)), EPA is required to consult with the National Fisheries Services (NOAA Fisheries) if EPA's action or proposed action that it funds, permits, or undertakes, may adversely impact any essential fish habitat (EFH). The Amendments broadly define essential fish habitat as: waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity (16 U.S.C. § 1802 (10)). Adversely impact means any impact which reduces the quality and/or quantity of EFH (50 C.F.R. § 600.910 (a)). Adverse effects may include direct (e.g., contamination or physical disruption), indirect (e.g., loss of prey, reduction in species' fecundity), site-specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions.

Essential fish habitat is only designated for species for which federal fisheries management plans exist (16 U.S.C. § 1855 (b) (1)(A)). EFH designations for New England were approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 3, 1999. The Ware River is not covered by the EFH designation for riverine systems and thus EPA has determined that a formal EFH consultation with the NFS is not required.

VII. Comment Period and Procedures the Final Decision

All persons, including applicants, who believe any condition of the 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 contacts listed below. 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 to be raised in the hearing. A public hearing may be held after at least thirty (30) days public notice whenever the Regional Administrator 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's Boston office.

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

VIII. Contacts

Requests for additional information or questions concerning the draft permit may be addressed Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, to:

Mark Malone (CMP)
Municipal Permits Branch
U.S. EPA
One Congress Street - Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114-2023
TEL: (617) 918-1619
FAX: (617) 918-2064

EMAIL: malone.mark@epa.gov

Paul Hogan
MA Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Watershed Management
627 Main Street
Worcester, MA 01608
TEL: (508) 767-2796
FAX: (508) 791-4131

EMAIL: paul.hogan@state.ma.us

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