

# **NPDES PERMIT NO. NM0031135**

## **FACT SHEET**

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

### **APPLICANT**

Farmington Electric Utility System - Bluffview Power Plant  
101 N. Browning Parkway  
Farmington, NM 87401

### **ISSUING OFFICE**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 6  
1445 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

### **PREPARED BY**

Isaac Chen  
Environmental Engineer  
NPDES Permits & Technical Branch (6WQ-PP)  
Water Quality Protection Division  
VOICE: 214-665-7364  
FAX: 214-665-2191  
EMAIL: chen.isaac@epa.gov

### **DATE PREPARED**

April 8, 2014

### **PERMIT ACTION**

The first time issuance.

### **RECEIVING WATER – BASIN**

San Juan River – San Juan River Basin

**DOCUMENT ABBREVIATIONS**

In the document that follows, various abbreviations are used. They are as follows:

4Q3	Lowest four-day average flow rate expected to occur once every three-years
BAT	Best available technology economically achievable
BCT	Best conventional pollutant control technology
BPT	Best practicable control technology currently available
BMP	Best management plan
BOD	Biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
BPJ	Best professional judgment
CBOD	Carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
CD	Critical dilution
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
COE	United States Corp of Engineers
CWA	Clean Water Act
DMR	Discharge monitoring report
ELG	Effluent limitation guidelines
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCB	Fecal coliform bacteria
F&WS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
mg/l	Milligrams per liter
ug/l	Micrograms per liter
MGD	Million gallons per day
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMIP	New Mexico NPDES Permit Implementation Procedures
NMWQS	New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Waters
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
ML	Minimum quantification level
O&G	Oil and grease
POTW	Publically owned treatment works
RP	Reasonable potential
SIC	Standard industrial classification
s.u.	Standard units (for parameter pH)
SWQB	Surface Water Quality Bureau
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
UAA	Use attainability analysis
USFWS	United States Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Service
WLA	Wasteload allocation
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

## **I. BACKGROUND**

The Bluffview Power Plant has discharged its wastewater to the City of Farmington Wastewater Treatment Plant (NPDES No. NM0020583) for treatment. Because the City WWTP could not meet the effluent limitation for TDS in accordance with the basin wide Colorado River Salinity Control Program (CRSCP), To resolve the TDS permit violation, the City issued an Industrial Pretreatment Program permit to order that the Bluffview Power Plant acquires its own NPDES permit for authorization of wastewater discharges.

## **II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY**

As described in the application, the City of Farmington Bluffview Power Plant (BPP) is located at 755 W. Murray Drive, Farmington, San Juan County, New Mexico. Under the Standard Industrial Classification Code 4911, the BPP is a steam electrical power plant.

BPP is owned and operated by the City of Farmington Electric Utility System (FEUS) and is a natural gas-fired generation plant. The BPP was built in 2004 and consists of one combustion turbine, one heat recovery steam generator and one steam turbine. It can generate a nominal 62 megawatt of electricity. BPP is proposing to construct a new pipeline and outfall (Outfall 001) for discharge of plant effluent directly to the San Juan River downstream of the confluence with the Animas River.

## **III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS**

A flow schematic and water balance chart attached to the Application Form 2C indicates that the plant effluent consists of cooling tower blowdown, demineralization reverse osmosis wastewater, evaporative cooler (summer only), and various floor drains (including oily water header that is treated by an oil separator, and process areas drain header). Boiler blowdown and city water are used in the cooling tower. The applicant has provided effluent characteristics in the application.

## **IV. REGULATORY AUTHORITY/PERMIT ACTION**

In November 1972, Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act establishing the NPDES permit program to control water pollution. These amendments established technology-based or end-of-pipe control mechanisms and an interim goal to achieve “water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water,” more commonly known as the “swimmable, fishable” goal. Further amendments in 1977 of the CWA gave EPA the authority to implement pollution control programs such as setting wastewater standards for industry and established the basic structure for regulating pollutants discharges into the waters of the United States. In addition, it made it unlawful for any person to discharge any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters, unless a permit was obtained under its provisions. Regulations governing the EPA administered NPDES permit program are generally found at 40 CFR §122 (program requirements & permit conditions), §124 (procedures for decision making), §125 (technology-based standards) and §136 (analytical procedures). Other parts of 40 CFR provide guidance for specific activities and may be used in this document as required.

The BPP submitted a complete permit application March 20, 2013. It is proposed that the permit be issued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.46(a).

## **V. DRAFT PERMIT RATIONALE AND PROPOSED PERMIT CONDITIONS**

### **A. OVERVIEW OF TECHNOLOGY-BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS**

Regulations contained in 40 CFR §122.44 require that NPDES permit limits are developed that meet the more stringent of either technology-based effluent limitation guidelines, numerical and/or narrative water quality standard-based effluent limits, or the previous permit.

### **B. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS/CONDITIONS**

#### **1. General Comments**

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44 (a) require technology-based effluent limitations to be placed in NPDES permits based on ELGs where applicable, on BPJ in the absence of guidelines, or on a combination of the two. In the absence of promulgated guidelines for the discharge, permit conditions may be established using BPJ procedures. EPA establishes limitations based on the following technology-based controls: BPT, BCT, and BAT. These levels of treatment are:

**BPT** - The first level of technology-based standards generally based on the average of the best existing performance facilities within an industrial category or subcategory.

**BCT** - Technology-based standard for the discharge from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and O&G.

**BAT** - The most appropriate means available on a national basis for controlling the direct discharge of toxic and non-conventional pollutants to navigable waters. BAT effluent limits represent the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category or subcategory.

#### **2. Effluent Limitation Guidelines**

Technology based requirements for this type of discharger are contained in 40 CFR §423, Steam Electric Power Generating. The BPP generates electricity from natural gas fueled units installed after 1982 when ELGs were established in 1982 for BPT, BAT and new source performance standards (NSPS). The facility generates 62 MW, more than the 25 MW threshold for certain ELGs contained in 40 CFR §423. The ELGs for this type of facility are based on NSPS.

Based on 40 CFR §423.15 for NSPS, the permittee must achieve the following ELGs:

The pH of all discharges, except once through cooling water, shall be within the range of 6.0–9.0.

There shall be no discharge of polychlorinated biphenyl compounds (PCBs) such as those commonly used for transformer fluid.

The quantity of pollutants discharged from low volume waste sources shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of low volume waste sources times the concentration listed in the following table:

Pollutant	Effluent limitations	
	Daily Max (mg/l)	30-Day Avg (mg/l)
TSS	100	30
Oil & Grease	20	15

The term low volume waste sources means, taken collectively as if from one source, wastewater from all sources except those for which specific limitations are otherwise established in this part. Low volume wastes sources include, but are not limited to: wastewaters from wet scrubber air pollution control systems, ion exchange water treatment system, water treatment evaporator blowdown, laboratory and sampling streams, boiler blowdown, floor drains, cooling tower basin cleaning wastes, and recirculating house service water systems. Sanitary and air conditioning wastes are not included.

The quantity of pollutants discharged in chemical metal cleaning wastes shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of chemical metal cleaning wastes times the concentration listed in the following table:

Pollutant	Effluent limitations	
	Daily Max (mg/l)	30-Day Avg (mg/l)
TSS	100	30
Oil & Grease	20	15
Copper, total	1.0	1.0
Iron, total	1.0	1.0

The term chemical metal cleaning waste means any wastewater resulting from the cleaning of any metal process equipment with chemical compounds, including, but not limited to, boiler tube cleaning.

For any plant with a total rated generating capacity greater than 25 MW, the quantity of pollutants discharged in once through cooling water shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of once through cooling water sources times the concentration listed in the following table:

Pollutant	Effluent limitations
	Daily Max (mg/l)
Total residual chlorine	0.2

The term once through cooling water means water passed through the main cooling condensers in one or two passes for the purpose of removing waste heat.

The quantity of pollutants discharged in cooling tower blowdown shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of cooling tower blowdown times the concentration listed below:

Pollutant	Effluent limitations	
	Daily Max (mg/l)	30-Day Avg (mg/l)
Free available chlorine	0.5	0.2

Pollutant	Effluent limitations	
	Daily Max (mg/l)	30-Day Avg (mg/l)
The 126 priority pollutants (Appendix A) contained in chemicals added for cooling tower maintenance, except:	*1	*1
Chromium, total	0.2	0.2
Zinc, total	1.0	1.0

Footnote:

\*1 No detectable amount.

The term blowdown means the minimum discharge of recirculating water for the purpose of discharging materials contained in the water, the further buildup of which would cause concentration in amounts exceeding limits established by best engineering practices. Neither free available chlorine nor total residual chlorine may be discharged from any unit for more than two hours in any one day and not more than one unit in any plant may discharge free available or total residual chlorine at any one time unless the utility can demonstrate to the permit issuing authority, that the units in a particular location cannot operate at or below this level of chlorination.

At the permitting authority's discretion, instead of the monitoring in 40 CFR 122.11(b), compliance with the limitations for the 126 priority pollutants in paragraph (j)(1) of this section may be determined by engineering calculations which demonstrate that the regulated pollutants are not detectable in the final discharge by the analytical methods in 40 CFR Part 136.

### 3. Cooling Water Intake Structure

Regulations contained in CWA §316(b), requires that the location, design, construction and capacity of cooling water intake structures (CWIS) reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact. CWIS cause adverse environmental impact by pulling large numbers of fish and shellfish or their eggs into a power plant's or factory's cooling system. There, the organisms may be killed or injured by heat, physical stress, or by chemicals used to clean the cooling system. Larger organisms may be killed or injured when they are trapped against screens at the front of an intake structure.

Because BPP uses city water for cooling water make-up, it does not withdraw water from the waters of United States, so it causes no adverse environmental impact. It complies with the CWA 316(b) requirements. Therefore, no further permit conditions are established for operations of the CWIS.

#### 4. Draft Permit Effluent Limitation Guidelines

##### a. TSS and Oil & Grease (O&G)

Because the ELG of TSS and O&G for the low volume waste source applies to the discharges of cooling tower blowdown, RO waste and floor drains which are composed of the effluent at Outfall 001, EPA proposes to establish the ELG-based TSS and O&G limitations at Outfall 001, instead of at separate internal outfalls.

##### b. 126 Priority Pollutants

In accordance with the provision in section 423.15(j)(3), at EPA's discretion, a narrative restriction is proposed as "If cooling tower maintenance chemicals are required, the permittee must demonstrate through engineering calculations that the 126 priority pollutants (listed at 40 CFR §423, Appendix A) are limited in the discharge to "no detectable amount," except total chromium (0.2 mg/l) and total zinc (1.0 mg/l). The use of chemical additives which may contain any of the 126 priority pollutants or may adversely impact aquatic lives is not authorized unless approval is obtained and limitations are established on a case-by-case basis. Records of chemical applications and engineering calculations must be kept on site for three years or longer."

##### c. Chemical Cleaning Waste

EPA has established a narrative restriction of "There shall be no discharges of metal cleaning wastes or chemical metal cleaning wastes" to regulate metal cleaning wastes through the NPDES permit for all power plants in the State of New Mexico.

##### d. Total Residual Chlorine or Free Available Chlorine

Because the ELG for chlorine is to protect aquatic life in the receiving stream and also because the ELG concentration is higher than the applicable state WQS for total residual chlorine (TRC), the most stringent state acute aquatic life standard of 0.019 mg/l of TRC is established at Outfall 001.

#### 5. Technology-Based Mass Limits

Regulations at 40 CFR §122.45(f)(1) require all pollutants limited in permits to have limits expressed in terms of mass such as pounds per day for continuous dischargers. For Outfall 001, the daily maximum flow is 48 gallons per minute, which is 0.069 MGD. So, the mass limits for TSS and O&G are calculated as

Mass Loads (lb/day) = Concentration Limits (mg/l) × 8.34 × Flow (MGD)  
where 8.34 is a conversion factor.

### C. WATER QUALITY BASED LIMITATIONS

#### 1. General Comments

Water quality based requirements are necessary where effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits are necessary to maintain or achieve federal or state water quality limits. Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on federal or state WQS. Effluent limitations and/or conditions established in the draft permit are in compliance with applicable State WQS and applicable State water quality management plans to assure that surface WQS of the receiving waters are protected and maintained, or attained.

## 2. Implementation

The NPDES permits contain technology-based effluent limitations reflecting the best controls available. Where these technology-based permit limits do not protect water quality or the designated uses, additional water quality-based effluent limitations and/or conditions are included in the NPDES permits. State narrative and numerical water quality standards are used in conjunction with EPA criteria and other available toxicity information to determine the adequacy of technology-based permit limits and the need for additional water quality-based controls.

## 3. State Water Quality Standards

The general and specific stream standards are provided in NMWQS (20.6.4 NMAC amended through June 5, 2013). The facility discharges into the San Juan River in segment number 20.6.4.401 of the San Juan River Basin. The designated uses of the receiving water are public water supply, industrial water supply, irrigation, livestock watering, wildlife habitat, primary contact, marginal coldwater aquatic life and warmwater aquatic life.

## 4. Permit Action - Water Quality-Based Limits

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44(d) require limits in addition to, or more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines (technology based). State WQS that are more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines are as follows:

### a. pH

Stream segment specific (20.6.4.403 NMAC) WQS for pH, 6.6 to 9.0 su, are established in the draft permit. These are more stringent than technology based limitations noted above.

### b. Total Dissolved Solids – Colorado Salinity Control Program

The discharge to the San Juan River is part of the Colorado River Basin where a basin wide Colorado River Salinity Control Program (CRSCP) was established by EPA in December 1974. The objective of the CRSCP, as provided in Sections I.A. and I.B., is to achieve "no salt return" whenever practicable for industrial discharges and an incremental increase in salinity over the supply water for municipal discharges.

Under the 2011 review of the NPDES permit program policy for implementation of Colorado River salinity standards, it provides a policy to regulate all new industrial sources as below: "...A new industrial source with operations and discharging facilities at multiple locations under common or affiliated ownership or management" shall be defined for purposes of NPDES permitting, as an industrial source that commenced construction on a pilot, development or production scale on or after October 30, 2002.

a. The permitting authority may permit the discharge of salt upon a satisfactory demonstration by the permittee that:

- i. It is not practicable to prevent the discharge of all salt from the new construction or,
- ii. In cases where the salt loading to the Colorado River from the new construction is less than one ton per day or 366 tons per year, or
- iii. The proposed discharge from the new construction is of sufficient quality in terms of TDS concentrations that it can be considered "fresh water" that would have no adverse effect on achieving the adopted numeric standards for the Colorado River System...."

The BPP has reused city water and boiler blowdown for the cooling tower and such technologies are the best available technology under the CWA 316(b) and cause "zero" adverse impacts to aquatic life. The quantity of discharges from BPP has been minimized in comparison with once-through cooling water system. It may not be practicable to remove all salt from cooling tower blowdown prior to discharging. TDS data during the period of December 2012 to January 2014 provided to EPA indicate that the TDS concentration in cooling tower blowdown ranges from 2004 to 2900 mg/l with the average TDS concentration of 2401 mg/l. Therefore, the loading range of TDS is calculated ( $\text{Load} = 2900 \text{ mg/l} \times 0.069 \text{ MGD} \times 8.34$ ) to be from 1153 to 1669 lb/day which is less than 1 ton (2000 lbs) per day. Therefore, EPA proposes to authorize the discharge to San Juan River with a Daily Maximum TDS limitation of < 2000 lb/day. A loading limit of 2000 lb/day is equivalent to 3475.5 mg/l concentration limitation. EPA also proposes a TDS concentration limit of 3475 mg/l.

c. TOXICS

i. General Comments

The CWA in Section 301 (b) requires that effluent limitations for point sources include any limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Federal regulations found at 40 CFR §122.44 (d) state that if a discharge poses the reasonable potential to cause an in-stream excursion above a water quality criteria, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant.

ii. Reasonable Potential – Toxics

The low flow or 4Q3 was provided by NMED as 437.7 cfs and the harmonic mean flow used to evaluate human health impacts is 1059.7 cfs. To convert 4Q3 expressed in cfs to 4Q3 expressed

as MGD, the constant 1.548 cfs/MGD is used. The gauge station to measure these flows is on the San Juan River downstream of the facility, and the City of Farmington POTW Outfall 001 is located between the proposed Outfall 001 and the gauge station; therefore the design flow of City of Farmington POTW was subtracted from the flow recorded at gauge station. Stream TSS of 97.3 mg/l and hardness of 118 mg/l are used for RP calculations. The values of TSS and hardness are the average values recorded at upstream and downstream gauge stations.

For Outfall 001, the effluent flow  $Q_e$  is 0.069 MGD. CD is expressed as the ratio of the effluent flow ( $Q_e$ ) divided by the sum of the low flow ( $Q_a$ ) and the effluent flow as follows:

$$CD = Q_e / [Q_e + Q_a]$$

The CD for the site based on this rate is:

$$CD = 0.069 / [0.069 + 282.83]$$
$$CD = 0.00024 \text{ or } 0.024\%$$

All pollutant values, except for total aluminum, have demonstrate no RP to exceed WQS and therefore no limits are required on RP basis. The effluent aluminum concentration of 0.4 mg/l itself does not cause RP, but the ambient aluminum concentration of 2.253 mg/l exceeds the chronic aquatic life standard of 1.701 mg/l. The NMED has not listed aluminum impairment for the receiving stream. Monitoring requirements and monthly average limitation of 1.701 mg/l are proposed in the permit.

### iii. TRC

The levels of discharge of chlorine at technology-based levels are quite higher than State WQS. WQS allow TRC of 11 ug/l for chronic and 19 ug/l for acute. Chronic criteria are allowed dilution based on the ratio of discharge flow and receiving water lowflow; CD, while acute criteria must meet end-of-pipe criteria. The acute 19 ug/l end-of-pipe criteria is more restrictive than the chronic after mixing and EPA proposes 19 ug/l at Outfall 001.

## 5. Stream Impairment Requirements

The San Juan River in the segment number 20.6.4.401 from Navajo boundary at Hogback to Animas River is listed as not supporting for marginal coldwater aquatic life and primary contact uses. The probable causes of impairment are E. coli, sedimentation/siltation and turbidity. The probable sources include drought-related impact, municipal point source discharge, on-site treatment system, rangeland grazing, and unknown sources. Bacteria are not expected in the discharge and sanitary waste is not authorized in the permit, limitations for bacteria are not required in the draft permit for the impairment. Because a bacteria effluent data, 2 mpn/100 ml, was reported in the application, a monitoring requirement is proposed in the permit. The permittee may provide three more bacteria data during the public comment period for EPA to conduct further evaluation. The probable sources listed in the State 303(d) report do not include point sources for causing stream sedimentation/siltation and turbidity. Because NMED has not developed a total maximum daily load (TMDL) to address sedimentation/siltation and turbidity

issues, EPA proposes to have a permit reopener clause to modify the permit once an approved TMDL becomes available. It is also not clear how TSS may affect stream sedimentation/siltation or turbidity. But, the permittee has reported a TSS of 14.0 mg/l in the application and that value is much lower than the geometric mean stream TSS of 97.3 mg/l. Therefore, it is unlikely the authorized discharge will cause adverse impact to San Juan River impairment for sedimentation/siltation or turbidity.

#### 6. Temperature

The stream segment number 20.6.4.401, the San Juan River from the Navajo Nation boundary at the Hogback upstream to its confluence with the Animas River, has a maximum criterion of 90 °F. The temperature of the cooling tower blowdown ranges from 50 to 70 °F and the effluent will be significantly diluted when it mixes with the high volume of San Juan River stream, temperature will not be a concern at all. No monitoring for effluent temperature is required..

#### 7. Monitoring Frequency for Limited Parameters

Regulations require permits to establish monitoring requirements to yield data representative of the monitored activity, 40 CFR §122.48(b), and to assure compliance with permit limitations, 40 CFR §122.44(i)(1).

Flow is proposed to be estimated daily. pH and TRC are monitored daily using grab sample. Because the volume of discharge and technology-based TSS and O&G effluent limitations are unlikely to cause adverse impact to the receiving water after the dilution, monitoring frequency of 1/month which is less than recommended frequency in the NMIP is proposed. Grab samples shall be used for TSS and O&G. TDS shall be sampled monthly using 12-hour composite samples. The TDS sampling frequency is same as one established for the Farming Animas Power Plant. Monitoring frequency of 1/year is proposed for total recoverable aluminum because the discharge itself does not cause RP.

#### D. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY LIMITATIONS

Procedures for implementing WET terms and conditions in NPDES permits are contained in the NMIP, March 2012. Table 11 of Section V of the NMIP outlines the type of WET testing for different types of discharges. The critical dilution was calculated above and it was determined to be very low, 0.024%. The BPP is rated as a minor industrial facility discharging to a perennial waterbody with a CD  $\leq$  10%. Provisions in the NMIP for WET testing with this CD allows for a 10:1 acute to chronic ratio be used and allow the less expensive acute test. Using the 10:1 ratio will allow an acute test of 0.24% CD. Since the CD is still low, the normal 75% dilution series will not be required for the WET testing. The EPA WET Section believes that for the vast majority of dischargers when the CD is this low, if toxicity were present in the effluent, it would be demonstrated at the CD. The use of the additional dilutions established for a 75% series would not add any expected value to the testing. Instead, the WET test will be performed at the CD and at the 100% control dilution. This approach has been applied to the Farming Animas Power Plant. The draft permit will require a WET testing using *Daphnia pulex* and *Pimephales promelas*. The test is to be done at a frequency of once per six-months for both species. During

the period beginning the effective date of the permit and lasting through the expiration date of the permit, the permittee is authorized to discharge from Outfall 001 to the San Juan River wastewater from an electric power plant. Discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

<u>EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>DISCHARGE MONITORING</u> <u>30-DAY AVG MINIMUM</u>	<u>48-Hr. MINIMUM</u>
Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (48 Hr. Static Renewal) (*1)		
<u>Daphnia pulex</u>	REPORT	REPORT
<u>Pimephales promelas</u>	REPORT	REPORT

<u>EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>MONITORING REQUIREMENTS</u> <u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (48 Hr. Static Renewal) (*1)		
<u>Daphnia pulex</u>	Once/Six months	24 Hr. Composite
<u>Pimephales promelas</u>	Once/Six months	24-Hr. Composite

FOOTNOTES:

1/ Monitoring and reporting requirements begin on the effective date of this permit. See Part II, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements for additional WET monitoring and reporting conditions.

**VI. ANTIDegradation**

The NMAC, Section 20.6.4.8 “Antidegradation Policy and Implementation Plan” sets forth the requirements to protect designated uses through implementation of the State water quality standards. The limitations and monitoring requirements set forth in the proposed permit are developed from the State water quality standards and are protective of those designated uses. Furthermore, the policy sets forth the intent to protect the existing quality of those waters, whose quality exceeds their designated use. The proposed permit is not an increased discharge. The permit requirements and the limits are protective of receiving waters, which is protective of the designated uses of that water, NMAC Section 20.6.4.8.A.2.

**VII. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS**

According to the most recent county listing available at USFWS IPaC website, <http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>, six species in San Juan County are listed as endangered (E) or threatened (T) for the project: the Colorado pike minnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), (E) with critical habitat, the razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*), (E) with critical habitat, the southwestern Willow flycatcher (*Empidonax trallii extimus*), (E), the Knowlton cactus (*Pediocactus knowltonii*), (E), Mancos milk-vetch (*Astragalus humillimus*), (E) and the Mesa Verde cactus (*Sclerocactus mesae-verdae*) (T).

On March 26, 1999, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concluded Endangered Species Act

consultation (Consultation #2-22-98-I-257) with EPA on the reissuance of NPDES Permit No. NM0020583. The FWS concurred with EPA's determination that the reissuance of the permit "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Colorado pikeminnow or razorback sucker; and "will not destroy or adversely modify their critical habitats."

In accordance with requirements under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, EPA has reviewed this permit for its effect on listed threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat. After review, EPA has determined that the issuance of this permit will have "no effect" on listed threatened and endangered species nor will adversely modify designated critical habitat. EPA makes this determination based on the following:

1. The BPP has been discharging its waste stream to the San Juan River through the Farmington POTW under the NPDES Permit No. NM0020583. The 2000 ESA consultation included waste streams from the BPP. And the authorization of the discharge under a new permit does not generate new loading of pollutants to the San Juan River.

2. No additions have been made to the USFWS list of threatened and endangered species and critical habitat designation in the area of the discharge which may be affected by this permitting action since last ESA consultation.

3. EPA has received no additional information which would lead to revision of its determinations.

4. WET testing requirements are established at the outfall that will provide a solid indicator of impacts to the receiving waters, especially to the aquatic species.

5. EPA determines that Items 1 thru 4 result in no change to the environmental baseline established by the previous consultation, therefore, EPA concludes that reissuance of this permit will have "no effect" on listed species and designated critical habitat.

EPA further determined that due to the authorized discharge only contribute 0.024% or less of flow to the San Juan River, the discharge itself will have no effect on listed species and will not adversely modify the critical habitat for those species.

## **IX. HISTORICAL and ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS**

The reissuance of the permit should have no impact on historical and/or archeological sites since no construction activities are planned in the reissuance.

## **X. PERMIT REOPENER**

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if State Water Quality Standards are promulgated or revised. In addition, if the State develops a TMDL, this permit may be reopened to establish effluent limitations for the parameter(s) to be consistent with that TMDL. The permit may also be reopened and modified pursuant to the provisions of 40 CFR §124.5.

**XI. VARIANCE REQUESTS**

No variance requests have been received.

**XII. CERTIFICATION**

The permit is in the process of certification by the State Agency following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 124.53. A draft permit and draft public notice will be sent to the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers; to the Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and to the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to the publication of that notice.

**XIII. FINAL DETERMINATION**

The public notice describes the procedures for the formulation of final determinations.

**XIV. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

**A. APPLICATION(S)**

EPA Application Form 2C received March 20, 2013.

**B. 40 CFR CITATIONS**

Citations to 40 CFR are as of March 1, 2014.

**C. STATE OF NEW MEXICO REFERENCES**

New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Water, 20.6.4 NMAC, as amended through June 5, 2013.

Procedures for Implementing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits in New Mexico, March 2012.

Statewide Water Quality Management Plan, December 17, 2002.

State of New Mexico 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2012 - 2014.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum. 2002. *2002 Review, water quality standards for salinity, Colorado river system*. Phoenix, Arizona.

**D. MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS**

E-mails from Aaron Dailey, BPP, to Isaac Chen, EPA, dated February 25, 2014, and April 3, 2014, respectively, providing additional information to EPA inquiries.