

**NPDES PERMIT NO. TX0134024**  
**STATEMENT OF BASIS**

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

**APPLICANT:**

Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.  
Corpus Christi Crude Oil Storage Facility  
333 Clay Street, Suite 1600  
Houston, TX 77002

**ISSUING OFFICE:**

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

**PREPARED BY:**

Maria E. Okpala  
Environmental Engineer  
Permitting Section (6WQ-PP)  
NPDES Permits & TMDL Branch  
Water Division  
Voice: 214-665-3152  
Fax: 214-665-2191  
Email: okpala.maria@epa.gov

**DATE PREPARED:**

September 26, 2016

**PERMIT ACTION**

It is proposed that the facility be issued an NPDES permit for a 5-year term in accordance with regulations contained in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 122.46(a).

40 CFR CITATIONS: Unless otherwise stated, citations to 40 CFR refer to promulgated regulations listed at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, revised as of September 23, 2016.

**RECEIVING WATER – BASIN**

Corpus Christi's MS4 to Corpus Christi Inner Bay, Segment No. 2484 of the Bays and Estuaries

**DOCUMENT ABBREVIATIONS**

For brevity, Region 6 used acronyms and abbreviated terminology in this Statement of Basis document whenever possible. The following acronyms were used frequently in this document:

BAT	Best Available Technology Economically Achievable)
BOD <sub>5</sub>	Biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
BPJ	Best professional judgment
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
F&WS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
GPD	Gallon per day
HT	Hydrostatic Testing
IP	Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards
µg/l	Micrograms per liter (one part per billion)
mg/l	Milligrams per liter (one part per million)
MGD	Million gallons per day
MSGP	Multi-Sector General Permit
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
MQL	Minimum quantification level
O&G	Oil and grease
RRC	Railroad Commission of Texas
RP	Reasonable potential
SIC	Standard industrial classification
s.u.	Standard units (for parameter pH)
TAC	Texas Administrative Code
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
TSWQS	Texas Surface Water Quality Standards
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WQS	Water Quality Standards

## I. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

The proposed permit allows only the hydrostatic test discharge water from new pipelines and tanks associated with construction of the Corpus Christi Oil Storage Facility. The Corpus Christi Oil Storage facility is located at 5500 Up River Road, Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Texas.

Under the SIC code 1311, Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas, the applicant plans to operate a crude oil storage and transportation facility.

## II. DISCHARGE LOCATION

The discharge points showing Outfall number, discharge coordinates: latitude and longitude, county, average flow rate in millions gallons per day (MGD), receiving water, and the waterbody identification numbers are shown in the following table:

Outfall Reference Number	Discharge Coordinates Latitude Deg° Min' Sec" Longitude Deg° Min' Sec"	County	Average Flow MGD	Receiving Water	Segment #
001	27° 48' 54" N 97° 27' 39" W	Nueces	0.53	Corpus Christi's MS4 to Corpus Christi Inner Bay	Segment No. 2484

## III. DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION

This will be a new facility and no discharge has occurred. Therefore, no effluent data are available. However, the proposed discharge from Outfall 001 is described as follows:

Discharges from Outfall 001 are to Corpus Christi's MS4 to Corpus Christi Inner Bay, Segment No. 2484.

The designated uses of Corpus Christi Inner Harbor are noncontact recreation and intermediate aquatic life.

## 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.

It is proposed that the permit be issued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 122.46(a). This is a first-time permit issuance. An NPDES Application for a Permit to

Discharge (Form 1 & 2E) dated August 25, 2015, and October 6, 2015, respectively were received on August 31, 2015, and February 24, 2016, and was deemed administratively complete on November 4, 2015.

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

### **A. OVERVIEW of TECHNOLOGY-BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITION FOR PERMIT ISSUANCE**

Regulations contained in 40 CFR §122.44 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, on best professional judgment (BPJ) in the absence of guidelines, and/or requirements pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d), whichever are more stringent.

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

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.

There are no published ELG's for this type of activity. Permit limits are proposed based on BPJ. Since hydrostatic test water discharges are batch discharges of short term duration, limits in this Permit will be expressed in terms of daily maximum concentrations rather than in terms of mass limitations, as allowed by 40 CFR 122.45(e) and (f). Limitations for Oil & Grease, TSS, and pH are proposed in the permit. The proposed limitations for TSS are 45 mg/l daily maximum, and Oil & Grease is 15 mg/l daily maximum. Narrative standards for oil, grease, or related residue have been placed in the proposed permit. A technology-based limit of 15 mg/l for Oil and Grease should assure that the narrative criterion is maintained. Concentration limits will be protective of the stream uses.

## 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 Clean Water Act 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 criterion, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant. If the discharge poses the reasonable potential to cause an in-stream violation of narrative standards, the permit must contain prohibitions to protect that standard. Additionally, the TWQS found at 30 TAC Chapter 307 states that "surface waters will not be toxic to man from ingestion of water, consumption of aquatic organisms, or contact with the skin, or to terrestrial or aquatic life." The methodology outlined in the "Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards" (IP) is designed to ensure compliance with 30 TAC Chapter 307. Specifically, the methodology is designed to ensure that no source will be allowed to discharge any wastewater which: (1) results in instream aquatic toxicity; (2) causes a violation of an applicable narrative or numerical state water quality standard; (3) results in the endangerment of a drinking water supply; or (4) results in aquatic bioaccumulation which threatens human health.

The IP document is not a state water quality standard, but rather, a non-binding, non-regulatory guidance document. See IP at page 2 stating that "this is a guidance document and should not be interpreted as a replacement to the rules. The TWQS may be found in 30 TAC Sections (§§) 307.1-.10."). EPA does not consider the IP to be a new or revised water quality standard and has never approved it as such. EPA did comment on and conditionally "approve" the IP as part of the Continuing Planning Process (CPP) required under 40 CFR §130.5(c) and the Memorandum of Agreement between TCEQ and EPA, but this does not constitute approval of the IP as a water quality standard under CWA section 303(c). Therefore, EPA is not bound by the IP in establishing limits in this permit – but rather, must ensure that the limits are consistent with the EPA-approved state WQS. However, EPA has made an effort, where we believe the IP procedures are consistent with all applicable State and Federal regulations, to use those procedures.

The general criteria and numerical criteria which make up the stream standards are provided in the 2014 EPA-approved Texas Water Quality Standards, Texas Administrative Code (TAC), 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - 307.9, effective September 23, 2014.

#### 4. Reasonable Potential- Procedures

EPA develops draft permits to comply with State WQS, and for consistency, attempts to follow the IP where appropriate. However, EPA is bound by the State's WQS, not State guidance, including the IP, in determining permit decisions. EPA performs its own technical and legal review for permit issuance, to assure compliance with all applicable State and Federal requirements, including State WQS, and makes its determination based on that review. Waste load allocations (WLA's) are calculated using estimated effluent dilutions, criteria outlined in the TWQS, and partitioning coefficients for metals (when appropriate and designated in the implementation procedures). The WLA is the end-of-pipe effluent concentrations that can be discharged and still meet instream criteria after mixing with the receiving stream. From the WLA, a long term average (LTA) is calculated, for both chronic and acute toxicity, using a log normal probability distribution, a given coefficient of variation (0.6), and either a 90th or a 99th percentile confidence level. The 90th percentile confidence level is for discharges to rivers, freshwater streams and narrow tidal rivers with upstream flow data, and the 99th percentile confidence level is for the remainder of cases. For facilities that discharge into receiving streams that have human health standards, a separate LTA will be calculated. The implementation procedures for determining the human health LTA use a 99th percentile confidence level, along with a given coefficient of variation (0.6). The lowest of the calculated LTA; acute, chronic and/or human health, is used to calculate the daily average and daily maximum permit limits.

Procedures found in the IP for determining significant potential are to compare the reported analytical data either from the DMR history and/or the application information, against percentages of the calculated daily average water quality-based effluent limitation. If the average of the effluent data equals or exceeds 70% but is less than 85% of the calculated daily average limit, monitoring for the toxic pollutant will usually be included as a condition in the permit. If the average of the effluent data is equal to or greater than 85% of the calculated daily average limit, the permit will generally contain effluent limits for the toxic pollutant. The permit may specify a compliance period to achieve this limit if necessary.

Procedures found in the IP require review of the immediate receiving stream and effected downstream receiving waters. Further, if the discharge reaches a perennial stream or an intermittent stream with perennial pools within three-miles, chronic toxicity criteria apply at that confluence.

For Outfall 001, the hydrostatic test water will be drawn from the City of Corpus Christi and be discharged into Corpus Christi's MS4, then to Corpus Christi Inner Bay, Segment No. 2484. Intake credits are not allowed for Outfall 001, since the discharge will be obtained from municipal water supply and be discharged into Corpus Christi's MS4.

## 5. 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

Daily minimum and daily maximum permit limits of 6.0 standard units to 9.0 standard units are typically used on hydrostatic test general permits developed by other EPA Regions and States. TAC 307.10 states, "The pH criteria are listed as minimum and maximum values expressed in standard units at any site within the segment."

However, wastewater discharges from the facility will flow into unnamed ditch which is part of Corpus Christi's MS4 to Corpus Christi Inner Bay, Segment No. 2484, which has Texas WQS of 6.5 – 9.0 s.u. pH shall be limited to 6.5 – 9.0 s.u., the criteria listed for Segment 2484.

### b. Total Residual Chlorine

TRC shall be limited to 0.019 mg/l in Outfall 001 because the source water is from the City of Corpus Christi municipal water. 0.019 mg/l is EPA's acute criteria for chlorine. The effluent shall contain NO MEASURABLE total residual chlorine (TRC) at any time. NO MEASURABLE will be defined as no detectable concentration of TRC as determined by any approved method established in 40 CFR 136.

### c. Narrative Limitations

Narrative protection for aesthetic standards will require that surface waters shall be maintained so that oil, grease, or related residue will not produce a visible film or globules of grease on the surface or coat the banks or bottoms of the watercourse; or cause toxicity to man, aquatic life, or terrestrial life.

The following narrative limitations in the proposed permit represent protection of water quality for Outfall 001.

"The effluent shall contain no visible film of oil or globules of grease on the surface or coat the banks or bottoms of the watercourse."

### e. Toxics

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.

The applicant proposes to draw water from a municipal water supply, to conduct its hydrostatic testing. Hydrostatic test water will contact only new pipe, and no chemicals or additives will be added. As a result, no contaminants are expected to be present in the hydrostatic test water discharge at amounts that would pose a reasonable potential to exceed State WQS.

## Solids and Foam

The prohibition of the discharge of floating solids or visible foam in other than trace amounts is proposed in the draft permit. In addition, there shall be no discharge of visible films of oil, globules of oil, grease or solids in or on the water, or coatings on stream banks.

### D. 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). The monitoring frequencies are based on BPJ, taking into account the nature of the facility.

For Outfall 001, monitoring for flow, TSS, Oil & Grease, total residual chlorine and pH shall be daily by grab sample, when discharging.

### E. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY LIMITATIONS

There are no chemical specific limitations in the draft permit and the applicant has stated that no chemical additives such as corrosion inhibitors are being added to the HT water. There does not appear that the discharge will have a potential for toxicity. The draft permit does not propose any biomonitoring of the HT water.

### F. FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

See the draft permit for limitations.

## VI. FACILITY OPERATIONAL PRACTICES

### A. WASTE WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall institute programs directed towards pollution prevention. The permittee will institute programs to improve the operating efficiency and extend the useful life of the treatment system.

### B. OPERATION AND REPORTING

The permittee must submit Discharge Monitoring Report's (DMR's) quarterly, beginning on the effective date of the permit, lasting through the expiration date of the permit or termination of the permit, to report on all limitations and monitoring requirements in the permit.

The permittee must submit monitoring results to EPA on either the electronic or paper Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) approved formats. Monitoring results can be submitted electronically in lieu of the paper DMR Form. All DMRs shall be electronically reported effective December 21, 2016, per 40 CFR 127.16. To submit electronically, access the NetDMR website at [www.epa.gov/netdmr](http://www.epa.gov/netdmr) and contact the [R6NetDMR@epa.gov](mailto:R6NetDMR@epa.gov) in-box for further instructions. Until the permittee is approved for Net DMR, it must report on the Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) Form EPA. No. 3320-1 in accordance with the "General Instructions" provided on the form. No additional copies are needed if reporting electronically, however when submitting paper form EPA No. 3320-1, the permittee shall submit the original DMR signed and certified as

required by Part III.D.11 and all other reports required by Part III.D. to the EPA and other agencies as required. (See Part III.D.IV of the permit.)

#### Electronic Reporting Rule

The EPA published the electronic reporting rule in the federal register (80 FR 64063) on October 22, 2015. The rule became effective on December 21, 2015. One year after the effective date of the final rule, NPDES regulated entities that are required to submit DMRs (including majors and non-majors, individually permitted facilities and facilities covered by general permits) must do so electronically. EPA and authorized NPDES programs will begin electronically receiving these DMRs from all DMR filers and start sharing these data with each other.

#### Sufficiently Sensitive Analytical Methods (SSM)

The permittee must use sufficiently sensitive EPA-approved analytical methods (SSM) (under 40 CFR part 136 or required under 40 CFR chapter I, subchapters N or O) when quantifying the presence of pollutants in a discharge for analyses of pollutants or pollutant parameters under the permit. In case the approved methods are not sufficiently sensitive to the limits, the most SSM with the lowest method detection limit (MDL) must be used as defined under 40 CFR 122.44(i)(1)(iv)(A). If no analytical laboratory is able to perform a test satisfying the SSM in the region, the most SSM with the lowest MDL must be used after adequate demonstrations by the permittee and EPA approval.

### **VII. IMPAIRED WATER - 303(d) LIST AND TMDL**

The receiving stream for Outfall 001, unnamed ditch which is part of Corpus Christi's MS4 to Corpus Christi Inner Bay, Segment No. 2484 is not listed in the 2014 State of Texas 303(d) List for Assessed River/Stream Reaches Requiring Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

The discharge water will not be treated with biocides or other additives. Therefore, no additional requirements beyond the previously described technology-based or water quality-based effluent limitations and monitoring requirements, are established in the proposed permit.

### **VIII. ANTIDEGRADATION**

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, Antidegradation, Title 30, Part 1, Chapter 307, Rule §307.5 sets forth the requirements to protect designated uses through implementation of the State WQS. The limitations and monitoring requirements set forth in the proposed permit are developed from the State WQS 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 permit requirements are protective of the assimilative capacity of the receiving waters, which is protective of the designated uses of that water.

### **IX. ANTIBACKSLIDING**

This is a first-time permit issuance.

## **X. ENDANGERED SPECIES**

The effects of EPA's permitting action are considered in the context of the environmental baseline. The environmental baseline is established by the past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in an action area; the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in an action area that have already undergone formal or early ESA §7 consultation; and the impact of State or private actions that are contemporaneous with the consultation in process (50 CFR §402.02). Hydrostatic test water discharges occur after a pipeline has already been put in place following earth disturbing activities that have had to have received appropriate federal, state, and local authorizations putting the construction of pipeline itself into the environmental baseline. The scope of the evaluation of the effects of the discharge authorized by this permit was therefore limited to the effects related to the authorized discharge.

According to the most recent county listing available at US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Southwest Region 2 website, at <http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/wizard/chooseLocation!prepare.action>, fifteen species are listed as threatened or endangered in Nueces County. They are 5 reptiles, 3 mammals, 5 birds, and 2 flowering plants. A description of the species and its effects to the proposed permit follows:

### **GREEN SEA TURTLE (*Chelonia mydas*)**

Green Sea Turtle is found in Nueces County. Sea turtles are graceful saltwater reptiles, well adapted to life in their marine world. With streamlined bodies and flipper-like limbs, they are graceful swimmers able to navigate across the oceans. When they are active, sea turtles must swim to the ocean surface to breathe every few minutes. When they are resting, they can remain underwater for much longer periods of time. Although sea turtles live most of their lives in the ocean, adult females must return to land in order to lay their eggs. Sea turtles often travel long distances from their feeding grounds to their nesting beaches. Human threats include: oil spills, live bottom smothering with sediments and drilling fluids, dredging, coastal development, agricultural and industrial pollution, seagrass bed degradation, shrimp trawling and other fisheries, boat collisions, under water explosions, ingestion of marine debris, entanglement in marine debris, and poaching.

### **HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)**

Hawksbill sea turtle is found in Nueces County. Hawksbill is a small to medium-sized sea turtle averaging approximately 2.8 feet in curved carapace length with a weight of approximately 176 pounds. Hawksbills reenter coastal waters when they reach approximately 20-25 cm carapace length. Coral reefs are widely recognized as the resident foraging habitat of juveniles, sub-adults and adults. This habitat association is undoubtedly related to their diet of sponges, which need solid substrate for attachment. The ledges and caves of the reef provide shelter for resting both during the day and night. Hawksbills are also found around rocky outcrops and high energy shoals, which are also optimum sites for sponge growth. Hawksbills are also known to inhabit mangrove-fringed bays and estuaries, particularly along the eastern shore of continents where coral reefs are absent. In Texas, juvenile hawksbills are associated with stone jetties. Hawksbills utilize both low- and high-energy nesting beaches in tropical oceans of the world. Both insular and mainland nesting sites are known. Hawksbills will nest on small pocket beaches and, because of their small body size and great agility can traverse fringing reefs that limit access by other species. They exhibit a wide tolerance for nesting substrate type. Nests are typically placed

under vegetation. Threats to this species include: poaching, oil spills, vessel anchoring and groundings, artificial lighting at nesting sites, mechanical beach cleaning, increased human presence, beach vehicular driving, entanglement at sea, ingestion of marine debris, commercial and recreational fisheries, water craft collisions, sedimentation and siltation, and agricultural and industrial pollution.

#### **KEMP'S RIDLEY SEA TURTLE (*Lepidochelys kempii*)**

Kemp's ridley sea turtle is found in Nueces County. Kemp's ridley sea turtles are the smallest of all extant sea turtles. Adult Kemp's ridleys' shells are almost as wide as long. Neonatal Kemp's ridleys feed on the available sargassum and associated infauna or other epipelagic species found in the Gulf of Mexico. In post-pelagic stages, the ridley is largely a crab-eater, with a preference for portunid crabs. Age at sexual maturity is not known, but is believed to be approximately 7-15 years, although other estimates of age at maturity range as high as 35 years. The major nesting beach for Kemp's ridleys is on the northeastern coast of Mexico. This location is near Rancho Nuevo in southern Tamaulipas. The species occurs mainly in coastal areas of the Gulf of Mexico and the northwestern Atlantic Ocean. Hunting of both turtles and eggs contributed to the decline of this species. Existing threats include: development and human encroachment of nesting beaches, erosion of beaches, vehicular traffic on beaches, fisheries, oil spills, floating debris, dredging, and explosive removal of old oil and gas platforms.

#### **LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE (*Dermochelys coriacea*)**

Leatherback sea turtle is found in Nueces County. Leatherback is the largest living turtle, and is so distinctive as to be placed in a separate taxonomic family, Dermochelyidae. The carapace is distinguished by a rubber-like texture, about 4 cm thick, and made primarily of tough, oil-saturated connective tissue. No sharp angle is formed between the carapace and the plastron, resulting in the animal being somewhat barrel-shaped. The front flippers are proportionally longer than in any other sea turtle. Nesting occurs from February - July with sites located from Georgia to the U.S. Virgin Islands. During the summer, leatherbacks tend to be found along the east coast of the U.S. from the Gulf of Maine south to the middle of Florida.

Leatherbacks become entangled in longlines, fish traps, buoy anchor lines and other ropes and cables. This can lead to serious injuries and/or death by drowning. Leatherback turtles eat a wide variety of marine debris such as plastic bags, plastic and styrofoam pieces, tar balls, balloons and plastic pellets. Effects of consumption include interference in metabolism or gut function, even at low levels of ingestion, as well as absorption of toxic byproducts. Leatherbacks are vulnerable to boat collisions and strikes, particularly when in waters near shore. Marine turtles are at risk when encountering an oil spill. Respiration, skin, blood chemistry and salt gland functions are affected.

#### **LOGGERHEAD SEA TURTLE (*Caretta caretta*)**

Loggerhead sea turtle is found in Nueces County. Loggerheads are the most abundant species in U.S. coastal waters, and are often captured incidental to shrimp trawling. Shrimping is thought to have played a significant role in the population declines observed for the loggerhead. Maturity is reached at between 16-40 years. Mating takes place in late March-early June, and eggs are laid throughout the summer.

Loggerheads are circumglobal, inhabiting continental shelves, bays, estuaries, and lagoons in

temperate, subtropical, and tropical waters. In the United States, killing of nesting loggerheads is infrequent. However, in a number of areas, egg poaching is common. Erosion of nesting beaches can result in loss of nesting habitat. Loggerhead turtles eat a wide variety of marine debris such as plastic bags, plastic and styrofoam pieces, tar balls, balloons and raw plastic pellets. Effects of consumption include interference in metabolism or gut function, even at low levels of ingestion, as well as absorption of toxic byproducts. Turtles are taken by gillnet fisheries in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Several thousand vessels are involved in hook and line fishing for various coastal species. Sea turtles are at risk when encountering an oil spill. Respiration, skin, blood chemistry and salt gland functions are affected. Pesticides, heavy metals and PCB's have been detected in turtles and eggs, but the effect on them is unknown. Turtles have been caught in saltwater intake systems of coastal power plants. The mortality rate is estimated at 2%. Underwater explosions can kill or injure turtles, and may destroy or damage habitat. The effects of offshore lights are not known. They may attract hatchlings and interfere with proper offshore orientation, increasing the risk from predators. Turtles get caught in discarded fishing gear. The number affected is unknown, but potentially significant.

### **PIPING PLOVER (*Charadrius melodus*)**

Piping Plover is listed in Nueces County as endangered and threatened. A small plover has wings approximately 117 mm; tail 51 mm; weight 46-64 g (average 55 g); length averages about 17-18 cm. Inland birds have more complete breast band than Atlantic coast birds. The non-breeding plovers lose the dark bands. The breeding season begins when the adults reach the breeding grounds in mid- to late April or in mid May in northern parts of the range. The adult males arrive earliest, select beach habitats, and defend established territories against other males. When adult females arrive at the breeding grounds several weeks later, the males conduct elaborate courtship rituals including aerial displays of circles and figure eights, whistling song, posturing with spread tail and wings, and rapid drumming of feet. The plovers defend territory during breeding season and at some winter sites. Nesting territory may or may not contain the foraging area. Home range during the breeding season generally is confined to the vicinity of the nest. Plovers are usually found in sandy beaches, especially where scattered grass tufts are present, and sparsely vegetated shores and islands of shallow lakes, ponds, rivers, and impoundments.

Food consists of worms, fly larvae, beetles, crustaceans, mollusks, and other invertebrates. The plovers prefer open shoreline areas, and vegetated beaches are avoided. It also eats various small invertebrates. It obtains food from surface of substrate, or occasionally probes into sand or mud.

Destruction of habitat, disturbance and increased predation rates due to elevated predator densities in piping plover habitat are described as the main reasons for this species' endangered status and continue to be the primary threats to its recovery. The remaining populations, whether on the breeding or wintering grounds, mostly inhabit public or undeveloped beaches. These populations are vulnerable to predation and disturbance.

Research of available material finds that the primary cause for the population decreases leading to threatened or endangered status for these species is destruction of habitat. Issuance of the permit will have no effect on this species, in that the discharge is not expected to lead to the destruction of habitat.

**WHOOPING CRANE (*Grus americana*)**

The tallest bird in North America, the Whooping Crane breeds in the wetlands of Wood Buffalo National Park in northern Canada and spends the winter on the Texas coast at Arkansas National Wildlife Refuge near Rockport. Cranes live in family groups made up of the parents and 1 or 2 offspring. In the spring, Whooping Cranes perform courtship displays (loud calling, wing flapping, and leaps in the air) as they get ready to migrate to their breeding grounds. Whooping Cranes are endangered because much of their wetland habitat has been drained for farmland and pasture. Whooping Cranes are nearly 5 feet tall. They eat Blue crabs, clams, frogs, minnows, rodents, small birds, and berries. They are found in large wetland areas. Cranes are considered sacred in many parts of the world. In China, they are a symbol of long life.

**JAGUARUNDI, GULF COAST (*Herpailurus Yagouaroundi Cacomitli*)**

The Jaguarundi is a small weasel-like wild cat with short rounded ears. It is also called Otter cats because of their shot legs, slender elongated bodies, and small flattened heads, giving them an otter-like appearance. They prefer lowland brush areas close to water or dense tropical areas as their habitat. They are good tree climbers and swimmers. Jaguarundis eat fish that they catch from streams and rivers. Mating occurs from September to November. The cat is suffering decline due to loss of habitat.

EPA has determined that the re-issuance of the permit will have “no effect” on the Gulf Coast Jaguarundi based on the limited information available on the species which indicates that in Texas, any current presence of jaguarundi apparently is confined to the southernmost four counties of Cameron, Willacy, Hidalgo and Starr.

**OCELOT (*Leopardus Pardalis*)**

The ocelot is a small cat, ranging from 15 to 30 pounds and measuring an average 3 feet 9 inches in length. Its coat has black spots, bars, and stripes on a rich tan to gray background, with irregular black dots on a white underside and dark bars on the tail. The ocelot is listed endangered due to habitat alteration and loss (primarily due to brush clearing), and predator control activities. EPA has determined that the issuance of the permit will have “no effect” on the Ocelot.

**NORTHEERN APLOMADO FALCON (*Falco femoralis septentrionalis*)**

The aplomado falcon has a steel grey back, red breast, black "sash" on its belly, and striking black markings on the top of its head, around its eyes, and extending down its face.

Aplomado falcons are most often seen in pairs. They do not build their own nests, but use stick nests built by other birds. Pairs work together to find prey and flush it from cover. Aplomados eat mostly birds and insects. They are fast fliers, and often chase prey animals as they try to escape into dense grass. They live up to 20 years in captivity.

Aplomado falcons require open grassland or savannah habitat with scattered trees or shrubs. Severe overgrazing by domestic livestock and resultant brush encroachment in the Southwest, including Texas, has been most frequently implicated as the principal cause for the species' decline. Direct adverse effects of livestock grazing on potential falcon prey species have also been suggested as a possible cause. However, a recent review of the history of livestock trends and practices and other ecological factors in the Southwest in relation to the decline of Aplomados suggests different causes. Climate change may also be a reason for the falcons

decline. Organophosphate pesticides are still heavily used throughout the range of the Aplomado Falcon, including in the U.S., and remain a serious threat to Aplomados.

**RED KNOT (*Calidris Canutus rufa*)**

Red Knot is a medium-sized shorebird and the largest of the "peeps" in North America, and one of the most colorful. It makes one of the longest yearly migrations of any bird, traveling 15,000 km (9,300 mile) from its Arctic breeding grounds to Tierra del Fuego in southern South America.

Their diet varies according to season; arthropods and larvae are the preferred food items at the breeding grounds, while various hard-shelled molluscs are consumed at other feeding sites at other times.

The Red Knot nests on the ground, near water, and usually inland. The nest is a shallow scrape lined with leaves, lichens and moss. Males construct three to five nest scrapes in their territories prior to the arrival of the females. The female lays three or more usually four eggs, apparently laid over the course of six days. Both parents incubate the eggs, sharing the duties equally. The incubation period last around 22 days.

The birds have become threatened as a result of commercial harvesting of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay which began in the early 1990s. Delaware Bay is a critical stopover point during spring migration; the birds refuel by eating the eggs laid by these crabs (with little else to eat in the Delaware Bay).

**LEAST TERN (*Sterna Antillarum*)**

The Least tern populations have declined due to habitat destruction by permanent inundation, destruction by reservoir releases, channelization projects, alterations of Natural River or lake dynamics resulting in vegetational succession of potential nesting sites, and recreational use of potential nesting sites. Issuance of this permit is found to have no impact on the habitat of this species, as none of the aforementioned listed activities is authorized by this permitting action.

**SOUTH TEXAS AMBROSIA (*Ambrosia Cheiranthifolia*)**

South Texas ambrosia is an erect, silvery to grayish-green, perennial, herbaceous plant, 4 to 12 inches in height. Its' simple leaves, about 3 inches long and 1.5 inches wide, are usually opposite on the lower portion of the plant and alternate above. Male and female flowers are separate but occur on the same plant. Male flowers are in heads arranged along a terminal, elongated stem. Flower stalks contain 10-20 small, yellowish, bud-like flowers, about 1/4 inch across and shaped like hanging bowls. Female flowers are in small clusters at the leaf bases below the male flowering stalks.

South Texas ambrosia occurs in open grasslands or savannas on soils varying from clay loams to sandy loams. It may occur in association with slender rush-pea, which is also federally-listed as endangered.

Associated native grasses found at the existing sites include Texas grama, buffalograss, Texas wintergrass, and tobosa. Native woody species found scattered throughout the existing sites include mesquite, huisache, huisachillo, brasil, granjeno, and lotebush. While south Texas ambrosia does not appear to survive continual plowing, sporadic disturbance may enhance its growth and spread.

Loss of habitat has led to the decline of this species. Conversion of habitat to agricultural fields and urban areas has limited the amount of habitat available for colonization. In addition, introduced species such as buffelgrass and King Ranch bluestem compete with this and other natives of the coastal prairie. Invasion of grasslands by shrub and tree species also contributes to loss of available habitat, although the species does occur among scattered woody plants. Disturbance associated with activities occurring along road right-of-ways where the species is found, may also be detrimental.

**SLENDER RUSH PEA (*Hoffmannseggia tenella*)**

Slender rush-pea is a perennial legume, 3-6 inches tall, with spreading stems. Leaves are twice compound, with 3-7 primary divisions each with 5-6 pairs of leaflets. The tiny leaflets are oblong, about 1/8 inch long, and slightly hairy on the under surface. Three to five salmon to orange-colored flowers, about 1/4 inch long, occur on each flowering stalk. Each flower has 5 egg-shaped petals and 10 stamens. Seed pods are straight, about 1/2 inch long and 1/4 inch wide, and densely covered with fine hairs.

Slender rush-pea grows on clayey soil of blackland prairies and creek banks in association with short and midgrasses such as buffalograss, Texas wintergrass, and Texas grama. Woody plants such as mesquite, huisache, huisachillo, spiny hackberry, brasil, retama, lotebush, tasajillo, and prickly pear are also common at the known sites.

It sometimes occurs in association with another endangered species, the south Texas 6 (*Ambrosia cheiranthifolia*). The use of herbicides for right-of-way maintenance poses a threat to this species. Conversion of coastal prairie habitat to other land uses is likely the most important factor contributing to the decline of slender rush-pea.

**WEST INDIAN MANATEE (*Trichechus manatus*)**

West Indian manatees are large, gray aquatic mammals with bodies that taper to a flat, paddle-shaped tail. They have two forelimbs, called flippers, with three to four nails on each flipper. Their head and face are wrinkled with whiskers on the snout. The manatee's closest relatives are the elephant and the hyrax. Manatees are believed to have evolved from a wading, plant-eating animal. The average adult manatee is about 10 feet long and weighs between 800 and 1,200 pounds.

Manatees can be found in shallow, slow-moving rivers, estuaries, saltwater bays, canals, and coastal areas — particularly where seagrass beds or freshwater vegetation flourish. Manatees are a migratory species.

Manatees are gentle and slow-moving animals. Most of their time is spent eating, resting, and traveling. Manatee are mostly herbivorous, however small fish and invertebrates can sometimes be ingested along with a manatee's normal vegetation diet.

West Indian manatees have no natural enemies, and it is believed they can live 60 years or more. As with all wild animal populations, a certain percentage of manatee mortality is attributed to natural causes of death such as cold stress, gastrointestinal disease, pneumonia, and other diseases. A high number of additional fatalities are from human-related causes. Most human-related manatee fatalities occur from collisions with watercraft. Other causes of human-related manatee mortality include being crushed and/or drowned in canal locks and flood control structures; ingestion of fish hooks, litter, and monofilament line; and entanglement in crab trap

lines. Ultimately, loss of habitat is the most serious threat facing manatees in the United States today.

#### Determination

Many of the threats to listed threatened or endangered species are related to activities in coastal areas and will not be affected by the proposed discharges. Those threats include: oil spills, live bottom smothering with sediments and drilling fluids, dredging, coastal development, agricultural and industrial pollution, seagrass bed degradation, shrimp trawling and other fisheries, boat collisions, under water explosions, ingestion of marine debris, entanglement in marine debris, commercial and recreational fisheries, water craft collisions, sedimentation and siltation, commercial harvesting of horseshoe crabs, and occasional mowing or burning. The discharges proposed to be authorized by the permit issuance will not affect those threats to threatened or endangered turtle species.

The Environmental Protection Agency has evaluated the potential effects of issuance of this permit upon listed endangered or threatened species. 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. No pollutants are identified by the permittee-submitted application at levels which might affect species habitat or prey species. Issuance of this permit is found to have no impact on the habitats of these species.
2. Based on information described above, EPA Region 6 has determined that discharges proposed to be authorized by the proposed permit will have no effect on the listed species in Nueces County.

The standard reopener clause in the permit will allow EPA to reopen the permit and impose additional limitations if it is determined that changes in species or knowledge of the discharge would require different permit conditions.

## **XI. HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS**

In a letter from the facility to EPA, dated February 19, 2016, the facility affirmed that based on available data from the National Park Service’s (NPS’) National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the Texas Historical Commission’s Archeological and Historic Sites Atlas, no archaeological sites, structures, or historic properties are known to occur on the project site. The facility also stated that no ground disturbance will occur as a direct result of the discharge. Therefore the issuance of the permit will have no impact on historical and/or archeological preservation.

## **XII. PERMIT REOPENER**

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if relevant portions of the Texas WQS are revised or remanded. In addition, the permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if relevant procedures implementing the WQS are either revised or promulgated. Should the State adopt a new WQS, and/or develop a TMDL, this permit may be reopened to establish effluent limitations for the parameter(s) to be consistent with that approved

State standard and/or water quality management plan, in accordance with 40 CFR §122.44(d). Modification of the permit is subject to the provisions of 40 CFR §124.5.

### **XIII. VARIANCE REQUESTS**

No variance requests have been received.

### **XIV. COMPLIANCE HISTORY**

This is a first-time permit issuance.

### **XV. CERTIFICATION**

This 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.

### **XVI. FINAL DETERMINATION**

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

### **XVII. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

#### **A. APPLICATION**

NPDES Application for Permit to Discharge, Form 1 & 2E, received on August 31, 2015. Additional Permit application information received on February 24, 2016.

#### **B. State of Texas References**

The State of Texas Water Quality Inventory, 13th Edition, Publication No. SFR-50, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, December 1996.

"Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards via Permitting," Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, June 2010.

Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - 307.9, effective September 23, 2014.

#### **C. Endangered Species References**

[http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/ES\\_Lists\\_Main.cfm](http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/ES_Lists_Main.cfm)

<http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/huntwild/wild/species/aplomfal/>

<http://www.savethemanatee.org/manfcts.htm>

#### D. 40 CFR CITATIONS

Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, and 136

#### E. MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Dorothy Brown, EPA, to Mr. Warren Fusilier, Director of Environmental and Regulatory Compliance, Corpus Christi Oil Storage facility, dated November 4, 2015, informing applicant that its' NPDES application received August 31, 2015, is administratively complete.

Letter from Mr. Warren Fusilier, Director of Environmental and Regulatory Compliance, Corpus Christi Oil Storage facility, dated February 19, 2016, to Maria Okpala, EPA, on additional facility information.

Letter from Dorothy Brown, EPA, to Mr. Warren Fusilier, Director of Environmental and Regulatory Compliance, Corpus Christi Oil Storage facility, dated December 18, 2015, informing applicant that its' NPDES application received August 31, 2015, is administratively incomplete.

Email from Robert Kirkland, EPA, to Maria Okpala, EPA, dated November 4, 2015, on critical condition information.