ADEQ Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

# DRAFT FACT SHEET

## ARIZONA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (AZPDES)

This document gives pertinent information concerning the reissuance of the AZPDES permit listed below. This facility is an electric power generating station and thus is considered to be a major facility under the NPDES program. The effluent limitations contained in this permit will maintain the Water Quality Standards listed in Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) R18-11-101 et. seq. This permit is proposed to be issued for a period of 5 years.

| | |
|---|---|
| Permittee's Name: | Salt River Project (SRP)<br>Agricultural Improvement and Power District |
| Permittee's Mailing Address: | P.O. Box 52025<br>Mail Station: AFS200<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85072 |
| Facility Name: | Agua Fria Generating Station (AFGS) |
| Facility Address or Location: | 7302 W. Northern Ave.<br>Glendale, AZ 85303 |
| County: | Maricopa |
| Contact Person(s):<br>Phone/e-mail address | Sara McCoy, Plant Manager<br>(602) 236-3941 |
| AZPDES Permit Number: | AZ0023531 |
| Inventory Number: | 100774 |

| **I. STATUS OF PERMIT(s)** | |
|---|---|
| AZPDES permit applied for: | Renewal |
| Date application received: | **12/12/2016** |
| Date application was determined administratively complete: | 12/13/2016 |
| Previous permit expiration date: | June 12, 2017 |
| **208 Consistency:**<br>208 Plan consistency is not required for industrial facilities. | |

DRAFT

| II. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION | |
|---|---|
| Type of Facility: | Major industrial (electric generating power plant) |
| Facility Location Description: | 7302 West Northern Avenue, Glendale, Arizona 85303 |
| Treatment Processes: | Raw water is used directly for cooling tower makeup. High purity water, used for the steam boilers and combustion turbines, is processed from raw water through a series of multimedia (sand and glass) filters, water softener vessels, reverse osmosis (RO) membranes and a demineralizer system to remove suspended and dissolved solids to produce an essentially mineral free water. |
| Nature of facility discharge: | Multimedia filter backwash, water softener rinse water, RO reject water, demineralizer reject water and air washer drainage water are sent to the outfall via AFGS' drain system. All these wastewaters constitute low volume wastes ("LVW"). Various other LVWs generated from sinks and floor drains, bearing cooling water tanks, water test laboratory sink, maintenance shop, raw water overflow from the storage ponds, and boiler blowdown from three steam units are generated within AFGS and ultimately discharged at the outfall. All floor drains are routed through a 1,000-gallon oil/water interceptor prior to discharge. Oil is removed from the interceptor and is recycled offsite. |
| Average flow per discharge: | The maximum blowdown from the three cooling towers is estimated to be approximately 3.155 MGD while the total volume of LVW is estimated at approximately 0.381 MGD. Maximum blowdown from steam unit boilers is approximately 0.254 MGD. |
| Reuse / irrigation or other disposal method(s): | NA |
| Continuous or intermittent discharge: | Continuous |

AFGS consists of six electric generating units. Units 1, 2, and 3 are steam electric boilers. Units 1 and 2 commenced operation in the late 1950's, and are each rated at approximately 113MW. Unit 3 began operation in 1961 and is rated at approximately 181 MW. Each of these units has a mechanical induced draft cooling tower. Units 4, 5, and 6 are simple cycle combustion turbines. All three units commenced operation in the mid 1970's. Unit 4, 5 and 6 are rated at approximately 69 MW. All six of the units use natural gas as primary fuel. Diesel fuel is maintained as an emergency fuel.

The three steam units, including cooling towers, are operated when power demands are high, during power system emergencies or when more economical energy sources are not available. The cooling tower water is treated with a variety of materials to retard algae growth and to reduce the corrosive and scaling action of the water. Blowdown of the cooling towers occur as solids build up from evaporation. Several conditioners and corrosion inhibitors are also used to pretreat boiler water in low concentrations. Blowdown from the steam unit boilers provides significant wastewater flow. Wastewater from the three combustion turbines consists of insignificant drainage from the air washers. Air washers utilize demineralized water and no chemicals are introduced. The unit load and related wastewater discharges will vary with power system demands.

Domestic water use at the plant is supplied by the City of Peoria; domestic waste generated at the plant is discharged into the City of Glendale's sanitary sewer system. No plant process wastewater is discharged to

DRAFT

Glendale. Source water used for steam electric power generation is obtained from four groundwater wells located onsite or near AFGS.

Ground water is pumped to the plant's raw water storage ponds. Pumping rates are regulated to control pond levels, with high level overflows discharging into the south drainage ditch. The storage ponds provide the make-up to all plant process water systems.

## III. RECEIVING WATER

The State of Arizona has adopted water quality standards to protect the designated uses of its surface waters. Streams have been divided into segments and designated uses assigned to these segments. The water quality standards vary by designated use depending on the level of protection required to maintain that use.

| | |
|---|---|
| Receiving Water : | SRP Lateral 20, part of the Phoenix Area Canals |
| River Basin: | Middle Gila |
| Outfall Location(s): | Outfall 001: Township 3N, Range 1E, Section 36<br>Latitude 33˚33' 17.5" N, Longitude 112˚ 13' 10.4" W |

The outfall discharges to, or the discharge may reach, a surface water listed in Appendix B of A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1.

| | |
|---|---|
| Designated uses for the receiving water listed above: | Agricultural Irrigation (AgI)<br>Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL) |
| Is the receiving water on the 303(d) list? | No, and there are no TMDL issues associated. |

Given the uses stated above, the applicable narrative water quality standards are described in A.A.C. R18-11-108, and the applicable numeric water quality standards are listed in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and in Appendix A thereof. In developing AZPDES permits, the standards for all applicable designated uses are compared and limits that will protect for all applicable designated uses are developed based on the standards.

## IV. DESCRIPTION OF DISCHARGE

Because the facility is in operation and discharges have occurred, effluent monitoring data are available. The following is the measured effluent quality reported in the application.

| **Parameters** | **Units** | **Maximum Daily Discharge Concentration** |
|---|---|---|
| Arsenic | µg/L | 24.2 |
| Copper | µg/L | 82.2 |
| Selenium | µg/L | 7.8 |

DRAFT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Zinc | µg/L | 232 |
| Hardness | mg/L | 1500 |
| pH | S.U. | 8.55 |

| **V. STATUS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE EXISTING AZPDES PERMIT** | |
|---|---|
| Date of most recent inspection: | 11/9/2016; no potential violations were noted as a result of this inspection. |
| DMR files reviewed: | July, 2012 through August, 2016. |
| Lab reports reviewed: | July, 2012 through August, 2016. |
| NOVs issued: | None |
| NOVs closed: | N/A |
| Compliance orders: | None |

**VI. PROPOSED PERMIT CHANGES**

The following table lists the major changes from the previous permit in this draft permit.

| **Parameter** | **Existing Permit** | **Proposed permit** | **Reason for change** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reporting Location | Mail in hard copies of DMRs and other attachments | DMRs and other reports to be submitted electronically through myDEQ portal. | Language added to support the NPDES electronic DMR reporting rule that became effective on December 21, 2015. |
| Copper | Limited | Discharge Characterization | Data submitted indicated no reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard. |
| Selenium | Discharge Characterization | Limited | Data submitted indicated reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard. |
| Special Conditions-Chemical Additives | Changes in chemical use required to be submitted 3 months prior to use for approval. | No pre-approval is required. Notification of changes within one day of use. | ADEQ determined the requirement for SRP to get chemical additive approvals during the permit term was an unnecessary burden and not a regulatory requirement. |

DRAFT

Anti-backsliding considerations – "Anti-backsliding" refers to statutory (Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act) and regulatory (40 CFR 122.44(l)) requirements that prohibit the renewal, reissuance, or modification of an existing NPDES permit that contains effluent limits, permit conditions, or standards that are less stringent than those established in the previous permit. The rules and statutes do identify exceptions to these circumstances where backsliding is acceptable. This permit has been reviewed and drafted with consideration of anti-backsliding concerns.

Limits for copper have been removed from the permit because evaluation of current data allows the conclusion that no reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard exists.

This is considered allowable backsliding under 303(d)(4). The effluent limitations in the current permit for copper were based on state standards, the respective receiving waters are in attainment for these parameters, and the revisions are consistent with antidegradation requirements. See Section XII for information regarding antidegradation requirements.

Limits are retained in the draft permit for parameters where reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard continues to exist or is indeterminate. In these cases, limits will be recalculated using the most current Arizona Water Quality Standards (WQS). If less stringent limits result due to a change in the WQS then backsliding is allowed in accordance with 303(d)(4) if the new limits are consistent with antidegradation requirements and the receiving water is in attainment of the new standard; see Section XII for information regarding antidegradation requirements.

No limits are less stringent due to a change in the WQS in this permit.

## VII. DETERMINATION OF EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS and ASSESSMENT LEVELS

When determining what parameters need monitoring and/or limits included in the draft permit, both technology-based and water quality-based criteria were compared and the more stringent criteria applied.

**Technology-based Limitations**: As outlined in 40 CFR Part 423 and incorporated by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905 (A) (9):
The regulations found at 40 CFR Part 423 require that steam electric power generating plants achieve specified treatment standards for pH, TSS, oil and grease, FAC, chromium, and zinc based on the type of treatment technology available. These parameters will be monitored with technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) as applicable at the external outfall.

No detectable amount of any of the 126 priority pollutants may be contained in any chemical added for cooling tower blowdown except for chromium and zinc at the maximum levels of 200 and 1,000 μg/L, respectively. The regulations further prohibit discharge of any polychlorinated biphenyl compounds (PCBs) such as those historically used in transformer fluid. These provisions have been applied based on Best Practicable Control Technology (BPT) currently available and Best Available Technology (BAT) economically achievable. Additionally, Part 8.O.7 of the *AZPDES Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges* requires any discharge of stormwater achieve a specified technology-based benchmark for iron.

DRAFT

**Numeric Water Quality Standards**: As outlined in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and Appendix A:
Per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(ii), (iii) and (iv), discharge limits must be included in the permit for parameters with "reasonable potential" (RP), that is, those known to be or expected to be present in the effluent at a level that could potentially cause any applicable numeric water quality standard to be exceeded. RP refers to the possibility, based on the statistical calculations using the data submitted, or consideration of other factors to determine whether the discharge may exceed the Water Quality Standards. The procedures used to determine RP are outlined in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD)* (EPA/505/2-90-001). In most cases, the highest reported value for a parameter is multiplied by a factor (determined from the variability of the data and number of samples) to determine a "highest estimated value". This value is then compared to the lowest applicable Water Quality Standard for the receiving water. If the value is greater than the standard, RP exists and a water quality-based effluent limitation (WQBEL) is required in the permit for that parameter. RP may also be determined from Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) based on knowledge of the treatment facilities and other factors. The basis for the RP determination for each parameter with a WQBEL is shown in the table below.

The proposed permit limits were established using a methodology developed by EPA. Long Term Averages (LTA) were calculated for each designated use and the lowest LTA was used to calculate the average monthly limit (AML) and maximum daily limit (MDL) necessary to protect all uses. This methodology takes into account criteria, effluent variability, and the number of observations taken to determine compliance with the limit and is described in Chapter 5 of the TSD. Limits based on A&W criteria were developed using the "two-value steady state wasteload allocation" described on page 99 of the TSD. When the limit is based on human health criteria, the monthly average was set at the level of the applicable standard and a daily maximum limit was determined as specified in Section 5.4.4 of the TSD.

**Mixing Zone:** The limits in this permit were determined without the use of a mixing zone. Arizona state water quality rules require that water quality standards be achieved without mixing zones unless the permittee applies for and is approved for a mixing zone. Since a mixing zone was not applied for or granted, all water quality criteria are applied at end-of-pipe.

**Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET):** ADEQ no longer requires WET testing if the receiving water has no aquatic and wildlife designated uses. Although the narrative standard prohibiting the discharge of toxic pollutants applies to all discharges, the test species are not appropriate for these receiving waters and no alternative tests are readily available. Therefore, WET testing is not required in this permit, and Part IV for WET testing is shown as "not applicable."

**Discharge Characterization (DC):** In addition to monitoring for parameters assigned either a limit or an AL, sampling is required to assess the presence of pollutants in the discharge at certain minimum frequencies for additional suites of parameters, whether the facility is discharging or not. This monitoring is specified in Table 2, *Discharge Characterization Testing,* as follows:

• Table 2 – Selected Metals

NOTE: In the event the facility does not discharge to a water of the U.S. during the life of the permit, DC monitoring of representative samples of the effluent is still required.

DRAFT

The purpose of DC monitoring is to characterize the effluent and determine if the parameters of concern are present in the discharge and at what levels. This monitoring will be used to assess RP per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(iii)). DC monitoring is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.43(a), 40 CFR 122.44(i), and 40 CFR 122.48(b) as well as A.R.S. §49-203(A)(7). If pollutants are noted at levels of concern during the permit term, this permit may also be reopened to add related limits or conditions.

**Permit Limitations and Monitoring Requirements**:

The table that follows summarizes the parameters that are limited in the permit and the rationale for that decision. Also included are the parameters that require monitoring without any limitations or that have not been included in the permit at all and the basis for those decisions. The corresponding monitoring requirements are shown for each parameter. In general, the regulatory basis for monitoring requirements is per 40 CFR §122.44(i) *Monitoring requirements*, and 40 CFR §122.48(b), *Required monitoring*; all of which have been adopted by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905, *AZPDES Program Standards*.

DRAFT

| Parameter | Lowest Standard / Designated Use | Maximum Reported Daily Value | No. of Samples | Estimated Maximum Value | RP Determination | Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flow | - - - | - - - | - - - | - - - | - - - | Discharge flow is to be monitored on a continual basis using a flow meter. |
| Chlorine, Free Available (FAC) | 0.2 mg/L 30-day average<br>0.5 mg/L daily maximum<br>Technology-based limits<br>40 CFR § 423.13 (d)(1) incorporated by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905 (A)(9). | <0.2 mg/L | 36 | N/A | Technology-based limit | Monitoring required and a TBEL remains in the permit |
| Oil & Grease | 15 mg/L 30-day average<br>20 mg/L daily maximum<br>Technology-based limits<br>40 CFR § 423.12 (b)(3) incorporated by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905 (A)(9). | <5 mg/L | 17 | N/A | Technology-based limit | Monitoring required and a TBEL remains in the permit |
| Chromium (Total) | 0.2 mg/L 30-day average<br>0.2 mg/L daily maximum<br>Technology-based limits<br>40 CFR § 423.13 (d)(1) incorporated by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905 (A)(9). | 50 µg/L | 17 | 120 µg/L | Technology-based limit | Monitoring required and a TBEL remains in the permit |
| Copper | 500 µg/L/ AgL | 82.2 µg/L | 17 | 197 µg/L | No RP | Monitoring required for discharge characterization. |
| pH | Minimum: 6.5 S.U.<br>Maximum: 9.0 S.U.<br>AgL [A.A.C.R 18-11-109(B)]<br>Also Technology-based limits<br>40 CFR § 423.12 (b)(1) | 8.55 µg/L | 223 | N/A | Technology-based limit | Monitoring required and a TBEL remains in the permit |
| Selenium | 20 µg/L/ AgI | 7.8 µg/L | 9 | 21.06 µg/L | RP Exists | Monitoring required with a WQBEL |
| Zinc (2) | 1,000 µg/L 30-day average<br>1,000 µg/L daily maximum<br>Technology-based limits<br>40 CFR § 423.13 (d)(1) incorporated by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905 (A)(9). | 232 µg/L | 17 | 557 µg/L | Technology-based limit | Monitoring required and a TBEL remains in the permit. |

DRAFT

| **VIII. NARRATIVE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS** |
|---|
| All narrative limitations in A.A.C. R18-11-108 that are applicable to the receiving water are included in Part I, Sections E through H of the draft permit. |

| **IX. MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS** (Part II of Permit) |
|---|
| Section 308 of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR Part 122.44(i) require that monitoring be included in permits to determine compliance with effluent limitations. Additionally, monitoring may be required to gather data for future effluent limitations or to monitor effluent impacts on receiving water quality. |
| Monitoring frequencies are based on the nature and effect of the pollutant, as well as a determination of the minimum sampling necessary to adequately monitor the facility's performance. Monitoring frequencies for some parameters may be reduced in second term permits if all monitoring requirements have been met and the limits or ALs for those parameters have not been exceeded during the first permit term. |
| For the purposes of this permit, a "24-hour composite" sample has been defined as a flow-proportioned mixture of not less than three discrete samples (aliquots) obtained at equal time intervals over a 24-hour period. The volume of each aliquot shall be directly proportional to the discharge flow rate at the time of sampling.<br><br>These criteria for composite sampling are included in order to obtain samples that are representative of the discharge given the potential variability in the duration, frequency and magnitude of discharges from this facility.<br><br>Discrete (i.e., grab) samples are specified in the permit for parameters that for varying reasons are not amenable to compositing. |
| Monitoring locations are specified in the permit (Part I.A and Part I.I) in order to ensure that representative samples of the influent and effluent are consistently obtained. |
| The requirements in the permit pertaining to Part II, Monitoring and Reporting, are included to ensure that the monitoring data submitted under this permit is accurate in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41(e). The permittee has the responsibility to determine that all data collected for purposes of this permit meet the requirements specified in this permit and is collected, analyzed, and properly reported to ADEQ. |
| The permit (Part II.A.2) requires the permittee to keep a Quality Assurance (QA) manual at the facility, describing sample collection and analysis processes; the required elements of the QA manual are outlined. |
| Reporting requirements for monitoring results are detailed in Part II, Sections B.1 and 2 of the permit, including completion and submittal of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs), and AZPDES Flow Record forms. The permittee is responsible for conducting all required monitoring and reporting the results to ADEQ on DMRs or as otherwise specified in the permit. |
| **Electronic reporting.** The US EPA has published a final regulation that requires electronic reporting and sharing of Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program information instead of the current paper-based reporting (Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 204, October 22, 2015). Effective December 21, 2016, the Federal rule requires permittees to make electronic submittals of any monitoring reports and forms called for in their permits. ADEQ has created an online portal called myDEQ that allows users to submit their discharge monitoring reports and other applicable reports required in the permit. |
| Requirements for retention of monitoring records are detailed in Part II.D of the permit. |

| **X. BIOSOLIDS REQUIREMENTS** (Part III in Permit) |
|---|
| Not applicable. |

DRAFT

## XI. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (Part V in Permit)

**Permit Reopener**

This permit may be modified based on newly available information; to add conditions or limits to address demonstrated effluent toxicity; to implement any EPA-approved new Arizona water quality standard; or to re-evaluate reasonable potential (RP), if assessment levels in this permit are exceeded [A.A.C. R18-9-B906 and 40 CFR Part 122.62 (a) and (b)].

**Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Annual Report**

A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be used in lieu of numeric discharge limitations as allowed by 40 CFR 122.44 (k) to control the potential discharge of pollutants contained in stormwater. The permittee will also be required to submit an annual report to ADEQ on various aspects of stormwater.

**Chemical Additives**

The permit contains requirements for notification, recordkeeping, and reporting of chemical use in operation of the facility.

**Cooling Water Intake Structure**

Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act requires that permits for facilities with cooling water intake structures (CWIS) ensure that the location, design, construction, and capacity of the structures reflect the best technology available (BTA) to minimize harmful impacts on the environment. Updated CWIS rules were promulgated on August 29, 2014 and became effective on October 14, 2014. The updated rule established requirements under section 316(b) of the CWA for existing power generating facilities that are designed to withdraw more than 2 million gallons per day of water from waters of the United States and use at least 25% of the water they withdraw exclusively for cooling purposes. The AZPDES Program Standards sited in A.A.C R18-9-A905 have incorporated by reference the July 1, 2003 section 40 CFR 125, subpart I, the requirement applicable to new cooling water intake structures. The newly promulgated 40 CFR, subpart J that sets requirements for existing facilities has not been incorporated by reference in the AZPDES Program Standards. AFGS has an emergency cooling water intake structure (CWIS) which consists of a manually operated valve that is connected to SRP Lateral 20, a concrete pipe used to distribute surface water from the Arizona Canal for local agricultural use. When the valve is opened, water can be transferred from Lateral 20 to AFGS make up water ponds. SRP has indicated the CWIS connected to SRP Lateral 20 has never been employed in the approximately 60 years the facility has been in operation to supply cooling water to the AFGS. The effluent limitation guidelines and standards in A.A.C R18-9-A905(8)(a) incorporates by reference the general provisions for CWIS listed in 40 CFR 401.14. ADEQ has made the determination that AFGS does not need to submit the application requirements for the existing CWIS because the CWIS has never been utilized and it only exists in case of an emergency. Since the CWIS does not meet the 2 MGD threshold, nor is emergency and fire suppression capacity included in design intake flow, ADEQ has made a BPJ determination that the CWIS is not subject to the requirements listed in 40 CFR 122.21.

## XII. ANTIDEGRADATION

Antidegradation rules have been established under A.A.C. R18-11-107 to ensure that existing surface water quality is maintained and protected. The discharge from AFGS will be to a canal which is subject to Tier 1 antidegradation protection. Effluent quality limitations and monitoring requirements have been established under the proposed permit to ensure that the discharge will meet the applicable water quality standards. As long as the permittee maintains consistent compliance with these provisions, the designated uses of the

DRAFT

receiving water will be presumed protected, and the facility will be deemed to meet currently applicable antidegradation requirements under A.A.C. R18-11-107.

## XIII. STANDARD CONDITIONS

Conditions applicable to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR, Part 122 are attached as an appendix to this permit.

## XIV. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

**Public Notice (A.A.C. R18-9-A907)**

The public notice is the vehicle for informing all interested parties and members of the general public of the contents of a draft AZPDES permit or other significant action with respect to an AZPDES permit or application. The basic intent of this requirement is to ensure that all interested parties have an opportunity to comment on significant actions of the permitting agency with respect to a permit application or permit. This permit will be public noticed in a local newspaper after a pre-notice review by the applicant and other affected agencies.

**Public Comment Period (A.A.C. R18-9-A908)**

Rules require that permits be public noticed in a newspaper of general circulation within the area affected by the facility or activity and provide a minimum of 30 calendar days for interested parties to respond in writing to ADEQ. After the closing of the public comment period, ADEQ is required to respond to all significant comments at the time a final permit decision is reached or at the same time a final permit is actually issued.

**Public Hearing (A.A.C R18-9-A908(B))**

A public hearing may be requested in writing by any interested party. The request should state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised during the hearing. A public hearing will be held if the Director determines there is a significant amount of interest expressed during the 30-day public comment period, or if significant new issues arise that were not considered during the permitting process.

**EPA Review (A.A.C. R18-9-A908(C))**

A copy of this draft permit and any revisions made to this draft as a result of public comments received will be sent to EPA Region 9 for review. If EPA objects to a provision of the draft, ADEQ will not issue the permit until the objection is resolved.

## XV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information relating to this proposed permit may be obtained from:

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Water Quality Division – AZPDES Individual Permits Unit
Attn: Richard Mendolia
1110 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Or by contacting Richard Mendolia at (602) 771 – 4374 or by e-mail at rjm@azdeq.gov.

DRAFT

## XVI. INFORMATION SOURCES

While developing effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and special conditions for the draft permit, the following information sources were used:

1. AZPDES Permit Application Forms 1 and 2C, received December 12, 2016, along with supporting data, facility diagram, and maps submitted by the applicant with the application forms.

2. ADEQ files on SRP Agua Fria Generating Station.

3. ADEQ Geographic Information System (GIS) Web site.

4. Information provided to ADEQ staff during a site visit to the facility on November 9, 2016.

5. Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1, *Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters*, adopted January 31, 2009.

6. A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 9, Article 9. *Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System* rules.

7. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40:
   Part 122, *EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.*
   Part 124, *Procedures for Decision Making.*
   Part 133. *Secondary Treatment Regulation.*
   Part 503. *Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge.*

8. EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control dated March 1991.

9. *Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Programs*, US EPA, May 31, 1996.

10. *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms* (EPA /821-R-02-013).

11. U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual, September 2010.

DRAFT