NPDES PERMIT NO. TX0052809
FACT SHEET

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

APPLICANT

Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas Eastside WWTP
571 State Park Road 56
Livingston, TX 77351

ISSUING OFFICE

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

PREPARED BY

Ruben Alayon-Gonzalez
Environmental Engineer
NPDES Permits & TMDLs Branch (6WQ-PP)
Water Division
VOICE: 214-665-6639
FAX: 214-665-2785
EMAIL: alayon-gonzalez.ruben@epa.gov

DATE PREPARED

August 30, 2017

PERMIT ACTION

Proposed reissuance of the current NPDES permit issued July 17, 2012, with an effective date of August 1, 2012, and an expiration date of July 31, 2017.

RECEIVING WATER – BASIN

Tombigbee Creek - Neches 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
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
IP	Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards
mg/l	Milligrams per liter (one part per million)
ug/l	Micrograms per litter (one part per billion)
MGD	Million gallons per day
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
MQL	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
TAC	Texas Administrative Code
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TSWQS	Texas Surface Water Quality Standards
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
UAA	Use attainability analysis
UV	Ultraviolet light
USFWS	United States Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Service
WLA	Wasteload allocation
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

I. CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS PERMIT

The changes made to the draft permit from the permit previously issued July 17, 2012, with an effective date of August 1, 2012, and an expiration date of July 31, 2017 are:

A. Total Residual Chlorine limit changed to protect WQS per 40 CFR 122.4(d) and 122.44(d).

II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

As described in the application, the Eastside facility is located adjacent to and west of Park Road 56 in Polk County, Texas. The facility is on Alabama-Coushatta Tribal land. The discharge is into waters that are on Tribal land, and the closest downstream State waters are approximately 1.6 miles downstream from the point of discharge.

Under the Standard Industrial Classification Code 4952, the applicant operates a POTW with a design flow of 0.12 MGD for a population of 991 residents.

The operation described in the application consists of an extended aeration plant using two aeration vessels, an aerated sludge holding tank, a clarifier, a chlorine contact chamber and dechlorinating before discharging into Tombigbee Creek.

The effluent from the treatment plant is discharged from Outfall 001 located at Latitude 30° 42' 30" North, Longitude 94° 40' 45" West.

III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS

A quantitative description of the discharge(s) described in the EPA Permit Application Form 2A received June 17, 2017, are presented below:

POLLUTANT TABLE - 1

Parameter	**Max** (mg/l unless noted)	**Avg** (mg/l unless noted)
Flow, million gallons/day (MGD)	0.05	0.04
Temperature, winter, °F	60.6	58.6
Temperature, summer, °F	83.7	81.3
pH, minimum, standard units (su)	6.8	NA
pH, maximum, standard units (su)	7.2	NA
Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day (BOD_5)	4.0	3.0
Fecal Coliform (#bacteria/100 ml)	5.0	2.0
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	9.0	5.0
Ammonia	0.38	0.2
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	2.3	2.0
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	8.8	7.9
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	3.7	3.6
Nitrate plus Nitrite Nitrogen	6.25	2.3
Oil and Grease	5.6	5.5
Phosphorus	5.4	4.6
Total Dissolved Solids	558	526

A summary of the last 3-years of pollutant data taken from DMRs indicates reported violations for the following parameter:

- TSS (Concentration, mg/L) Daily Max – May. 2016

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 reissued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.46(a). The previous permit will expire July 31, 2017. The application was received on June 14, 2017.

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.

Technology-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for TSS and BOD_5. Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for E. coli bacteria, DO, TRC and pH.

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.

The facility is a POTW's that has technology-based ELG's established at 40 CFR Part 133, Secondary Treatment Regulation. Pollutants with ELG's established in this Chapter are BOD, TSS, percent removal for each and pH. BOD limits of 30 mg/l for the 30-day average, 45 mg/l for the 7-day average and 85% percent (minimum) removal are found at 40 CFR §133.102(a). TSS limits of 30 mg/l for the 30-day average, 45 mg/l for the 7-day average and 85% percent (minimum) removal are found at 40 CFR §133.102(b). ELG's for pH are between 6-9 s.u. and are found at 40 CFR §133.102(c). 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. Regulations

at 30 TAC Section 309.1 (b), "Domestic Wastewater Effluent Limitations and Plant Sitting," Secondary Treatment, specifies more restrictive limitations for BOD and TSS. Table 1 of TAC Section 309.4 lists that for domestic treatment plants using secondary treatment, limits for both BOD and TSS shall be 20 mg/l for the 30-day average, 30 mg/l for the 7-day average and a daily maximum of 45 mg/l. These limitations are more restrictive than those shown above in the technology-based section and while they are based on State of Texas requirements that do not apply to Tribal waters, they cannot be removed since that would constitute backsliding in accordance with 40 CFR §122.44(l). The BOD and TSS limitations are also protective of downstream State waters consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR 122.4(d). These limits are identical to those in the current permit and do not impose a new requirement on the facility. When determining mass limits for POTW's, the plant's design flow is used to establish the mass load. Mass limits are determined by the following mathematical relationship:

Loading in lbs/day = pollutant concentration in mg/l * 8.345 lbs/gal * design flow in MGD
TSS/BOD_5 loading (lbs/day) = 20 mg/l * 8.345 lbs/gal * 0.12 MGD = 20 lbs/day

Since the technology-based limits are more restrictive than the 85% established in 40 CFR Part 133, percent removal limits for TSS and BOD_5 are not established in the draft permit.

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/Tribal WQS and applicable State/Tribal 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. Final Effluent Limits – 0.12 MGD

EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS	**DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS lbs/day, unless noted**			**DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS mg/L, unless noted (*1)**			**MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**	
POLLUTANT	30-DAY AVG	7-DAY AVG	DAILY MAX	30-DAY AVG	7-DAY AVG	DAILY MAX	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
Flow	Report MGD	Report MGD	Report MGD	***	***	***	Daily	Instantaneous
Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day (BOD_5)	20	30	45	20	30	45	Once/Week	24-Hr Composite
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	20	30	45	20	30	45	Once/Week	24-Hr Composite
E. Coli Bacteria (*2)	N/A	N/A	N/A	126 cfu/100ml	N/A	235 cfu/100ml	Once/Week	Grab
Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19 µg/L	Once/Week	Instantaneous Grab (*3)

EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS	**DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS Standard Units, unless noted**		**MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**	
POLLUTANT	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
pH	6.0	9.0	Once/Week	Instantaneous Grab (*3)
Dissolved Oxygen	2.0 mg/l	N/A	Once/Week	Instantaneous Grab (*3)

Footnotes:

*1 See **Appendix A of Part II** of the permit for minimum quantification limits.

*2 Colony forming units (cfu) per 100 ml.

*3 Regulations at 40 CFR Part 136 define “instantaneous grab” as analyzed within 15 minutes of collection. The effluent limitation for TRC is the instantaneous maximum and cannot be averaged for reporting purposes.

4. State Water Quality Standards

The Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas does not have EPA approved WQS. The discharge does have a reasonable potential to impact the State of Texas surface waters downstream from the point of discharge. As such, the effects of the downstream State of Texas WQS must be considered in the permit. The general criteria and numerical criteria which make up the stream standards are provided in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - 307.10, amended to be effective July 22, 2010. The State's WQS are also applied to be protective of the quality of waters within the jurisdiction of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas.

The treated effluent is discharged to Tombigbee Creek below Tombigbee Lake thence to Bear Creek, thence to Big Sandy Creek, thence to Village Creek in Segment 0608 of the Neches River Basin. Tombigbee Creek below Tombigbee Lake has no significant aquatic uses. The designated uses for Segment 0608 are high aquatic life, contact recreation and public water supply.

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. BACTERIA

Segment specific standards for Segment 0608 require E. coli bacteria of 126 cfu/100 ml monthly geometric mean and 394 cfu/100 ml daily maximum. The limits for bacteria will be maintained in this draft permit.

b. pH

Segment specific standards for Segment 0608 require pH to be between 6.0 – 8.0 SU's. The pollutant pH segment specific limitations of 6.0 – 8.0 are instream values. The dilution offered by the receiving waters will allow the technology based limitations above, 6-9 SU's, to meet applicable WQS. The permit shall have pH limited to 6-9 SU's, same as the current permit.

c. DISSOLVED OXYGEN

The initial receiving water, Tombigbee Creek, is an unclassified receiving water. It must maintain a minimum DO of 2.0 mg/l. Village Creek, the first classified receiving water, has a minimum DO requirement of 5.0 mg/l. EPA verified using a desktop DO model that the BOD_5 limits proposed above are sufficient to meet those requirements. The previous permit had a DO limitation of 2.0 mg/l, and this limit will be maintained in the draft permit.

d. 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.

All applicable facilities are required to fill out appropriate sections of the Form 2A, 2S or 2E, to apply for an NPDES permit or reissuance of an NPDES permit. The new form is applicable not only to POTWs, but also to facilities that are similar to POTWs, but which do not meet the regulatory definition of "publicly owned treatment works" (like private domestics, or similar facilities on Federal property). The forms were designed and promulgated to "make it easier for permit applicants to provide the necessary information with their applications and minimize the need for additional follow-up requests from permitting authorities," per the summary statement in the preamble to the Rule. These forms became effective December 1, 1999, after publication of the final rule on August 4, 1999, Volume 64, Number 149, pages 42433 through 42527 of the FRL. The facility is designated as a minor, and does not need to fill out the expanded pollutant testing section Part D of Form 2A. There are no toxics that need to be placed in the draft permit except for those presented below.

ii. TRC

19µg/L is EPA's acute chlorine criteria and 11µg/L is EPA's chronic chlorine criteria. Limits must be protective of WQS per 40 CFR 122.4(d) and 122.44(d). Since the acute conditions do not allow dilution; the limit must be met at end-of-pipe but chronic standards do allow dilution, the permit shall use the most stringent WQS for the permit limit.

The critical dilution is 8%. The in-stream TRC concentration after allowing for dilution is: 11µg/L ÷ 0.08 = 137.5 µg/L. Since this value is more than the19 µg/L end-of-pipe acute standard, the19 µg/L is more stringent and will be more protective. The draft permit shall establish the 19µg/L limit. However, TRC is toxic at measurable amounts, so in addition to the 19 µg/L chemical specific limitation, the narrative limit for TRC shall be "No Measurable." Hence, the effluent shall contain NO MEASURABLE TRC at any time. NO MEASURABLE will be defined as no quantifiable level of TRC as determined by any approved method established in 40 CFR 136 that is greater than the established MQL. The effluent limitation for TRC is the instantaneous maximum and cannot be averaged for reporting purposes. TRC shall be measured within fifteen (15) minutes of sampling. Current values on previous DMR's shows that the WWTP can comply with this new limit.

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). Sample frequency is based on the previous permit. BOD_5, TSS, pH and DO are proposed to be monitored once per week. Flow is proposed to be monitored daily using

instantaneous readings. Sample type for BOD_5 and TSS are 24-hour composite which is consistent with the previous permit. TRC, DO and pH shall be sampled using instantaneous grab. Regulations at 40 CFR §136 define instantaneous grab as being analyzed within 15-minutes of collection. New parameter E. coli shall be monitored once per week by grab sample.

E. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY LIMITATIONS

Whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, also known as biomonitoring, is required in permits where the potential exists for the effluent to cause toxicity in the receiving water (30 TAC §307.6(e)(2)(A) and 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(v)). The State requires WET testing for domestic wastewater facilities under certain conditions. Those conditions are either a final phase of their permit with a design flow of 1 MGD or greater, an approved pretreatment program with significant industrial users or the potential to cause toxicity in the receiving water. The permittee does not have any of these conditions; therefore, WET testing is not required in the draft permit.

VI. FACILITY OPERATIONAL PRACTICES

A. SEWAGE SLUDGE

The permittee shall use only those sewage sludge disposal or reuse practices that comply with the federal regulations established in 40 CFR Part 503 "Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge." The specific requirements in the permit apply as a result of the design flow of the facility, the type of waste discharged to the collection system, and the sewage sludge disposal or reuse practice utilized by the treatment works. Part 503 regulations are self-implementing, which means that facilities must comply with them whether or not a sludge-only permit has been issued. Part IV of the draft permit contains sewage sludge permit requirements.

Sludge testing information will be retained by the permittee for a minimum of five (5) years as required in the record keeping requirements section of Part IV.

B. 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.

C. INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER CONTRIBUTIONS

The treatment plant has no non-categorical Significant Industrial User’s (SIU) and no Categorical Industrial User’s (CIU). The EPA has tentatively determined that the permittee will not be required to develop a full pretreatment program. However, general pretreatment provisions have been required. The facility is required to report to EPA, in terms of character and volume of pollutants any significant indirect dischargers into the POTW subject to pretreatment standards under §307(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR Part 403.

D. OPERATION AND REPORTING

The applicant is required to operate the treatment facility at maximum efficiency at all times; to monitor the facility's discharge on a regular basis; and report the results quarterly. The monitoring results will be available to the public.

VII. 303(d) LIST

No waters within the jurisdiction of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas are listed as impaired. Village Creek and Big Sandy Creek, Waterbody Segment Code No. 0608, are on the "2014 Texas 303(d) List." Village Creek does not meet applicable WQS for mercury in edible tissue. The stream has been designated a Category 5c, meaning that additional data will be collected for one or more parameters before a management strategy is selected. Big Sandy Creek does not meet applicable WQS for bacteria. Big Sandy Creek has been assigned a Category 5b, meaning that a review of the standards for the parameter will be conducted before a management strategy is selected. At this time, TMDLs have not been scheduled, and permit limits have been included for pH and bacteria that meet applicable WQS. No additional permit limits have been proposed based on these listings, and the permit has a reopener clause that would allow the permit to be changed if at a later date the segment had a TMDL completed.

VIII. ANTIBACKSLIDING

The proposed permit is consistent with the requirements to meet antibacksliding provisions of the Clean Water Act, Section 402(o) and 40 CFR §122.44(l)(i)(A), which state in part that interim or final effluent limitations must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, unless material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation. The proposed permit maintains the mass loading requirements of the previous permit for BOD and TSS. The remaining pollutants concentration limits are as restrictive as the previous permit.

IX. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS

According to the most recent county listing available at US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Southwest Region 2 website, https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp0/reports/species-by-current-range-county?fips=48373, two species in Polk County are listed as endangered or threatened. The red-cockaded woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) and the Texas trailing phlox (*Phlox nivalis ssp. texensis*) are listed as endangered.

In the previous permit, the Bald eagle was previously identified. Since that environmental baseline was established, the American Bald eagle has been delisted as being threatened. In a letter January 25, 2001, the US Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a biological assessment (BA) stating that the permit action "is not likely to adversely affect the red-cockaded woodpecker or any other federally listed or proposed species."

The Texas trailing phlox was not specifically mentioned in the previous permit's statement of basis ESA discussion. Texas trailing phlox is an evergreen perennial herb or shrub. Plants often form clumps with the stems spreading along the ground, with only the upper one to six inches of

the stem erect. Leaves are about 5/8 inch long, needle-like, and densely packed on the stem. Young stems produce the flowers and have leaves that are longer and lighter-green in color. Older stems have smaller leaves, darker-green in color, and typically lie directly on the surface of the ground. The flowers are pink to magenta in color. Flowers have five petals, each about 3/8 inches in length. Texas trailing phlox is well-adapted to fire. Although aboveground parts of the plant are destroyed by fire, underground parts are undamaged, and new growth appears within two weeks after a spring burn. If prescribed burning occurs in April, even plants that had flowered before the fire will resprout and flower again in May. The main factor in the decline of Texas trailing phlox has been the loss of open, fire-maintained forests, especially longleaf pine. Habitat loss and degradation due to site preparation for pine plantations, land clearing for pasture establishment, exposure to herbicides, and activities associated with development has also contributed to the decline of this species. Recent increases in the number of plants at some study sites indicate that periodic fire is essential to maintain the open pine woodland essential to the survival of this species.

The site where the plant is located does not contain many old growth long leaf pines. Since the main impact of the species is due to loss of suitable habitat and not the actual discharge, EPA determines that the proposed action shall have *no effect* on the Texas trailing phlox.

After review, EPA has determined that the reissuance 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:

X. 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.

XI. 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 amends a TMDL, this permit may be reopened to establish effluent limitations for the parameter(s) to be consistent with that TMDL. Modification of the permit is subject to the provisions of 40 CFR §124.5.

XII. VARIANCE REQUESTS

No variance requests have been received.

XIII. CERTIFICATION

The facility is located on tribal land. The tribe does not have EPA approved WQS. The EPA will do the permit certification consistent with 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.

XIV. FINAL DETERMINATION

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

XV. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

A. APPLICATION(s)

EPA Application Form 2A received June 14, 2017.

B. 40 CFR CITATIONS

Citations to 40 CFR as of August 2, 2017.
Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, 136

C. STATE OF TEXAS REFERENCES

Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - 307.10, amended to be effective July 22, 2010

State of Texas 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2014.