NPDES PERMIT NO. OK0044881
STATEMENT OF BASIS

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

APPLICANT:

Marketlink LLC
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 700
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
NPDES Permits Branch (6WQ-PP)
Water Quality Protection Division
Voice: 214-665-3152
Fax: 214-665-2191
Email: okpala.maria@epa.gov

DATE PREPARED:
October 3, 2017

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 29, 2017.

RECEIVING WATER – BASIN

Tributary to Wildhorse Creek, which is Oklahoma Segment OK620900010320 in the upper Arkansas River.

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_5	Biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
BOPD	Barrels of oil per day
BPJ	Best professional judgment
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
CPP	Continuing Planning Process
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
HTW	Hydrostatic Test Water
µg/l	Micrograms per litter (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
ODEQ	Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
OWQS	Oklahoma Water Quality Standards
OWRB	Oklahoma Water Resources Board
RP	Reasonable potential
SWP3	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SIC	Standard industrial classification
s.u.	Standard units (for parameter pH)
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQBELs	Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits
WQSIP	Water Quality Standards Implementation Plan
WQS	Water Quality Standards

I. PROPOSED CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS PERMIT

None

II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

Under the SIC Code 4612, the applicant is engaged in Crude Petroleum Pipelines.

As described in the application, the facility is located at 350553 E 750 Road, Cushing, Lincoln County, Oklahoma. The facility is engaged in crude petroleum Pipelines.

III. PROCESS AND DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION

The company, MarketLinc LLC, plans to perform hydrostatic testing on new oil storage tanks associated with the Keystone Pipeline near Cushing, Oklahoma. The new oil storage tanks will undergo hydrostatic testing in four phases with the first testing period planned in November of 2017, the second in August of 2018, the third in February of 2019, and the last in July of 2019. The facility will test about six storage tanks during each of the testing phases, and a total of 100,680,000 gallons of hyrostatic test water would be discharged.

The facility does not plan to use chemical additives during hydrostatic testing, water withdrawal, or water discharge process. Wastewater discharges will occur through an existing onsite stormwater pond and constructed Outfall into tributary to Wildhorse Creek. The existing discharge outfall will prevent scour erosion associated with discharge. EPA notes that previous NPDES Permit # OK0044806 - Keystone Pipeline Project (Gulf Coast Segment) discharged through the same outfall. NPDES Permit # OK0044806 was terminated in February of 2014 following the completion of the previous construction phase.

The discharge point 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	Waterbody ID #
001	Latitude 35° 55' 30" N; Longitude 96° 45' 7" W	Lincoln	10.08	Tributary to Wildhorse Creek	OK620900010320

The designated uses of Wildhorse Creek, Oklahoma waterbody ID OK620900010320 are

- EWS - Emergency Water Supply
- WWAC - Warm Water Aquatic Community subcategory
- PBCR - Primary Body Contact beneficial use
- Agriculture
- Aesthetic Standards.

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). An NPDES Application for a Permit to Discharge (Form 1) and Form 2D were received on August 22, 2017, and was deemed administratively complete on September 25, 2017.

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. Technology-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for, TSS, Oil and grease. Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for pH.

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.

Effluent Limitations

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 30mg/l average, 45 mg/l maximum; and Oil & Grease is 15 mg/l maximum. The draft permit will not propose mass limits since the flow is variable and intermittent. Concentration limits will be protective of the stream uses.

D. WATER QUALITY SCREENING

1. General Comments

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.

The narrative and numerical stream standards are provided in OWQS, as amended (OAC 785:45), and implementation criteria contained in OACs 785:46 and 252:690, promulgated by the OWRB, effective as of September 11, 2015, and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), respectively. This is to ensure that no point-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.

2. Reasonable Potential

EPA develops draft permits to comply with State WQS, and for consistency, attempts to follow OWQS, OWQS implementation criteria in OAC 785:46 and OAC 252:690, and the CPP document where appropriate. ODEQ develops WQBELs following both a 1991 EPA Region 6 approach and the method prescribed in the 1991 EPA Technical Support Document for water Quality-Based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001 ("TSD"). However, EPA is bound by the State's WQS, not State guidance, including the OWQSIP, 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.

In the RP screening process, the 95th percentile effluent concentration, or estimate thereof if the effluent data set is not sufficiently large to determine it directly, is used to compute an instream concentration according to the regulatory mixing zone equations defined in OAC 785:46. The computed instream concentrations are then compared with the applicable criteria to determine whether RP is exhibited. If RP is exhibited, in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi) and OAC 252:690, a wasteload allocation and criterion long term average is computed for each applicable criterion. Water quality-based permit limitations are calculated for each pollutant exhibiting RP for all applicable criteria. The most stringent of the resulting monthly average

permit limitations and its associated daily maximum limitations are established in the draft permit for each pollutant requiring such limitations.

The applicant proposes to discharge water from the same location as the source water. Hydrostatic test water will contact only new pipe, and no chemicals 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.

Since the hydrostatic test water is to be discharged back into the same water body from which it was taken, intake credits could normally be authorized to account for in-situ waterbody conditions for only TSS.

3. Reasonable Potential-Calculations

a. pH

The daily minimum and daily maximum permit limits of 6.0 standard units to 9.0 standard units on hydrostatic test general permits developed by other EPA Regions and States. OAC 785:45-5-12(f)(3) states, "pH values shall be between 6.5 and 9.0 in waters designated for fish and wildlife propagation; unless pH values outside that range are due to natural conditions." The water quality–based daily minimum pH limit of 6.5 is more stringent than the technology-based daily minimum pH limit of 6.0 standard units. As a result, the Oklahoma Water Quality Based limits of 6.5 standard units to 9.0 standard units are established in the proposed permit.

b. Narrative Limitations

1. Aesthetic Standards
According to OWQS, OAC 785:45-5-12(f) (4) which states that narrative protection for aesthetic standards will propose 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. A narrative condition prohibiting the discharge of any visible sheen of oil or globules of oil or grease will be included in the proposed permit. In addition, the technology-based limit of 15 mg/l for Oil and Grease should assure that the narrative criterion is maintained.

2. Public and Private Water Supplies (OAC 785:45-5-10)
Test water being discharged from hydrostatic testing should not contain substances listed in Raw Water Numerical Criteria (785:45-5-10(1)) and Water Column Criteria to protect for the consumption of fish, flesh and water (785:45-5-10(6)) at levels which would have reasonable potential to violate numerical criteria.

3. Emergency Public and Private Water Supplies (OAC 785:45-5-11)
(a) During emergencies, those waters designated Emergency Public and Private Water Supplies may be put to use.
(b) Each emergency will be handled on a case-by-case basis, and be thoroughly evaluated by the appropriate State agencies and/or local health authorities.

4. Fish and Wildlife Propagation (OAC 785:45-5-12)
Test water being discharged from hydrostatic testing should not contain substances listed in Toxic Substances (785:45-5-12(f)(6)) and Water Column Criteria to protect for the consumption

of fish, flesh and water (785:45-5-10(6)) at levels which would have reasonable potential to violate numerical criteria.

Warm Water Aquatic Community means a subcategory of the beneficial use category "Fish and Wildlife Propagation" where the water quality and habitat are adequate to support climax fish communities. (OAC 785:45-5-12(c).

4. Agriculture/Livestock (OAC 785:45-5-13)
The levels of chloride, sulfate and total dissolved solids in the test water should be the same as in the receiving water. Hydrostatic testing should not result in significant increases in levels of chloride, sulfate or total dissolved solids in the test water above levels contained in the fill water.

5. Primary Body Contact Recreation (OAC 785:45-5-16)
Hydrostatic test wastewater should not contain coliform bacteria, Escherichia coli, and Enterococci at significant levels.

E TECHNOLOGY BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

Following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR122.44(l)(2)(ii), 122.44(d), and 130.32(b)(6), the draft permit limits are based on either technology-based effluent limits pursuant to 40 CFR122.44(a), on the results of or on State Water Quality Standards and requirements pursuant to 40 CFR122.44(d), or on the results of an established and EPA approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), whichever are more stringent.

Numerical water quality based limitations have been placed in the permit for pH. 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.

F. 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.

G. FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

See the draft permit for limitations.

H. MONITORING FREQUENCY

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 discharge.

For both outfall 001, monitoring for flow, TSS, Oil & Grease, and pH shall be daily by grab sample, when discharging.

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.

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

According to the 303(d) list of impaired waters, the receiving stream for Outfall 001, Wildhorse Creek (OK620900010320) is not listed in the 2014 edition of the 303(d) list of impaired waters. Therefore, no additional requirements beyond the already proposed technology-based and/or water-quality based requirements are established in the proposed permit.

VIII. ANTIDEGRADATION

The OWRB- OWQS, antidegradation policy, OAC 785:46, Subchapter 13, 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.

There are no antidegradation restrictions listed in Appendix A of the OWQS for Wildhorse Creek, and the Arkansas River to which the facility discharges. As a result, no further protection beyond the Tier1 level (maintenance and protection of designated uses, as herein described).

IX. ANTIBACKSLIDING

The proposed permit is consistent with the requirements and exemption to meet Antibacksliding provisions of the Clean Water Act, Section 402(o) and 40 CFR Part 122.44(i)(B), which state in

part that interim or final effluent limitations must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, unless information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance. Since this is a first time individual NPDES Permit for this discharge, antibacksliding does not apply.

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), IPAC-Information, Planning, and Conservation System Website https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/location/ADZOTPVXRVHIPJJCYR2SWV557Y/resources, five endangered or threatened species in Lincoln County may be affected by the project. These species are Least tern (Sterna antillarum), piping plover (Charadrius melodus), American burying beetle (Nicrophorus americanus), and Whooping Crane (Grus americana). A description of the species and its effects to the proposed permit follows:

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. The interior least tern is known to use reaches of the North Canadian River, South Canadian River, and Red River in Oklahoma (USFWS 2011b). The species also occurs along the Red River in Bryan County, Oklahoma and Fannin County, Texas.

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.

PIPING PLOVER (Charadrius melodus)

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 nonbreeding plovers lose the dark bands. In Laguna Madre, Texas, non-breeding home ranges were larger in winter than in fall or spring. 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 this permit is found to have no impact on the habitat of this species, since the discharge is not expected to lead to the destruction of habitat.

AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE (*Nicrophorus americanus)*

American burying beetle (ABB) is a shiny black with hardened protective covers that meet in a straight line down the back. It has large orange-red marking on the raised portion of the pronotum, a feature shared with no other members of the genus in North America. The American burying beetle also has orange-red frons (a mustache-like feature) and a single orange-red marking on the top of the head (triangular in females and rectangular in males). Antennae are large, with notable orange clubs at the tips.

American burying beetle is nocturnal (active at night), lives for only one year, and typically reproduces only once. During the winter months when temperatures are below 60°F (15°C) American burying beetles bury themselves in the soil. When temperatures are above 60°F (15°C) they emerge from the soil and begin the mating and reproduction process.

The American burying beetle has been found in various types of habitat including oak-pine woodlands, open fields, oak-hickory forest, open grasslands, and edge habitat. Research indicates that American burying beetles are feeding habitat generalists. Data is lacking pertaining to American burying beetle reproductive habitat requirements, but species experts assume that they are more restrictive in selecting their reproductive habitat than feeding habitat.

The cause for the decline of this species could be a result of habitat fragmentation, habitat loss, carcass limitation, pesticides, disease, light pollution, or a combination of these factors. Species experts believe the primary causes of decline are habitat loss and fragmentation. The construction of the Project may cause the loss and disturbance of habitat used by the American burying beetle.

EPA has determined that the issuance of this permit is found to have no impact on the habitat of this species, since 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.

The overall decline of whooping cranes has been attributed to habitat loss, direct disturbance and hunting by humans, predation, disease, and collisions with manmade features (CWS and USFWS 2005). The main threat to whooping cranes in the wild is the potential of a hurricane or contaminant spill destroying their wintering habitat on the Texas coast. Collisions with power lines and fences are known hazards to wild whooping cranes. The primary threats to captive birds are disease and parasites.

Based on information available, EPA believes that issuance of this permit will have no effect on the Whooping Crane or will it adversely modify designated critical habitats.

No critical habitat has been designated for this 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. The proposed permit establishes limits to meet the current state water quality standards for the area of discharge. The limits established in the proposed permit are protective and will have no impact on the habitats of this species. The discharge water will not be treated with biocides or other additives. The proposed permit has limits for Oil & Grease, Total Suspended Solids, and pH. The proposed permit is written to include limitations and monitoring requirements on those parameters as conditions in permit.

2. The issuance of this permit will have no effect above the environmental baseline on the listed species.

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.

Additionally, 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, EPA has determined that this permit issuance will have "no effect" on listed threatened and endangered species nor will adversely modify designated critical habitat.

Operators have an independent ESA obligation to ensure that any of their activities do not result in prohibited "take" of listed species. Section 9 of the ESA prohibits any person from "taking" a listed species, e.g., harassing or harming it, with limited exceptions. See ESA Sec 9; 16 U.S.C. §1538. This prohibition generally applies to "any person," including private individuals, businesses and government entities. Operators who intend to undertake construction activities in areas that harbor endangered and threatened species may seek protection from potential "take" liability under ESA section 9 either by obtaining an ESA section 10 permit or by requesting coverage under an individual permit and participating in the section 7 consultation process with the appropriate FWS or NMFS office. Operators unsure of what is needed for such liability protection should confer with the appropriate Services.

XI. HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS

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

XII. PERMIT REOPENER

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if relevant portions of the Oklahoma 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

None

XV. CERTIFICATION

The permit is in the process of certification by the Oklahoma Department of Environmental quality 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 & 2D, received on August 22, 2017.

B. State of Oklahoma References

"Implementation of the Oklahoma Water Quality Standards," Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Title 785, Chapter 46, effective as of September 11, 2015.

Oklahoma Water Quality Standards, (Title 785, Chapter 45) promulgated by the Oklahoma Water Resources Board including all amendments which are effective as of November 7, 2016.

http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/

http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/wizard/chooseLocation!prepare.action

D. 40 CFR CITATIONS

Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, and 136

E. MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Dorothy Brown, EPA, to Mr. Richard Prior, VP and Manager, MarketLink LLC dated August 17, 2017, informing the applicant that its' NPDES application received August 22, 2017, is administratively complete.
.