

NPDES PERMIT NO. TX0134065
STATEMENT OF BASIS

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

APPLICANT:

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, LLC
Pipeline Relocation Project
1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000
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:

April 9, 2018

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 April 6, 2018.

RECEIVING WATER – BASIN

Outfalls 001 through and 004 discharge into palustrine emergent wetland. These outfalls then discharge to an unnamed ditch and then to Sabine Pass (estuary, classified segment 2411) approximately within 3 miles downstream. These outfalls are located in the Sabine River Basin.

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)
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

Natural Gas Pipeline of America plans to relocate two existing, co-located 30-inch natural gas pipelines. The proposed permit allows only the hydrostatic test discharge water from two new, relocated 30-inch natural gas pipelines referred to as the Natural Gas Pipeline (NGPL) Relocation Project. The NGPL Pipeline Relocation Project will include removal of an approximate 1.3-mile section of each pipeline and installation of 2 new, co-located 30-inch pipeline sections. The new, relocated pipeline sections will be approximately 1.8 miles in length and will require a 100-foot-wide construction right-of-way, of which 60 feet will be maintained for operational purposes.

Under the SIC code 4922, Natural Gas Transmission, the applicant plans to engage in the transmission of natural gas. The new pipelines will be filled with water to test for leaks prior to putting the pipeline into operation. Test water will come into contact with only new pipe as a result of the hydrostatic test. Water will be discharged on-site within a wetland area due to lack of available uplands in the area. The water used for these hydrostatic tests will be obtained from the Port Arthur Drinking Water Utility.

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:

Table 1 – Discharge Location for Outfalls 001 - 006

Outfall Reference Number	Discharge Coordinates Latitude Deg° Min' Sec" Longitude Deg° Min' Sec"	County	Average Flow MGD	Receiving Water	Segment #
001	29° 44' 58" N 93° 54' 3" W	Jefferson	1.44	Palustrine Emergent Wetland	Segment No.2411
002	29°44' 57" N 93° 54' 0.50" W	Jefferson	1.44	Palustrine Emergent Wetland	Segment No. 2411
003	29° 45'17" N 93°55'21" W	Jefferson	1.44	Palustrine Emergent Wetland	Segment No. 2411
004	29° 45'18" N 93°55'22" W	Jefferson	1.44	Palustrine Emergent Wetland	Segment No. 2411

III. DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION

There will be two new, relocated 30-inch natural gas pipelines referred to as the Natural Gas Pipeline (NGPL) Relocation Project. The source water will be from a municipal water source which meets all standards for drinking water source. The facility stated that no chemical additives will be introduced into the water during water withdrawal, hydrostatic testing, or water discharge processes. A total volume of 332,500 gallons of wastewater will be discharged in less than one day.

The designated uses of Black Bayou, Segment 2411, are primary contact recreation, Exceptional aquatic life and oyster waters.

The facility stated in its permit application that discharge will not be directly to any stream/waterbodies and the test water will be from a municipal source. Since municipal water

will be used, the facility requested that estimates of data on pollutants in Group A be waived. Furthermore, the facility stated that no Group B pollutants will be added to the water during the hydrostatic testing process and only new pipe will be tested. The facility did not report Group B pollutants because it had no reason to believe that Group B pollutants will be discharged. EPA concurs with the permittee for not reporting both Group A and Group B pollutants because the hydrostatic test source water is from a municipal source, no chemicals or additives are to be used in the test water and only new steel pipe are to be tested. Furthermore, non-submittal of these water quality data will not change the permit requirements.

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 & 2D) dated November 13, 2017, was received on November 15, 2017, and was deemed administratively complete on March 21, 2018.

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 and TRC.

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 all Outfalls, hydrostatic test water will be from a municipal water source to the receiving stream as shown in Table 1 above. Intake credits are not allowed for all the Outfalls, since the discharges will be obtained from a municipal water source and discharged into the receiving stream.

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 all Outfalls will discharge into a palustrine emergent wetland. These outfalls then discharge to an unnamed ditch and then to Sabine Pass (estuary, classified segment 2411) approximately within 3 miles downstream. These outfalls are located in the Sabine River Basin. The pH criteria listed for Segment 2411 is 6.5 to 9.0. pH shall be limited to 6.5 – 9.0 s.u., the criteria for Segment 2411.

b. 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 all Outfalls.

“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.”

c. Total Residual Chlorine

TRC shall be limited to 0.019 mg/l in all the Outfalls because the source water is from a municipal source. Municipal water source is required to have a chlorine residual for disinfection. EPA's maximum residual disinfectant level (MRDL) for chlorine in water supply is 4 mg/L. 0.019 mg/L is EPA's acute chlorine criteria and 0.011mg/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.

Discharges from all the outfalls is to an intermittent water body within 3 miles of a bay, estuary, or tidal water body with no upstream flow information. The critical conditions for all Outfalls are as follows: Average discharge of all Outfalls is 1.44 MGD (< 10MGD) and the width of Sabine Pass is greater than 400 feet. Chronic toxic criteria apply as follows: MZ (Mixing Zone–Chronic Criteria) = 8%.

For all Outfalls, the effluent TRC concentration after allowing for dilution is: $11\mu\text{g/L} \div 0.08 = 137.5\mu\text{g/L}$ in discharge. Since this value is greater than the $19\mu\text{g/L}$ end-of-pipe acute standard, the $19\mu\text{g/L}$ is more stringent and will be more protective. The draft permit shall establish $19\mu\text{g/L}$ (0.019 mg/L) limit for all Outfalls.

However, TRC is toxic at measurable amounts, so in addition to the $19\mu\text{g/L}$ 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. In addition, EPA has established a MQL for TRC at $33\mu\text{g/l}$. Values less than $33\mu\text{g/L}$ can be reported as zero.

d. 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 source 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 all Outfalls, monitoring for flow, TSS, Oil & Grease, TRC, 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.

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

According to the 2014 State of Texas 303(d) List for Assessed River/Stream Reaches Requiring Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), the receiving stream for all Outfalls, Segment 2411 is impaired for bacteria and PCBs in edible tissue. This impairment is under TCEQ's category 5c and 5a respectively. Category 5c implies that that additional data or information will be collected and/or evaluated for one or more parameters before a management strategy is selected while category 5a implies that TMDLs are underway, scheduled, or will be scheduled for one or more parameters.

In light of the nature of the discharges, the discharger is not likely to contribute to bacteria and PCBs in edible tissue. 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

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 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.

The permittee has developed protected measures to be implemented during construction for the protection of wildlife, including migratory bird species, and submitted correspondence of an assumed "no effect" to listed species to the F&WS. The F&WS concurred with the facility on "no effect" to listed species in the project area. On July 27, 2017, the F&WS stated that it had no further comments regarding the Pipeline Relocation Project at this time. The F&WS TAILS Consultation Codes for the Pipeline Relocation Project are 02ETTX00-2017-SLI-0437 and 02ETTX00-2017-TA-1405.

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>, 8 species are listed as endangered or threatened in Jefferson County. These species include: Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Red Knot (*Calidris canutus*), West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*), the green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), Kemp's ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricate*), leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) and loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*).

A description of the species and its effects to the proposed permit follows:

PIPING PLOVER (*Charadrius melodus*)

Piping Plover is listed in Jefferson County as 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.

RED KNOT (*Calidris Canutus rufa*)

Red Knot is listed as threatened in Jefferson County. 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).

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 includes 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.

GREEN SEA TURTLE (*Chelonia mydas*)

Green Sea Turtle is found in Jefferson 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.

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

Kemp's ridley sea turtle is found in Jefferson 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.

HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

Hawksbill sea turtle is found in Jefferson 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.

LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE (*Dermochelys coriacea*)

Leatherback sea turtle is found in Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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.

Determination

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 this 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 Jefferson 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.

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

Based on information provided in the permit application, the permittee stated that it received concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office on August 16, 2016, that the project will have no effect on cultural resources protection pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

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 Texas Railroad Commission 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 November 11, 2017.

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://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 Ms. Gina Dorsey, Director – EHS, Natural Gas Pipelines Company of America (Gulf Coast Expansion Project), informing applicant that its NPDES application received on November 15, 2017, was deemed administratively complete on March 21, 2018.

Email from Allen Brooks, exp., to Maria Okpala, EPA, dated April 6, 2018, and March 12, 2018, on revised permit application information.

Email from Michael Daniel, EPA, to Maria Okpala, EPA, dated March 12, 2018, on critical condition information.