


DEQ/DWR
FACT SHEET FOR NPDES PERMIT DEVELOPMENT
 NPDES No. NC0038377, Duke Energy Progress, LLC
 Mayo Steam Electric Generating Plant

Facility Information			
Applicant/Facility Name:	Duke Energy Progress/Mayo Steam Electric Generating Plant		
Applicant Address:	10660 Boston Road, Roxboro, NC 27573		
Facility Address:	(same)		
Permitted Flow	Not limited		
Type of Waste:	99.8 % Industrial, 0.2% - domestic		
Facility/Permit Status:	Existing/Renewal		
County:	Person		
Miscellaneous			
Receiving Stream:	Mayo Reservoir and Crutchfield Branch	Regional Office:	RRO
Stream Classification:	WS-V and C	Quad	A23SW
303(d) Listed?:	No	Permit Writer:	Sergei Chernikov, Ph.D.
Subbasin:	030205 (Roanoke)	Date:	August 12, 2016
Drainage Area (mi ²):	N/A		
Summer 7Q10 (cfs)	0		
30Q2 (cfs):	0		
Average Flow (cfs):	0		
IWC (%):	100% (assumed, no modeling info.)		
Primary SIC Code:			

SUMMARY

This is a renewal for the Mayo Electric Generating Plant. The facility is a coal-fired electric generating plant with one unit rated at a maximum dependable capacity of 745 mw. Water for plant uses is withdrawn from the Mayo Reservoir as required to make up evaporative losses from the cooling tower, boiler water and drinking water needs. This facility is subject to EPA effluent guideline limits per 40 CFR 423- Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category. The facility has a closed cycle cooling system (cooling tower), actual intake flow and design intake flow is less than 125 MGD. The facility has a dry fly ash handling system, dry bottom ash handling system, and one ash pond.

The mixing zone for Chlorides was granted to the facility in December of 2007. The daily maximum limit for Chlorides in the permit is an acute limit, monthly average is allowed to exceed the state water quality standard in the mixing zone, it is set at 672.0 mg/L and is based on the modeling information. However, the Chloride chronic standard is being met at the end of the mixing zone. The size of the mixing zone is

established in accordance with the model.

The facility is located in the Lower Piedmont area of the state, the applicable state water quality temperature standard is 32°C (89.6 F).

In response to North Carolina's Clean Air Initiative (Clean Smokestacks Bill of 2002), which requires the reduction of SO_x and NO_x from air emissions, the company installed Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) system. The FGD is essentially a scrubber system to remove SO_x by mixing flue gas with a limestone slurry.

The FGD blowdown generates a flow of approximately 0.254 MGD, with relatively elevated concentrations of metals and chloride. Duke Energy Progress treats the FGD blowdown via VCE (vapor compression evaporator) whose purpose is to evaporate the majority of the waste water produced from the FGD scrubber system. The VCE became operational in February, 2015. It produces two waste streams, both are utilized in the plant processes. The concentrated wastewater is used for moisture conditioning of fly ash prior to sending to the landfill. The second stream is a clean distillate that is utilized to partially replace water withdrawal from Mayo Reservoir. The VCE system eliminates the FGD blowdown stream from Outfall 002, except for severe rain events.

The ash pond dam has two toe drains that are designed for the stability of the dam. The average discharge of the both drains is approximately 11,000 gpd, the discharge is routed to the Crutchfield branch. The Crutchfield Branch does not discharge to the Mayo Reservoir.

The facility proposes to build a new Retention Basin to reroute all waste streams that are currently discharged to the ash basin. This change is necessary to decommission the existing ash pond and meet the requirements of Coal Ash Management Act. The Retention Basin will have a cell where various vacuumed sediments and solids can be decanted prior to disposal. The Basin will also accept the monofill leachate, the monofill contains coal ash.

The facility is also constructing a new FGD settling basin, the waste from the basin will be treated by VCE. In case of the severe storms, overflow from the basin may be routed to Outfall 002. Appropriate TBEL limits are applied to Outfall 002 to accommodate such overflows.

The facility operates the following outfalls:

- Outfall 001. Cooling Tower System. Less than once per year the cooling towers and circulating water system are drained by gravity and discharged directly to Mayo Reservoir.
- Outfall 002. Ash Pond Treatment System. Outfall 002 discharges directly to Mayo Reservoir. The ash pond receives ash transport water, coal pile runoff, stormwater runoff, cooling tower blowdown, FGD wastewater, and various low volume wastes such as boiler blowdown, oily waste treatment, wastes/backwash from the water treatment processes including Reverse-Osmosis (RO) wastewater, plant area wash down water, landfill leachate,

monofill leachate, equipment heat exchanger water, groundwater, yard sump overflows, occasional piping leakage from limestone slurry and FGD system, and treated domestic wastewater.

- Internal Outfall 008. Cooling tower blowdown is directly discharged to the ash pond. Cooling tower blowdown is usually mixed with ash sluice water prior to discharge to the ash pond. Cooling tower blowdown is indirectly discharged to Mayo Reservoir via the ash pond treatment system (Outfall 002).
- Internal Outfall 009. Discharge from the FGD blowdown treatment system. FGD blowdown is indirectly discharged to Mayo Reservoir via the ash pond treatment system (Outfall 002).
- Outfall 002A. Upon completion of construction, discharge from the new lined retention basin. **The flows from the ash basin will be re-directed to the retention basin when the construction of the retention basin is completed. At that point, the ash basin will no longer accept any wastewater.** Retention basin will accept wastes from holding cell (vacuumed sediments and solids), monofill leachate (coal ash), ash transport water, coal pile runoff, stormwater runoff, cooling tower blowdown, FGD wastewater, and various low volume wastes such as boiler blowdown, oily waste treatment, wastes/backwash from the water treatment processes including Reverse-Osmosis (RO) wastewater, plant area wash down water, landfill leachate, equipment heat exchanger water, groundwater, occasional piping leakage from limestone slurry and FGD system, chemical metal cleaning waste, and treated domestic wastewater. The wastewater from this outfall discharges to Mayo Reservoir via Outfall 002.
- Internal Outfall 002B. Yard sump overflows (contain all wastes routed to the new retention basin). The wastewater from this outfall discharges to Mayo Reservoir via Outfall 002.
- Toe Drain Outfalls 101 and 102. 2 potentially contaminated toe drains. These toe drains discharge to Crutchfield Branch.
- Seep Outfalls 101A, 102A, 102B, 108, and 110. 5 potentially contaminated groundwater seeps. These seeps discharge to Crutchfield Branch.
- Internal outfall 011. Coal ash monofill leachate. The wastewater from this outfall discharges to Mayo Reservoir via Outfall 002A.
- Outfalls 004, 005, 006b, 006c, 006d, and 006e. These are former stormwater outfalls, they primarily contain stormwater and groundwater with some additional dust suppression irrigation, and cooling tower drift. These outfalls discharge to Mayo Reservoir.

SEEPS - OUTFALLS 101A, 102A, 102B, 108, AND 110.
Existing Discharges from Seepage

The facility identified 10 unpermitted seeps (all non-engineered) from the ash settling basin and 2 toe drains. However, 5 of the seeps do not need coverage under the permit based on the low concentration of the constituents associated with the coal ash and or/absence of the discharge to the “Waters of the State”. Seep S-5 was a sampling location inside the ash pond and does not represent a wastewater discharge: seep S-7 merges with seep S-6, during 3 sampling events seep S-7 did not have any flow; concentration of Boron, Arsenic, and Selenium in seeps S-6, and S-9 are below detection level; concentrations of Boron and Arsenic in seep S-4 are below 2 µg/L, and concentration of Selenium is below detection level. Boron, Arsenic, and Selenium are a good indicators of a water contaminated by coal ash constituents, and their absence or a low concentration demonstrate that water has no contact with the coal ash. Therefore, these seeps are not considered point-source wastewater discharges under the Clean Water Act. Seeps that have not been covered by the permit shall be sampled once during the next permit cycle and the results shall be submitted with the next renewal application. The samples shall be analyzed for all the parameters listed in the permit for seep outfalls.

The locations of the seeps covered by the permit are identified below and are depicted on the map attached to the permit.

Table 1. Discharge Coordinates and Assigned Outfall Numbers

Discharge ID	Latitude	Longitude	Outfall number
S-1 (west toe drain)	36.53890	-78.89351	101
S-2 (east toe drain)	36.53890	-78.89341	102
S-1A	36.538903	-78.89351	101A
S-2A	36.53801	-78.89161	102A
S-2B	36.53800	-78.89137	102B
S-8	36.53750	-78.89040	108
S-10	36.538422	-78.890395	110

The outfall for these discharges is through an effluent channel meeting the requirements in 15A NCAC 2B .0228. Within 180 days of the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall demonstrate, through in-stream sampling meeting the requirements of condition A. (31.), that the water quality standards in the receiving stream are not contravened.

Discharges from Seepage Identified After Permit Issuance

The facility shall comply with the “Plan for Identification of New Discharges” as contained in Attachment 2. For any discharge identified pursuant to this Plan, the facility shall, within 90 days of the seep discovery, determine if the discharge seep meets the state water quality standards established in 15A NCAC 2B .0200 and submit the results of this determination to the Division. If the standards are not contravened, the facility shall conduct monitoring for the parameters specified in A. (8.).

If any of the water quality standards are exceeded, the facility shall be considered in violation until one of the options below is fully implemented:

- 1) Submit a complete application for 404 Permit (within 30 days after determining that a water quality standard is exceeded) to pump the seep discharge to one of the existing outfalls, install a pipe to discharge the seep to the Mayo Lake/Crutchfield Branch, or install an *in-situ* treatment system. After the 404 Permit is obtained, the facility shall complete the installation of the pump, pipe, or treatment system within 180 days from the date of the 404 permit receipt and begin pumping/discharging or treatment.
- 2) Demonstrate through modeling that the decanting and dewatering of the ash basin will result in the elimination of the seep. The modeling results shall be submitted to the Division within 120 days from the date of the seep discovery. Within 180 days from the completion of the dewatering the facility shall confirm that the seep flow ceased. If the seep flow continues, the facility shall choose one of the other options in this Special Condition.
- 3) Demonstrate that the seep is discharging through the designated "Effluent Channel" and the water quality standards in the receiving stream are not contravened. This demonstration should be submitted to the Division no later than 180 days from the date of the seep discovery. The "Effluent Channel" designation should be established by the DEQ Regional Office personnel prior to the issuance of the permit. This permit shall be reopened for cause to include the "Effluent Channel" in a revised permit.

All effluent limits, including water quality-based effluent limits, remain applicable notwithstanding any action by the Permittee to address the violation through one of the identified options, so that any discharge in exceedance of an applicable effluent limit is a violation of the Permit as long as the seep remains flowing.

The new identified seep is not permitted until the permit is modified and the new seep included in the permit and the new outfall established for the seep.

ASH POND DAMS

Seepage through earthen dams is common and is an expected consequence of impounding water with an earthen embankment. Even the tightest, best-compacted clays cannot prevent some water from seeping through them. Seepage is not necessarily an indication that a dam has structural problems, but should be kept in check through various engineering controls and regularly monitored for changes in quantity or quality which, over time, may result in dam failure.

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS(RPA)-ASH POND AND SEEPS

The Division conducted EPA-recommended analyses to determine the reasonable potential for toxicants to be discharged at levels exceeding water quality standards/EPA criteria by this facility. For the purposes of the RPA, the background concentrations for all parameters were assumed to be below detection level. The RPA uses 95% probability level and 95% confidence basis in accordance with the EPA Guidance entitled "Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control." The RPA included evaluation of dissolved metals' standards, utilizing a default hardness value of 25 mg/L CaCO₃ for hardness-dependent metals. The RPA spreadsheets are attached to this Fact Sheet.

- a) RPA for Decanting of Ash Pond (Outfall 002).

The RPA was conducted for decanting of Ash Pond, the calculations included: As, Be, Cd, Chlorides, Total Phenolic Compounds, Cr, Cu, CN, F, Pb, Hg, Mo, Ni, Se, Ag, Zn, Ba, Sb, SO⁴, and Tl (please see attached). The flow of 10.2 MGD was used for the analysis. The discharge data on the EPA Form 2C was used for the RPA, it was supplemented by the analysis of the free standing water in the ash pond. The analysis indicates reasonable potential to violate the surface water quality standards or EPA criteria for the following parameters: Be, Chlorides, F, and Tl. The appropriate limits were added or maintained in the permit.

b) RPA for Dewatering of Ash pond (Outfall 002).

To meet the requirements of the Coal Ash Management Act of 2014, the facility needs to dewater two ash ponds by removing the interstitial water and excavate the ash to deposit it in landfills. The facility's highest discharge rate from the dewatering process will be 2.0 MGD. The facility submitted data for the standing surface water in the ash ponds, interstitial water in the ash, and interstitial ash water that was treated by filters of various sizes. To evaluate the impact of the dewatering on the receiving stream the RPA was conducted for the wastewater that will be generated by the dewatering process. To introduce a margin of safety, the highest measured concentration for a particular parameter was used. The RPA was conducted for As, Cd, Chlorides, Cr, Cu, F, Pb, Hg, Mo, Ni, Se, Zn, Ba, Sb, SO₄, and Tl. The analysis indicates reasonable potential to violate the surface water quality standards or EPA criteria for the following parameters: As, Cd, Cr (III), Cr (VI), Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn, Ba, and Tl. The appropriate limits were added to the permit.

c) RPA for Seeps and Toe Drains (Outfalls 101, 102, 101A, 102A, 102B, 108, and 110).

The combined RPA calculations was conducted for all seeps and toe drains since both receiving water bodies (Mayo Lake and Crutchfield Branch) are considered zero flow streams. Calculations included: As, Cd, Chlorides, Cr, Cu, F, Pb, Hg, Ni, Se, Zn, Ba, Sb, and Tl. The flow volume for all seeps was measured at 0.000854 MGD. However, the flow of 0.1 MGD was used for RPA calculations to incorporate a safety factor, account for potential new seeps that might emerge in the future or increase in flow volume at the existing seeps. The analysis indicates reasonable potential to violate the surface water quality standards or EPA criteria for the following parameters: Pb. The appropriate limits were added to the permit.

The Division also considered wastewater from the coal ash monofill in the RPA evaluation. This flow is only 0.041 MGD, which represents just 0.41% of the overall flow from Outfall 002. Based on the leachate analysis and the leachate flow volume, it can be concluded that this waste stream will not have a noticeable impact on the concentration of the pollutants in the discharge from Outfall 002.

The proposed permit requires that EPA methods 200.7 or 200.8 (or the most current versions) shall be used for analyses of all metals except for total mercury.

MERCURY EVALUATION- OUTFALL 002 (ASH POND)

The State of North Carolina has a state-wide mercury impairment. A TMDL has been developed to address this issue in 2012. The TMDL included the implementation

strategy, both documents were approved by EPA in 2012. The mercury evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Permitting Guidelines for Statewide Mercury TMDL.

Year	2014	2015	2016
Annual average concentration (ng/L)	1.85	0.91	0.1
Maximum sampling result (ng/L)	7.05	1.18	0.1
Number of samples	28	43	13

The allowable mercury concentration for this facility is 12.0 ng/L. All annual average mercury concentrations are below the allowable level. All maximum sampling results are below the TBEL of 47.0 ng/L. Based on the Permitting Guidelines for Statewide Mercury TMDL, the limits are not required.

CWA SECTION 316(a) TEMPERATURE VARIANCE

This section is not applicable since the facility has a closed cycle cooling system, which is considered a BAT. Effluent temperature is monitored daily at the Outfall 001, 002, and 002A, and instream temperature is monitored semi-annually to assure compliance with the state temperature standard.

CWA SECTION 316(b)

The permittee shall comply with the Cooling Water Intake Structure Rule per 40 CFR 125.95. The Division approved the facility request for an alternative schedule in accordance with 40 CFR 125.95(a)(2). The permittee shall submit all the materials required by the Rule with the next renewal application. The Actual Intake Flow and Design Intake Flow for this station is less than 125 MGD.

INSTREAM MONITORING- OUTFALL 002 (ASH POND)

The proposed permit will require a semi-annual monitoring for total arsenic, total selenium, total mercury (method 1631E), total chromium, total lead, total cadmium, total copper, bromide, total hardness, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), and total zinc.

TOXICITY TESTING-OUTFALL 002 (ASH POND)

Current Requirement: Outfall 002 – Acute P/F @ 90% using *Pimephalis promelas*

Recommended Requirement: Outfall 002 – Acute P/F @ 90% using *Pimephalis promelas*

This facility has passed all toxicity tests (22 out of 22) during the previous permit cycle, please see attached.

For the purposes of the permitting, the long term average flow was used in conjunction with the 7Q10 summer flow to calculate the percent effluent concentrations to be used for WET.

COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

During the last 5 years, the facility had 1 violations of the Fluoride limit (Outfall 002), please see attached.

PERMIT LIMITS DEVELOPMENT

- The Free Available Chlorine limits, Total Chromium Limits, Total Zinc Limits, and Priority Pollutant Limits (Outfall 001 and Outfall 008) were established in accordance with the 40 CFR 423.
- The limits for Oil and Grease and Total Suspended Solids (Outfall 002, Outfall 002A, Outfall 002B, Internal Outfall 009, Internal Outfall 011, Outfall 101, Outfall 102, Outfall 101A, Outfall 102A, Outfall 102B, Outfall 108, Outfall 110, Outfall 004, Outfall 005, Outfall 006a, Outfall 006b, Outfall 006c, Outfall 006d, and Outfall 006e) were established in accordance with the 40 CFR 423.
- The pH limits (Outfall 001, Outfall 008, Outfall 002, Outfall 002A, Outfall 002B, Outfall 101, Outfall 102, Outfall 101A, Outfall 102A, Outfall 102B, Outfall 108, Outfall 110, Outfall 004, Outfall 005, Outfall 006a, Outfall 006b, Outfall 006c, Outfall 006d, and Outfall 006e) in the permit are based on the North Carolina water quality standards (15A NCAC 2B .0200).
- The turbidity limit in the permit (Outfall 002) is based on the North Carolina water quality standards (15A NCAC 2B .0200).
- The Whole Effluent Toxicity limit (Outfall 002) is based on the requirements of 15A NCAC 2B .0500.
- The BOD and Fecal Coliform limits (Outfall 002 and Outfall 002A) were established in accordance with the 40 CFR 133.
- The Technology Based Effluent Limits for Total Arsenic, Total Mercury, Total Selenium, and Nitrate/nitrite as N (Outfall 002, Outfall 002A, and Outfall 009) are based on the requirements of 40 CFR 423.
- The Water Quality Based Effluent Limits for Total Beryllium, Total Chlorides, Total Fluoride, and Total Thallium in the permit (Outfall 002 – decanting) are based on the North Carolina water quality standards (15A NCAC 2B .0200) and EPA water quality criteria.
- The Water Quality Based Effluent Limits for Total Arsenic, Total Cadmium, Total Chlorides, Chromium (III), Chromium (VI), Total Copper, Total Lead, Total Nickel, Total Zinc, Total Barium, and Total Thallium in the permit (Outfall 002 – dewatering) are based on the North Carolina water quality standards (15A NCAC 2B .0200) and EPA water quality criteria.
- The Water Quality Based Effluent Limits for Total Lead (Outfall 101, Outfall 102, Outfall 101A, Outfall 102A, Outfall 102B, Outfall 108, Outfall 110, Outfall 004, Outfall 005, Outfall 006a, Outfall 006b, Outfall 006c, Outfall 006d, and Outfall 006e) are based on the North Carolina water quality standards (15A NCAC 2B .0200) and EPA water quality criteria.

PROPOSED CHANGES

- The daily maximum TSS limit was reduced to 50 mg/L (Outfall 002) to meet the requirements of 40 CFR 423.
- The daily maximum limit and monthly average limit for Total Beryllium (Outfall 002 – decanting) were added to the permit based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis. The weekly average limit was removed.
- The daily maximum limit and monthly average limit for Total Fluoride (Outfall 002 – decanting) were added to the permit based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis. The weekly average limit was removed.

- The daily maximum limit and monthly average limit for Total Thallium (Outfall 002 – decanting) were added to the permit based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis. The weekly average limit was removed.
- The limits for Total Cadmium, Total Chromium, Total Lead, Total Molybdenum, Total Selenium, Total Mercury, Total Antimony, Total Nickel, and Total Barium (Outfall 002 – decanting) were eliminated from the permit based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis.
- The limits for Total Boron, Total Cobalt, and Total Manganese (Outfall 002 – decanting) were eliminated from the permit due to the absence of the state water quality standards for these parameters.
- The monitoring for Total Molybdenum, and Total Nickel was eliminated (Outfall 002 – decanting) from the permit due to the removal of the limits.
- The monitoring frequency for Total Copper, Total Barium, Total Boron, and Total Zinc were reduced to Monthly (Outfall 002 - decanting) based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis.
- The Selenium Study and Crutchfield Branch Special Conditions were eliminated from the permit, they are replaced with Outfalls 101 and 102 for toe drains. Please see A. (8.) and A. (9.).
- The monitoring frequency for the Whole Effluent Toxicity was increased to Monthly (Outfall 002) to address the EPA comment.
- The monitoring frequency for the Total Chlorides was increased to Weekly (Outfall 002) to address the EPA comment.
- The monitoring for Total Iron, Total Vanadium, Total Cobalt, and Total Manganese was eliminated from the permit due to the absence of the state water quality standards for these parameters.
- The monitoring for Total Silver (Outfall 002 – decanting) was eliminated from the permit based on the results of Reasonable Potential Analysis.
- A separate effluent page for the dewatering of the ash pond (Outfall 002) was added to the permit. Please see Condition A. (4.).
- The following monitoring parameters were eliminated (Outfall 009) to be consistent with the latest update to 40 CFR 423: Total Beryllium, Total Cadmium, Total Chlorides, Total Chromium, Total Copper, Total Fluoride, Total Lead, Total Manganese, Total Nickel, Total Silver, Total Barium, Total Thallium, Total Vanadium, Total Antimony, Total Boron, Total Cobalt, Total Molybdenum, Total Zinc, and TSS.
- The Technology Based Effluent Limits for Total Arsenic, Total Mercury, Total Selenium, and Nitrate/nitrite as N were added to the permit (Outfall 009) based on the requirements in 40 CFR 423.
- The monitoring frequency for Total Arsenic, Total Mercury, Total Selenium, and Nitrate/nitrite as N was reduced to Quarterly (Outfall 009) based on the review of the effluent data.
- The monitoring for Total Arsenic, Total Mercury, Total Selenium, and Nitrate/nitrite as N was added to the permit (Outfall 002) to accommodate potential overflows from the FGD settling basin.
- The turbidity limit was added to the permit (Outfall 002) to meet the state turbidity standard per 15A NCAC 2B .0211(3) (k).
- The limits for BOD and Fecal Coliforms were added to Outfall 002 to address the EPA comment.

- The Seep Outfalls 101A, 102A, 102B, 108, and 110 (Please see A. (10.) through A. (14.)) and Seep Pollutant Analysis Special Condition (Please see A. (32.)) were added to the permit.
- The Toe Drain Outfalls 101 and 102 (Please see A. (8.) and A. (9.)) were added to the permit.
- The Domestic Wastewater Treatment Plant Special Condition was added to the permit to assure compliance with the 40 CFR 133.102. Please see Special Condition A. (23.).
- The Additional Conditions and Definitions Special Condition was added to the permit. Please see Special Condition A. (25.).
- Federal regulations require electronic submittal of all discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) and program reports. The final NPDES Electronic Reporting Rule was adopted and became effective on December 21, 2015. The requirement to begin reporting discharge monitoring data electronically using the NC DWR's Electronic Discharge Monitoring Report (eDMR) internet application has been added to your final NPDES permit. Please See Special Condition A. (25.)

For information on eDMR, registering for eDMR and obtaining an eDMR user account, please visit the following web page:

<http://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/water-resources/edmr>.

For more information on EPA's final NPDES Electronic Reporting Rule, please visit the following web site:

<http://www2.epa.gov/compliance/final-national-pollutant-discharge-elimination-system-npdes-electronic-reporting-rule>.

- The Special Condition entitled Groundwater Monitoring Well Construction and Sampling was added to the permit. Please see Special Condition A. (27).
- The attachment 1 entitled "Groundwater Monitoring Plan" was added to the permit.
- The special condition entitled "Structural Integrity Inspections of Ash Pond Dam" was added to the permit in accordance with the new EPA requirements. Please see Special Condition A. (28).
- The "Clean Water Act Section 316(b)" Special Condition was added to the permit. Please see Special Condition A. (29.).
- The Fish Tissue Monitoring near Ash Pond Discharge Special Condition was added to the permit. Please see Special Condition A. (30.).
- The Instream Monitoring Special Condition was added to the permit to monitor the impact of the facility on the receiving stream. Please see Special Condition A. (31.).
- The Biocide Special Condition A. (33) was added to the permit to be consistent with the permitting procedure for power plants.
- The Ash Pond Closure Special Condition was added to the permit to facilitate the decommissioning of the ash ponds. Please see Special Condition A. (34.).
- The new internal outfall 002A was added to the permit to accommodate construction of the new Retention Basin. Please see A. (5.).
- The new internal outfall 002B was added to the permit to accommodate construction of the new yard sump. Please see A. (6.).
- The former Stormwater Outfalls 004, 005, 006b, 006c, 006d, and 006e were added to the permit. Please see A. (15.) through A. (21.).

- The requirement for a physical-chemical treatment of wastewater generated during the decanting and dewatering was added to the permit.
- The Internal Outfall 011 for monofill leachate was added to the permit. Please see A. (34.).

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Draft Permit to Public Notice:

January 22, 2017

Permit Scheduled to Issue:

April 4, 2017

STATE CONTACT

If you have any questions on any of the above information or on the attached permit, please contact Sergei Chernikov at (919) 807-6386 or sergei.chernikov@ncdenr.gov.