

Application Type Renewal  
Facility Type Sewage  
Major / Minor Major

**NPDES PERMIT FACT SHEET  
ADDENDUM**

Application No. PA0026557  
APS ID 787577  
Authorization ID 937228

**Applicant and Facility Information**

Applicant Name	<u>The Municipal Authority of the City of Sunbury</u>	Facility Name	<u>Sunbury Municipal Authority Wastewater Treatment Facility</u>
Applicant Address	<u>462 S 4th Street Sunbury, PA 17801-3134</u>	Facility Address	<u>485 Fawn Lane Sunbury, PA 17801</u>
Applicant Contact	<u>Michael Kerstetter</u>	Facility Contact	<u>Michael Kerstetter</u>
Applicant Phone	<u>(570) 988-1930</u>	Facility Phone	<u>(570) 988-1930</u>
Client ID	<u>41774</u>	Site ID	<u>249013</u>
SIC Code	<u>4952</u>	Municipality	<u>Sunbury City</u>
SIC Description	<u>Trans. &amp; Utilities - Sewerage Systems</u>	County	<u>Northumberland</u>
Date Published in PA Bulletin	<u>May 3, 2014</u>	EPA Waived?	<u>No</u>
Comment Period End Date	<u>June 2, 2014</u>	If No, Reason	<u>Major Facility, Significant CB Discharge</u>
Purpose of Application	<u>Application for a renewal of an NPDES permit for discharge of treated Sewage.</u>		

**Internal Review and Recommendations**

On June 26, 2014 EPA filed a general objection pursuant to 40 CFR § 123.44(b)(1) regarding the Chesapeake Bay language in Part C I of the permit. An attached letter from EPA, received on May 21, 2014, specifically objected to this permit. As a result of discussions between EPA and DEP, Pennsylvania's Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP), Phase II was revised on April 6, 2015. It is believed that the revisions satisfy EPA's concerns. As per the revised WIP, minimum measurement frequencies for Chesapeake Bay parameters have been increased from 1/week to 2/week. Additionally, revised Chesapeake Bay language, consistent with the WIP, has been proposed at Part C I.

In a meeting between the Department and the permittee on 5/22/14, the permittee requested that the nutrients monitoring be conducted 1/week in lieu of 2/week. They noted a discrepancy between the fact sheet and the permit. However, in accordance with the revised Phase II WIP mentioned above, this monitoring frequency will remain. The permittee also requested that DO and Ammonia-Nitrogen be report only given that the receiving stream is impaired due to AMD. Monitoring only will be acceptable for DO given that the WQM 7.0 model does not require water quality-based effluent limits. However, given that the model does require effluent limits for ammonia-nitrogen and there is observed aquatic life in the receiving stream, the proposed effluent limits will remain. The permittee questioned if eDMR is required for this facility. eDMR is required for all major facilities and this will be clarified in the final transmittal letter. Additionally, the permittee noted that the flow rate listed on page 23 of the permit is 4.8 mgd in lieu of 4.2 mgd. This will be changed to 4.2 mgd which is the plants design capacity.

The operations section noted that there should be no effluent limits for DO and Ammonia-Nitrogen given that the stream is impaired due to AMD. This is explained above. Also, it was noted that there is a discrepancy between the permit and the DMRs for TN and TP. This will be corrected to be in alignment with the revised WIP Phase II.

No comments were received from the public. The abovementioned changes will be applied and the permit will be re-drafted for an additional 30-day comment period.

Approve	Return	Deny	Signatures	Date
X			Jonathan P. Peterman / Project Manager	May 5, 2015
			Jeremiah W. Northridge, P.E. / Environmental Engineer Manager	
			Thomas M. Randis / Program Manager	