

nonconventional. Conventional pollutants are those defined in CWA section 304(a)(4) and 40 C.F.R. §401.16 (five day-biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (TSS), fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease). Toxic (priority) pollutants are those defined in CWA section 307(a)(1) and include 126 metals and manmade organic compounds. Nonconventional pollutants are those that do not fall under either of the above categories (conventional or toxic pollutants) and include parameters such as, but not limited to, chlorine, ammonia, nitrogen, phosphorus, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and whole effluent toxicity (WET).

EPD evaluates the data provided in the application and supporting documents. If a pollutant is listed in the following sections of this fact sheet below, the permit writer determined the pollutant is a pollutant of concern and there may be a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream violation of the Georgia water quality standards. If a pollutant is not listed below, EPD determined the pollutant is not a pollutant of concern or has determined, based on the data provided in the application, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream violation of the Georgia water quality standards. An example may be if the applicant reported “not detect” or “below detection limit”.

Upon identification of a pollutant of concern by the permit writer, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(ii), the permit writer must then perform a reasonable potential analysis using a procedure which has accounted for any combination of the following criteria: existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, the variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the effluent, the sensitivity of the species to toxicity testing (when evaluating whole effluent toxicity), and where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water to determine if the pollutant and its discharge has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the allowable ambient concentration of a state narrative or numeric criteria within the state’s water quality standard for an individual pollutant.

In accordance with 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(iii), if the permit writer has determined, using a reasonable potential procedure the pollutant of concern in the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above the allowable ambient concentration of a state numeric or narrative criteria within a state water quality standard for an individual pollutant, the permit must contain effluent limits for that pollutant. If the permit writer has determined there is insufficient data, the permit writer might also consider monitoring requirements to collect the additional data related to the presence or absence of a specific pollutant to provide information for further analyses for the development of appropriate numeric or narrative standard .

The conventional, nonconventional, and toxic pollutants listed in the following sections have been identified by the permit writer as pollutants of concern and the permit writer has determined through current practices and procedures one of the following: no additional monitoring or numeric and/or narrative effluent limits are needed; additional monitoring is required; or numeric and/or narrative effluent limits are necessary to protect the receiving water body and its downstream users and those limits have been included in the permit.

The monitoring and sampling locations are prescribed in the permit and determined by the permit writer after considering, at a minimum, the following: type of discharge, specific pollutant, discharge frequency, location of the discharge, receiving waterbody, downstream users, etc.