GEORGIA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

Richard E. Dunn, Director

Watershed Protection Branch
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive
Suite 1152, East Tower
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
404-463-1511

Persons who commented on
Draft NPDES Permit No. GA0026778

10/15/2020

RE: EPD Response to Comments
Georgia Power Company – Plant Wansley
NPDES Permit No. GA0026778

To Whom it May Concern:

Thank you for your comments regarding the permit issuance for the Georgia Power Company – Plant Wansley NPDES Permit. Attached is a summary of comments from the public and our responses to the issue raised. We appreciate your interest in this matter.

After consideration of your comments, EPD has determined that the permit is protective of water quality standards and we have issued the permit.

If you have any questions, please contact Ian McDowell of my staff at 404-232-1567.

Sincerely,

Audra Dickson, Manager
Wastewater Regulatory Program
Watershed Protection Branch

AHD/im

Attachment: Response to Comments

Public Comments and EPD Responses on Draft NPDES Permit
Georgia Power Company – Plant Wansley NPDES Permit No. GA0026786

Acronyms

BAT – Best Available Technology Economically Achievable
CFR – Code of Federal Regulations
CPP – Clean Power Plan
CWA – Clean Water Act
CWIS – Cooling Water Intake Structure
ELG – Effluent Limit Guideline for Steam Electric Power Generating Facilities, 40 CFR Part 423
EPD – Environmental Protection Division
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
MCL – Maximum Contaminant Level
Permittee – Georgia Power Company – Plant Wansley
RPA – Reasonable Potential Analysis
Rules – Georgia Rules and Regulations for the Water Quality Control Act
TBEL – Technology Based Effluent Limit
WQBEL – Water Quality Based Effluent Limit
WQS – State of GA Water Quality Standards

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
The Draft Permit would allow Georgia Power to dewater Plant Wansley's massive, 343-acre, 16-million-ton coal ash pond without specific limits on the amount of pollution that can be discharged into the Chattahoochee River. Instead of proactively protecting Georgia's most-used river, EPD is opting for a wait-and-see approach. According to the Draft Permit, EPD will evaluate Georgia Power's effluent sampling and upstream and downstream stream sampling, and "determine if there is a reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to a violation of the instream water quality standards and if necessary, may open the permit to include applicable effluent limits to protect the receiving waterbody." (Draft Permit Part III.C.7.a.9). Waiting for a disastrous result violates the Clean Water Act because it fails to adequately protect the Chattahoochee River by imposing stringent, bright-line effluent limits for toxic metals commonly found in coal ash pond wastewater. EPD should rewrite this section of the Draft Permit to provide that when Plant Wansley submits its dewatering plan, EPD will reopen the permit to perform an analysis of and set technology-based effluent limitations on the pollutant-laden discharge from the coal ash pond.	40 C.F.R. § 125.3(c) allows for technology-based treatment requirements to be imposed on a case-by-case basis under Section 402(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act, to the extent that EPA-promulgated effluent limitations are inapplicable. Thus, EPD is not authorized to develop a TBEL when a federal categorical ELG already contains applicable TBELs. The draft permit includes the applicable TBELs required by 40 C.F.R. Part 423. EPD evaluated the need for WQBELs by conducting a reasonable potential analysis on the pollutant data submitted with the application for all external outfalls. This reasonable potential analysis was conducted in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the State of Georgia as outlined in 391-3-6-.06(4)(d)(5). The reasonable potential analysis for each outfall indicated that there was no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to instream violations of Georgia's WQS and thus monitoring or effluent limitations are not required to be included. The draft permit contains effluent limits sufficient to cover both the current activities and future dewatering activities, which do not result from a fundamentally different activity. EPD, however, has included heavy metals monitoring requirements for discharges related to future coal ash dewatering through the Coal Ash Dewatering Plan requirements included in the permit. Upon approval, the Coal Ash Dewatering Plan will be available at: https://epd.georgia.gov/coal-ash-pond-dewatering-plans

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
	Upon the commencement of dewatering, the permittee will monitor the effluent and the receiving waterbody for pollutants of concern and provide the results to EPD for evaluation. This monitoring will provide continued characterization of the effluent throughout the permit term. EPD will evaluate this data to determine if a reasonable potential exists and take appropriate actions to ensure the discharge does not cause or contribute to water quality violations. Existing dewatering data from Plants McManus, McDonough-Atkinson, McIntosh, Branch, and Bowen has thus far indicated that no reasonable potential exists for the discharge to cause or contribute to instream violations of Georgia's WQS.
The Draft Permit states in part that "If bromine or a combination of bromine and chlorine is utilized for control of biofouling, limitations for [total residual chlorine] and [free available chlorine] shall be applicable to TRO (Total Residual Oxidants) and FAO (Free Available Oxidants)." (Draft Permit Part III.C.1.c.). The Draft Permit's Special Conditions contemplate the use of bromine without imposing monitoring or reporting requirements, raising the prospect of Plant Wansley discharging indeterminate amounts of bromine to the Chattahoochee River. This is of particular concern because of the potential for bromine to form carcinogens in drinking water when mixed with chlorine in water treatment plants. Requiring Plant Wansley to report bromine and bromide discharges to the Chattahoochee River would allow downstream water treatment plants in Heard County and on West Point Lake to respond appropriately.	Georgia does not have a numeric Water Quality Standard for bromide. Bromide has however been identified as a potential pollutant of concern when present at high concentrations in the source water of a drinking water treatment plant due to the potential formation of carcinogenic disinfection by-products (DBPs). While bromide was not identified above the detection limit in the sampling conducted for the application, bromide has been identified as a common pollutant present in FGD wastewater discharges and may additionally be present in biofouling control measures. Georgia EPD identified the LaGrange drinking water system (GA2850001) as the closest surface water intake downstream of

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
	Plant Wansley. The surface water intake is located on West Point Lake, more than 25 miles downstream of Plant Wansley. Review of the past five (5) years of compliance monitoring indicated no violations of the MCLs established in the Stage 2 Disinfection Byproducts Rule; hence, EPD has not included bromide monitoring in the permit. In accordance with Part II.A.1. of the permit, the permittee is required to submit a notification of change for any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility which could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. As such, any potential increases in bromide or bromine concentrations would be reported to EPD and evaluated to determine if a permit modification is warranted.
Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act is intended to reduce the number of fish and other aquatic species killed or mutilated when power plants pull massive volumes of water from rivers into their intake structures. In 2014, EPA introduced a set of regulations under Section 316(b) to reduce this widespread ecological harm, called the the 316(b) Rule. One provision requires facilities to conduct "at least weekly" visual inspections of the intake structure, or employ remote [monitoring devices during the period the cooling water intake structure is in operation to ensure that any technologies operated] … are maintained and operated to function as designed …" 40 C.F.R. § 125.96(e). "The [EPD] Director may establish alternative procedures if this requirement is not feasible (e.g., an offshore intake, velocity cap, or during periods of inclement weather)." *Id.*	The rationale behind the CWIS requirements included in the permit is discussed in Section 5.4 of the fact sheet. 40 C.F.R. § 125.96(e) requires the permittee to conduct visual inspections or employ remote monitoring devices at least weekly to ensure that any technologies operated to comply with 40 C.F.R. § 125.94 are maintained and operated to function as designed. The regulations do not specify the inspection/monitoring location to be at the intake structure, nor would this be the appropriate location for Plant Wansley which utilizes a closed-cycle recirculating system. As the reduction of impingement mortality and entrainment is considered proportionate to the reduction of flow achieved by a closed-cycle recirculating system, daily monitoring of actual intake flows satisfies the weekly remote monitoring requirements in 40 C.F.R. § 125.96(e) that demonstrates proper operation of maintenance. EPD has additionally included quarterly

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
The Draft Permit does not require Georgia Power to inspect the intake structure whatsoever, much less on a weekly basis. Instead, the Draft Permit requires inspections of the cooling towers only four times a year. (Draft Permit Part III.C.3.c) this is a clear violation of the 316(b) Rule, as the record is lacking any basis to conclude that weekly inspections of the intake structure are not feasible. 40 C.F.R. § 125.96(e). While Plant Wansley's cooling towers and closed-cycle recirculating system significantly reduce the amount of water drawn from the river – and satisfies the Best Technology Available standard under the 316(b) Rule – it does not replace or overwrite the requirements to visually inspect the intake pipe every week. Even with the reduced amount of water required to operate Plant Wansley, fish and other aquatic species will continue to be killed and mutilated. Ensuring that the intake structure is not causing undue harm should be a bare minimum requirement in the Draft Permit.	inspections of the cooling towers to ensure proper maintenance of the towers and to maximize flow reductions.
Coal ash contains toxic pollutants such as arsenic, mercury, and selenium. Arsenic causes cancer, skin tumors, and nervous system disorders. Mercury impairs brain development in children and causes nervous system and kidney damage in adults. Selenium is acutely poisonous to fish and aquatic life in even small doses. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, steam electric power plants like Plant Wansley discharge at least half of all toxic pollutants from industrial sources into the nation's rivers and streams. Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category, 78 Fed. Reg. 34,431 (June 7, 2013).	As specified by the rule, the "as soon as possible" date determined by the permitting authority for the implementation of BAT limitations is November 1, 2018 for fly ash transport water and November 1, 2020 for bottom ash transport water and FGD wastewater, unless the permitting authority determines another date after receiving information submitted by the discharger. Assuming that the permitting authority receives relevant information from the discharger, in order to determine what date is "as soon as possible" within the implementation period, the permitting authority must then consider the following factors:

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
To comply with the Clean Water Act and reduce the dumping of toxic wastewater into the Chattahoochee River, Plant Wansley must meet technology-based limits on the pollutants discharged under the 2015 ELG Rule, 40 CFR Part 423, which requires dischargers to meet the pollution limits for bottom ash transport water ("BATW") and flue gas desulfurization wastewater ("FGDW") by November 1, 2020, unless the EPD determines another, "as soon as possible" date based on information from the discharger. In the Draft Permit, EPD would give Georgia Power until the end of 2023 – or more than 40 months from now – to comply with the ELGs for BATW and FGDW based on the possibility that President Trump's Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") will extend the compliance deadlines. But compliance with the more stringent pollution control requirements is achievable sooner, rather than later. Georgia Power Company acknowledged in its Draft Permit application ("Application") that it began evaluating how to comply with the ELG rule "well before" it was issued in November 2015 (with the effective date in January 2016), and has begun the engineering work to that end. (Application, pdf page 108.) Based on a report compiled in 2017 on behalf of SELC for Plant Hammond by Dr. Ranajit Sahu, an expert in coal-fired power plant processes, ELG compliance is achievable in roughly 24 months when starting from scratch. (Sahu Report, Attachment A). The basis of Dr. Sahu's conclusion applies equally here, as it was based on demonstrated timelines for installing treatment and handling systems for BATW and FGDW at other coal-fired power plants and discussions with vendors that show that compliance was readily achievable.	(a) Time to expeditiously plan (including to raise capital), design, procure, and install equipment to comply with the requirements of the final rule; (b) Changes being made or planned at the plant in response to greenhouse gas regulations for new or existing fossil fuel-fired power plants under the Clean Air Act, as well as regulations for the disposal of coal combustion residuals under subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; (c) For FGD wastewater requirements only, an initial commissioning period to optimize the installed equipment; and (d) Other factors as appropriate. Additionally, GA. Comp. R. & Regs. 391-3-6-.06(10)(a) requires the Director to determine the shortest reasonable period of time necessary to achieve such compliance, but in no case later than an applicable statutory deadline. The current federal statutory deadline for the applicable wastestreams is December 31, 2023. The permittee submitted relevant information in a document, entitled "Plant Wansley Effluent Limitation Guidelines Rule Applicability Timing NPDES Permit Application 2018" with the NPDES application. Plant Wansley has demonstrated that they can comply with the new federal regulations for fly ash transport water upon the effective date of the permit but has requested that the applicable statutory deadline of December 31, 2023 be applied to bottom ash transport water and FGD wastewater based on the factors outlined above. The first three factors are fairly self-explanatory.

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
Additionally, Georgia Power cited the Clean Power Plan ("CPP") as one of its main reasons for requesting an extended deadline, asserting a need to coordinate the greenhouse gas regulations at Plant Wansley. (Application, pdf page 109-110). That's no longer a valid justification. In June 2019, the EPA repealed the CPP and replaced it with the Affordable Clean Energy rule. At the very least, EPD should require Georgia Power to reassess its timeline for complying with the ELG rule based on the change. As is too often the case, Georgia Power seeks once again to delay for as long as possible developing pollution reduction controls governing its wastewater discharges when the record establishes that compliance can be achieved sooner. The permit should require compliance with the ELG Rule by 2022, rather than allow the continued discharge of increased levels of toxic industrial pollution to contaminate Georgia's waterways for an artificially extended time period, under the auspices of a renewed permit that itself may not come up for renewal for years to come.	but the fourth factor serves as a less precise general catch-all for other factors that may be relevant to this determination. EPA has however provided examples of factors that may be appropriate to consider through their statements in the preamble of their final rule postponing the compliance dates for certain effluent limitation guidelines. (See bullets below) • "…the CWA directs EPA to consider several factors, including 'other factors as the Administrator deems appropriate,' and the Agency is afforded considerable discretion in deciding how much weight to give each factor. See, e.g., Weyerhaeuser Co. v. Costle, 590 F.2d 1011, 1045 (D.C. Cir. 1978). In this case, where EPA has decided to undertake a new rulemaking, which may result in substantive changes to the 2015 Rule, that is an appropriate factor to consider and one that warrants the postponement of compliance dates for the new, more stringent BAT and PSES requirements for two wastestreams in the 2015 Rule, until such a rulemaking is complete (i.e., EPA issues any final rule that substantively revises the 2015 Rule or EPA decides not to issue such a final rule). This will prevent the potentially needless expenditure of resources during a rulemaking that may ultimately change the 2015 Rule in these respects." • "In light of the compliance date postponements being finalized today, in determining the 'as soon as possible date,' EPA believes it would be reasonable for permitting authorities to consider the need for a facility to make integrated planning decisions regarding compliance with the requirements for all of the wastestreams currently subject to new, more stringent requirements in the 2015 Rule, as well as the other rules

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
	identified in § 423.11(t) to the extent that a facility demonstrates such a need. This could include harmonizing schedules to the extent provided for under the 2015 Rule for meeting the 2015 Rule requirements for fly ash transport water and FGMC wastewater to allow time for a facility to have certainty regarding what their ultimate requirements will be under the steam electric ELGs, as well as the requirements under the other rules listed in § 423.11(t)." It is clear that EPA intends to preserve that regulatory status quo and prevent industries from incurring needless costs preparing to comply with the 2015 Rule which is under reconsideration. It is thus appropriate to delay capital and design determinations until the promulgation of a revised rule Following promulgation of a revised rule, Plant Wansley will require time to expeditiously plan (including to raise capital), design, procure, and install equipment to comply with the rule requirements. In addition, an initial commissioning period to optimize the installed FGD wastewater equipment is required. Finally, the facility will need to evaluate the changes being made or planned at the plant in response to greenhouse gas regulations under the Clean Air Act, as well as regulations for the disposal of coal combustion residuals under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to ensure retrofit or closure decisions do not result in stranded assets. It is thus appropriate to establish a December 31, 2023 applicability date for FGD wastewater after consideration of the factors listed in 40 C.F.R. § 423.11(t). Georgia Power Company has installed a remote mechanical drag chain (RMDC) system at Plant Wansley for the handling of bottom ash transport water (BATW). EPA in its technical

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
	development document for the 2015 rule recognized RMDC systems as Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BAT) for bottom ash transport water because of potential space constraints at some plants' boilers. The resulting installation will result in an approximately 96-98% reduction of BATW discharge but may blowdown 2-4% to the FGD scrubber system. Such blowdowns may be necessary to accommodate an excess water balance in the closed-loop system due to stormwater events, maintenance activities, or to address water quality challenges that may affect system operation. Due to such challenges, the facility may be unable to comply with the zero discharge of pollutants requirement for BATW at all times. While these infrequent blowdown events may be addressed in the rule reconsideration, an avenue exists in the 2015 rule that allows for bottom ash transport water to be used in the FGD scrubber. This avenue however is dependent on BAT compliance for FGD wastewater and thus the applicability date for BATW is intimately tied to the applicability date for FGD wastewater. At the time EPD is drafting these comments, EPD cannot yet consider how the finalized revised rule will address the RMDC blowdown, and it is appropriate to establish a December 31, 2023 applicability date for BATW due to the inherent ties with the FGD wastewater applicability date. EPD has reviewed the submitted information and determined the permittee has demonstrated good faith efforts to comply with the new rules, and will need an extended timeframe, past November 1, 2020 for bottom ash transport water, to implement the necessary changes to comply with the rules. As stated in the EPA document, Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category: EPA's

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
	Response to Public Comments, "The time provided for in the rule allows the permitting authority to account for time the facility needs to coordinate all the requirements of this rule, along with other regulatory requirements, to make the correct planning and financing decisions, and to implement the new requirements in an orderly and feasible way….given the extent of the capital expenditure and the complexity of these facilities, it is reasonable (referring to the deadline year 2023)." On August 31, 2020 EPA submitted for publication in the Federal Register, the Steam Electric Reconsideration Rule. The rule will become effective 60 days following the publication of the rule in the Federal Register. The rule will revise the BAT effluent limitations and compliance dates for bottom ash transport water and FGD wastewater. Following the effective date of the rule, EPD will modify the permit to include the revised federal regulations.
The coal ash dewatering plan that will be created for Plant Wansley's massive stores of toxic coal ash must be made an enforceable element of the permit with numeric effluent limits for heavy metals and other constituents of concern found in coal ash wastewater. The draft permit contemplates the forthcoming dewatering of Plant Wansley's massive, 343-acre, 16-million-ton coal ash pond. See Draft Permit Part III.C.7, page 35 of 40. However, EPD fails to require specific limits on the amount of pollution that can be discharged into the Chattahoochee River. We know coal ash contains toxic heavy metals. We know that these contaminants currently are present in groundwater at Plant Wansley and other Georgia Power plants across the state. And	EPD evaluated the need for WQBELs by conducting a reasonable potential analysis on the pollutant data submitted with the application for all external outfalls. This reasonable potential analysis was conducted in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the State of Georgia as outlined in 391-3-6-.06(4)(d)(5). The reasonable potential analysis for each outfall indicated that there was no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to instream violations of Georgia's WQS and thus monitoring or effluent limitations are not required to be included.

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
we know coal ash-laden wastewater will continue to sit intermingled with groundwater for decades during and after the forthcoming dewatering process. Even so, EPD is opting for a wait-and-see approach. According to the Draft Permit, EPD will evaluate Georgia Power's effluent sampling and upstream and downstream stream sampling, and "determine if there is a reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to a violation of the instream water quality standards and if necessary, may open the permit to include applicable effluent limits to protect the receiving waterbody." See Draft Permit Part III.C.7.a.9. This is not an appropriate or protective approach to managing the treatment and discharge of this toxic wastewater in the Chattahoochee River. It was not sufficient at Plant McDonough-Atkinson, is not sufficient at Plant Yates, and will not be sufficiently protective at Plant Wansley. The agency's decision to separate the dewatering activities from the NPDES permitted activities leaves EPD without true oversight over the coal ash wastewater discharges. As a result, CRK has little confidence that EPD wishes to or even can exercise its regulatory authority if or when the coal ash wastewater discharges present a threat to the Chattahoochee River. EPD should include numeric effluent limits for heavy metals such as selenium, arsenic, chromium, lead, cadmium, zinc, nickel and boron for Outfall 1. At a minimum, the special conditions in the draft permit should require that when Georgia Power provides notice of dewatering and submits its dewatering plan, EPD will reopen the permit to perform an analysis of and set	Part III.C.7 of the draft permit placed on public notice did address future dewatering of the coal ash ponds on site, which is not a fundamentally different activity. This included a permit condition mandating that the permittee submits to EPD a Coal Ash Dewatering Plan no fewer than ninety (90) days before beginning dewatering activities. Minimum requirements for the Coal Ash Dewatering Plan were also established and available for public comment. This is an enforceable condition in the permit and indeed regulates coal ash dewatering within the NPDES permitting scheme. As such, EPD's regulatory authority has not been compromised or diminished. The draft permit contains effluent limits sufficient to cover both the current activities and future dewatering activities, which do not result from a fundamentally different activity. EPD, however, has included heavy metals monitoring requirements for discharges related to future coal ash dewatering through the Coal Ash Dewatering Plan requirements included in the permit. Upon approval, the Coal Ash Dewatering Plan will be available at: https://epd.georgia.gov/coal-ash-pond-dewatering-plans Upon the commencement of dewatering, the permittee will monitor the effluent and the receiving waterbody for pollutants of concern and provide the results to EPD for evaluation. This monitoring will provide continued characterization of the effluent throughout the permit term. EPD will evaluate this data to determine if a reasonable potential

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
technology-based effluent limitations on the pollutant-laden discharge from the coal ash pond. EPD has not provided any explanation how mere weekly monitoring of flow at outfall number 01 and TSS and oil & grease at outfall number 03A is sufficient to safeguard the river from the pollutants of concern known to be in coal ash wastewater. EPD must require monitoring and effluent limits for heavy metals at outfall number 01, through which treated coal ash wastewater will be discharged. CRK believes the agency's inaction with regard to Georgia Power's coal ash dewatering activities establishes a dangerous precedent under which permittees may seek to funnel new pollutants through existing permitted wastewater outfalls without adhering to the existing NPDES permitting program. These permits and their mandatory self-reporting schemes form the bedrock of Georgia's environmental regulatory program. EPD still has not provided adequate explanation for its decision to allow coal ash pond dewatering to go forward in the Chattahoochee and other Georgia waterways outside of the legally required NPDES permitting scheme that otherwise applies to wastewater discharges from point sources into state waters.	exists and take appropriate actions to ensure the discharge does not cause or contribute to water quality violations. Existing dewatering data from Plants McManus, McDonough-Atkinson, McIntosh, Branch, and Bowen has thus far indicated that no reasonable potential exists for the discharge to cause or contribute to instream violations of Georgia's WQS.
The simple addition of monitoring requirements for heavy metals at outfalls 03A and 03B are insufficiently protective of instream water quality. These outfalls cover emergency overflow points in Plant Wansley's coal ash pond. Releases from these so-called outfalls would not go through wastewater treatment, and thus	EPD has evaluated the submitted permit application and supporting documentation and proposed a permit with appropriate effluent limits based on applicable federal and state regulations and the reasonable potential analysis conducted on the pollutants of concern submitted in the Form 2C permit

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
would constitute untreated releases and should be considered unpermitted discharges of pollutants to waters of the state. It is inappropriate for EPD to essentially rubber stamp in advance anticipated emergency releases of untreated toxic wastewater from Plant Wansley's coal ash pond.	application and other supporting documents ensuring the permit is legal, enforceable and protective of human health and the environment. This evaluation includes the discharges from Outfalls 03A and 03B which did not indicate the need for water quality or technology based effluent limitations. Furthermore, as indicated in the application, discharges from these outfalls do not consist of untreated wastewater.
Further, there is no reasonable justification provided for the creation of a new "internal" outfall—01C—located between the coal ash pond and the final outfall 01. There is even less reason for that outfall to be given effluent limits for Total Suspended Solids and Oil and Grease, but not for any of the heavy metals noted above. As far as CRK can tell, this "internal" outfall serves no purpose. It ultimately connects to outfall number 01 which then directly discharges to the Chattahoochee River. EPD does not explain the purpose of this new outfall.	The addition of Internal Outfall 01C allows for the application of technology-based effluent limitations (i.e. total suspended solids and oil & grease) prior to commingling with other facility wastestreams, eliminating the need to include flow-weighted technology based effluent limitation at External Outfall 01. Heavy metal effluent limitations have not been included at Internal Outfall 01C, as no such limitations have been established by the federal effluent limitation guidelines and thus no technology-based effluent limitations for heavy metals are required. Furthermore, water-quality based effluent limitations are not applicable to internal outfalls.
What few monitoring requirements placed on outfall 01 are insufficient. Flow should be monitored daily rather than weekly. Temperature monitoring should be more frequent than quarterly. Further, there needs to be clarity for the conditions under which quarterly upstream/downstream temperature monitoring will be conducted. The draft permit should be revised to establish proper conditions for monitoring that reflect average river conditions. If	Weekly flow monitoring is sufficient to characterize the facility's discharge from Outfall 01 over the course of the permit term. Based on the data submitted in the application, quarterly temperature monitoring is adequate to ensure compliance with the effluent limitations included in the permit. Furthermore, the monitoring frequency is consistent with previously issued power

COMMENTS RECEIVED	EPD RESPONSE
Georgia Power can select the timing of its quarterly monitoring event, and those events occur when river flows are inordinately high, EPD will not receive an accurate snapshot of the plants impact on river temperature. These quarterly sampling events should be tied to instances of near-average flows through this stretch of the river.	plant permits (*See Plant Yates and Plant McIntosh*) with closed-cycle cooling. Part I.B.1 of the permit requires representative sampling, stating that "samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. The permittee shall maintain a written sampling plan and schedule onsite" The permittee is required to conduct sampling at the edge of their mixing zone that is representative of volume and nature of both their effluent and the receiving water. No further adjustments to the instream sampling language have been made.