

Comparison of Permit Restrictions on Direct Discharges in Edwards/Trinity Contributing Zone

For BS/EACD Board Discussion Purposes

| | Belterra Draft TPDES Permit (before settlement) | Belterra Final TPDES Permit (with settlement terms) | Dripping Springs Pre-Draft TPDES Permit | Notes/Comments on D/S Pre-Draft Permit |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. TPDES Permittee | Hays County WCID No. 1 | Hays County WCID No. 1 | City of Dripping Springs | |
| 2. Permit Term/Renewal | Standard 3-year term; upon notice/application, auto renewal if no changes/non-compliance | Standard 3-year term; upon notice/application, auto renewal if no changes/non-compliance | Term now ends 9/1/2019, which is close to start of new WWTP operation; auto renewal if no changes/non-compliance | D/S requesting delayed start of permit term |
| 3. Receiving Stream | Bear Creek main stem, immediately below Belterra development | Bear Creek main stem, immediately below Belterra development; no direct discharge known to have yet occurred | Walnut Springs Creek, thence to Onion Creek main stem | About one-half mile of wastewater flow in Walnut Springs Creek, nearly all within Caliterra development |
| 4. Outfall Location | Recharge zone of Upper Trinity and possibly Middle Trinity; contributing zone of Edwards, 8 miles upstream of its recharge zone | Recharge zone of Upper Trinity and possibly Middle Trinity; contributing zone of Edwards, 8 miles upstream of its recharge zone | Recharge zone of Middle and Upper Trinity; contributing zone of Edwards, about 19 miles upstream of its recharge zone | Direct Onion Creek recharge to Middle Trinity indicated, quantity and conditions for recharge not yet confirmed |
| 5. Discharged Effluent Volume, Final Daily Average Flow | Up to 500,000 gpd | 350,000 gpd permitted for direct discharge | 995,000 gpd | Timing issue: Initial permit phase for 399,000 gpd will be before new plant unit is complete to achieve the direct- |

Comparison of Permit Restrictions on Direct Discharges in Edwards/Trinity Contributing Zone

For BS/EACD Board Discussion Purposes

| | Belterra Draft TPDES Permit (before settlement) | Belterra Final TPDES Permit (with settlement terms) | Dripping Springs Pre-Draft TPDES Permit | Notes/Comments on D/S Pre-Draft Permit |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | discharge effluent limits and therefore will require modification of existing TLAP. Second phase of 497,500 gpd will use new unit that will nominally be able to achieve limits |
| 6. Effluent Limitations¹ | Initially, 5-5-2-1, no Total N limit. TCEQ later changed TP to 0.15 mg/L | 5-5-2-0.15, <u>with</u> Total N of 6 mg/L. Total P of 0.3 mg/L (rather than 0.15 mg/L) when discharge 2 or fewer days/month. Nominally this would comply with Anti-degradation Policy, per SOAH finding | 5-5-1.2-0.15, <u>without</u> Total N limit; no Sulfate limit. TCEQ says this complies with their Anti-degradation Policy | TCEQ says possibly elevated sulfate source in influent is not problematic; D/S originally requested a 5-5-2-0.5 and 5 mg/L DO. D/S requesting a conditional 0.3 mg/L Total P similar to Belterra. |
| 7. Treatment Technology | Membrane Bioreactor | Membrane Bioreactor with Denitrification; specifies UV for disinfection unless better available; all wastewater to be | Four-stage Bardenpho, with external carbon and alum addition; uses less ecologically sound Chlorine for disinfection | D/S treatment train based on its requested limits, not as proposed. Bardenpho cannot achieve 0.15 mg/L P reliably |

¹ For Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day) – Total Suspended Solids – Ammonia-Nitrogen – Total Phosphorus, respectively, in mg/L on a 30-day average basis. All have same Coliform and DO limits. For D/S permit, only final-phase limits are shown; interim-phase limits for N are somewhat higher.

Comparison of Permit Restrictions on Direct Discharges in Edwards/Trinity Contributing Zone

For BS/EACD Board Discussion Purposes

| | Belterra Draft TPDES Permit (before settlement) | Belterra Final TPDES Permit (with settlement terms) | Dripping Springs Pre-Draft TPDES Permit | Notes/Comments on D/S Pre-Draft Permit |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | treated with MBR and denitrification regardless of intent to direct-discharge it | | |
| 8. WWTP Operator Licensing | Class C | Class A | Class C | Bardenpho with various proposed chemical additions needs both a SCADA and a Class A operator |
| 9. Storage Requirement | Yes; on-site impoundment for hydraulic equalization | Yes; on-site 5.25MG (15 days) lined pond or tank plus additional 1.75 MG (5 days) if remedial action triggered by monitoring | None | |
| 10. Restrictions/ Conditions for Discharge | None | No direct discharge unless 1) stream flow is > 14 cfs, 2) storage pond is full, or 3) spray fields are frozen/saturated | None | |
| 11. Associated TLAP/Ch. 210 Authorization | Abandoning drip irrigation under TLAP even though it reduces volume subject to direct discharge; discretionary 210 reuse for spray irrigation within Belterra | Continuing 150,000 gpd of drip irrigation under TLAP reduces volume subject to direct discharge; mandatory 210 reuse for spray irrigation within Belterra. | 210 reuse not required. Will abandon modified TLAP for on-site irrigation within 30 days of new plant startup | Discretionary 210 reuse planned for irrigating municipal parklands and other properties, including Caliterra, No details yet available |

Comparison of Permit Restrictions on Direct Discharges in Edwards/Trinity Contributing Zone

For BS/EACD Board Discussion Purposes

| | Belterra Draft TPDES Permit (before settlement) | Belterra Final TPDES Permit (with settlement terms) | Dripping Springs Pre-Draft TPDES Permit | Notes/Comments on D/S Pre-Draft Permit |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Mandatory installation of soil moisture monitors near creek buffer zones. | | |
| 12. Externally Generated Wastewater Included? | Yes, on a limited basis | Prohibited | Yes | More than half of D/S wastewater will come from outside City – designed to be regional WWTP |
| 13. TPDES Permit Reporting Requirements | Monthly self-reporting, now via online system at TCEQ, of Average Daily and Max Grab results of all sampling; | Monthly self-reporting, now via online system at TCEQ, of Average Daily and Max Grab results of all sampling; Permit holder must share all monitoring reports with parties to settlement | Monthly self-reporting, now via online system at TCEQ, of Average Daily and Max Grab results of all sampling; Before startup, City must submit final engineering reports, plans, and specs to clearly show how treatment process will be able to meet applicable effluent limits | D/S wants to provide engineering reports only if/as requested by TCEQ, rather than as a mandatory permit provision/requirement |
| 14. Mandated Monitoring Studies and Responses to Outcomes² | None. | Ongoing instream WQ monitoring, to be paid by Permit holder for first 18 months following first discharge and by other | None volunteered by D/S. TCEQ requiring effluent analysis of Nitrate-N within 90 days of startup, to assess | D/S requesting that effluent sampling and analysis for Nitrate be done only when the plant is treating effluent |

² In addition to standard required effluent monitoring and reporting

Comparison of Permit Restrictions on Direct Discharges in Edwards/Trinity Contributing Zone

For BS/EACD Board Discussion Purposes

| | Belterra Draft TPDES Permit (before settlement) | Belterra Final TPDES Permit (with settlement terms) | Dripping Springs Pre-Draft TPDES Permit | Notes/Comments on D/S Pre-Draft Permit |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | parties thereafter, and statistical analysis that triggers specific defined remedial actions ³ by the Permit holder if agreed protections are not achieved | need for Nitrate-N effluent limits/monitoring | at quality required for direct discharge. D/S requesting that N and P effluent monitoring only be required during direct discharge |
| 15. Supporting Water Quality Modeling Studies | Preliminary generic QUAL-TX modeling of DO under steady state conditions without nutrient cycling | Extensive DO and ecological modeling provided by multiple parties before and after permitting/settlement | None known in support of permit application. COA's dynamic WASP modeling demonstrates change in trophic status in Onion Creek and elevated Nitrate at Edwards recharge zone boundary | D/S appears to assume that asserting they will meet effluent limits is all that is required |

³ Remedial action is to 1) construct an additional 1.75 MG (5 days) storage or 2) reduce effluent by equivalent amount.