567—64.7 (455B) Terms and conditions of NPDES permits.

64.7(1) *Prohibited discharges.* No NPDES permit may authorize any of the discharges prohibited by 567—62.1(455B).

64.7(2) *Application of effluent, pretreatment and water quality standards and other requirements.* Each NPDES permit shall include any of the following that is applicable:

a. An effluent limitation guideline promulgated by the administrator under Sections 301 and 304 of the Act and adopted by reference by the commission in 567—62.4(455B).

b. A standard of performance for a new source promulgated by the administrator under Section 306 of the Act and adopted by reference by the commission in 567—62.4(455B).

c. An effluent standard, effluent prohibition or pretreatment standard promulgated by the administrator under Section 307 of the Act and adopted by reference by the commission in 567—62.4(455B) or 567—62.5(455B).

d. A water quality related effluent limitation established by the administrator pursuant to Section 302 of the Act.

e. Prior to promulgation by the administrator of applicable effluent and pretreatment standards under Sections 301, 302, 306, and 307 of the Act, such conditions as the director determines are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act.

f. Any other limitation, including those:

(1) Necessary to meet water quality standards, treatment or pretreatment standards, or schedules of compliance established pursuant to any Iowa law or regulation, or to implement the antidegratation policy in 567—subrule 61.2(2); or

(2) Necessary to meet any other federal law or regulation; or

(3) Required to implement any applicable water quality standards; or

(4) Any legally applicable requirement necessary to implement total maximum daily loads established pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Act and incorporated in the continuing planning process approved under Section 303(e) of the Act and any regulations and guidelines issued pursuant thereto.

g. Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any water quality standard, including narrative criteria, in 567—Chapter 61. When the permitting authority determines that a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion of the water quality standard for an individual pollutant, the permit must contain effluent limits for that pollutant.

h. Any more stringent legally applicable requirements necessary to comply with a plan approved pursuant to Section 208(b) of the Act.

In any case where an NPDES permit applies to effluent standards and limitations described in paragraph *"a," "b," "c," "d," "e," "f," "g,"* or *"h,"* the director must state that the discharge authorized by the permit will not violate applicable water quality standards and must have prepared some verification of that statement. In any case where an NPDES permit applies any more stringent effluent limitation, described in 64.7(2)*"f"*(1) or *"g,"* based upon applicable water quality standards, a waste load allocation must be prepared to ensure that the discharge authorized by the permit is consistent with applicable water quality standards.

64.7(3) *Effluent limitations in issued NPDES permits.* In the application of effluent standards, and limitations, water quality standards, and other legally applicable requirements, pursuant to 64.7(2), the director shall, for each issued NPDES permit, specify average and maximum daily quantitative limitations for the level of pollutants in the authorized discharge in terms of weight (except pH, temperature, radiation, and any other pollutants not appropriately expressed by weight). The director may, in addition to the specification of daily quantitative limitations by weight, specify other limitations such as average or maximum concentration limits, for the level of pollutants authorized in the discharge.

[COMMENT. The manner in which effluent limitations are expressed will depend upon the nature of the discharge. Continuous discharges shall be limited by daily loading figures and, where appropriate, may be limited as to concentration or discharge rate (e.g., for toxic or highly variable continuous discharges). Batch discharges should be more particularly described and limited in terms of (i) frequency (e.g., to occur not more than once every three weeks), (ii) total weight (e.g., not to exceed 300 pounds per batch discharge), (iii) maximum rate of discharge of pollutants during the batch discharge (e.g., not to exceed 2 pounds per minute), and (iv) prohibition or limitation by weight, concentration, or other appropriate measure of specified pollutants (e.g., shall not contain at any time more than 0.1 ppm zinc or more than ¼ pound of zinc in any batch discharge). Other intermittent discharges, such as recirculation blowdown, should be particularly limited to comply with any applicable water quality standards and effluent standards and limitations.]

64.7(4) *Schedules of compliance in issued NPDES permits.* The director shall follow the following procedure in setting schedules in NPDES permit conditions to achieve compliance with applicable effluent standards and limitations, water quality standards, and other legally applicable requirements.

a. With respect to any discharge which is not in compliance with applicable effluent standards and limitations, applicable water quality standards, or other legally applicable requirements listed in 64.7(2)*"f"* and 64.7(2)*"g,"* the permittee shall be required to take specific steps to achieve compliance with: applicable effluent standards and limitations; if more stringent, water quality standards; or if more stringent, legally applicable requirements listed in 64.7(2)*"f"* and 64.7(2)*"g."* In the absence of any legally applicable schedule of compliance, such steps shall be achieved in the shortest, reasonable period of time, such period to be consistent with the guidelines and requirements of the Act.

b. In any case where the period of time for compliance specified in paragraph 64.7(4)*"a"* exceeds one year, a schedule of compliance shall be specified in the permit which shall set forth interim requirements and the dates for their achievement; in no event shall more than one year elapse between interim dates. If the time necessary for completion of the interim requirements (such as the construction of a treatment facility) is more than one year and is not readily divided into stages for completion, interim dates shall be specified for the submission of reports of progress toward completion of the interim requirement.

[COMMENT. Certain interim requirements such as the submission of preliminary or final plans often require less than one year, and thus a shorter interval should be specified. Other requirements such as the construction of treatment facilities may require several years for completion and may not readily subdivide into one-year intervals. Long-term interim requirements should nonetheless be subdivided into intervals not longer than one year at which the permittee is required to report progress to the director pursuant to 64.7(4)*"c."*]

c. Either before or up to 14 days following each interim date and the final date of compliance the permittee shall provide the department with written notice of the permittee's compliance or noncompliance with the interim or final requirement.

d. On the last day of the months of February, May, August, and November the director shall transmit to the regional administrator a list of all instances, as of 30 days prior to the date of such report, of failure or refusal of a permittee to comply with an interim or final requirement or to notify the department of compliance or noncompliance with each interim or final requirement (as required pursuant to paragraph *"b"* of this subrule). Such list shall be available to the public for inspection and copying and shall contain at least the following information with respect to each instance of noncompliance:

(1) Name and address of each noncomplying permittee.

(2) A short description of each instance of noncompliance (e.g., failure to submit preliminary plans, two-week delay in commencement of construction of treatment facility; failure to notify of compliance with interim requirement to complete construction by June 30).

(3) A short description of any actions or proposed actions by the permittee to comply or by the director to enforce compliance with the interim or final requirement.

(4) Any details which tend to explain or mitigate an instance of noncompliance with an interim or final requirement (e.g., construction delayed due to materials shortage, plan approval delayed by objections).

e. If a permittee fails or refuses to comply with an interim or final requirement in an NPDES permit such noncompliance shall constitute a violation of the permit for which the director may, pursuant to 567—Chapters 7 and 60, modify, suspend or revoke the permit or take direct enforcement action.

64.7(5) *Schedules of compliance in issued NPDES permits for disadvantaged communities.* If compliance with federal regulations, applicable requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department will result in substantial and widespread economic and social impact (SWESI) to the ratepayers and the affected community, the director may establish in an NPDES permit a schedule of compliance that will result in an improvement of water quality and reasonable progress toward complying with the applicable requirements but does not result in SWESI. Schedules of compliance established under this subrule are intended to result in compliance with the applicable federal and state regulations and requirements by the regulated entity and the affected community.

a. *Disadvantaged community status.* The director shall find that a regulated entity and the affected community are a disadvantaged community by evaluating all of the following:

(1) The ability of the regulated entity and the affected community to pay for a project based on the ratio of the total annual project costs per household to median household income (MHI),

(2) MHI in the community and the unemployment rate of the county in which the community is located, and

(3) The outstanding debt of the system and the bond rating of the community.

b. *Disadvantaged community analysis (DCA).* A regulated entity or affected community must submit a disadvantaged community analysis (DCA) to the director to be considered for disadvantaged status. A DCA may only be submitted when new requirements in a proposed or reissued NPDES permit may result in SWESI.

(1) A DCA may be submitted by any of the following:

1. A wastewater disposal system owned by a municipal corporation or other public body created by or under Iowa law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes, or a designated and approved management agency under Section 208 of the Act (a POTW);

2. A wastewater disposal system for the treatment or disposal of domestic sewage which is not a private sewage disposal system and which is not owned by a city, a sanitary sewer district, or a designated and approved management agency under Section 208 of the Act (33 U.S.C. 1288) (a semipublic system); or

3. Any other owner of a wastewater disposal system that is not a private sewage disposal system and does not discharge industrial wastes. "Private sewage disposal system" and "industrial waste" are defined in rule 567—60.2(455B).

(2) A DCA may be submitted prior to the issuance of an initial NPDES permit if the facility does not discharge industrial wastes and is not a new source or new discharger. "New source" is defined in rule 567—60.2(455B). "New discharger" means any building, structure, facility, or installation from which there is or may be a discharge of pollutants; that did not commence the discharge of pollutants at a particular site prior to August 13, 1979; that is not a new source; and that has never received a finally effective NDPES permit for discharges at that site.

(3) A DCA may be submitted by the entities noted in subparagraph 64.7(5)*"b"*(1) above for consideration of a disadvantaged community loan interest rate under the clean water state revolving fund.

c. *Contents of a DCA.*

(1) A DCA must contain all of the following:

1. Proposed total annual project costs as defined in paragraph 64.7(5)*"d"*;

2. The number of households in the affected community or, if the entity is not serving households, the number of ratepayers;

3. A description of the bond rating of the affected community over the last year, if available;

4. The user rates, as follows:

- If the DCA is submitted by or for a municipality or other community, the current sewer rate ordinances, including the sewer rates of any industrial users;
- If the DCA is submitted by or for a water treatment facility, the water rate schedules or tables; or
- If the DCA is submitted by or for an entity other than a municipality, community, or water treatment facility, the monthly ratepayer charge for wastewater treatment;

5. An explanation of why the regulated entity or affected community believes that compliance with the proposed requirements will result in SWESI.

(2) If the DCA is submitted by or for an entity other than a municipality, community, or water treatment facility, the DCA must also contain either:

1. For entities with more than ten households or ratepayers, the median household or ratepayer income, as determined by an income survey conducted by the regulated entity based on the Iowa community development block grant income survey guidelines (the survey must be included in the DCA); or

2. For entities with ten or fewer households or ratepayers, an estimate of median household or ratepayer income.

d. Definition of total annual project costs. "Total annual project costs" means the current costs of wastewater treatment in the community (if any) plus the future costs of proposed wastewater system improvements that will meet or exceed all applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or requirements of an order of the department. Total annual project costs shall include any current and proposed facility operation and maintenance costs and any existing (outstanding) and proposed system debt, as expressed in current and proposed sewer rates. The costs of the proposed wastewater treatment shall assume a 30-year loan period at an interest rate equal to the current state revolving fund interest rate. Awarded grant funding must be subtracted from the total annual project costs.

The formula for the calculation of total annual project costs for a regulated entity and affected community is: total annual project costs = [(Estimated costs to design and build proposed project - Awarded grant funding) amortized over 30 years] + Current annual system budget (if any), including operation and maintenance (O&M) and existing debt service + Future annual O&M costs.

e. Disadvantaged community matrix (DCM). The department hereby incorporates by reference "Disadvantaged Community Matrix," DNR Form 542-1246, effective January 16, 2013. This document may be obtained on the department's NPDES Web site.

Upon receipt of a complete DCA, the director shall use the disadvantaged community matrix (DCM) to evaluate the disadvantaged status of the community. Compliance with the applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department shall be considered to result in SWESI, and the regulated entity and affected community shall be considered a disadvantaged community, if the point total derived from the DCM is equal to or greater than 12. The following data sources shall be used to derive the point total in the DCM:

(1) The total annual project costs as stated in the DCA;

(2) The number of households or ratepayers in a community as stated in the DCA;

(3) The bond rating of the community, if available, as stated in the DCA;

(4) The MHI of either:

1. The community, as found in the most recent American Community Survey or United States Census or as stated in an income survey that is conducted by the regulated entity or community and is based on the Iowa community development block grant income survey guidelines; or

2. The ratepayer group, as stated in an income survey that is conducted by the regulated entity and is based on the Iowa community development block grant income survey guidelines; and

(5) The unemployment rate of the county where the community is located and of the state as found in the most recent Iowa Workforce Information Network unemployment data.

The ratio of the total annual project costs per household or per ratepayer to MHI shall be calculated in the DCM as follows: The total annual project costs shall be divided by the number of households or ratepayers to obtain the costs per household or per ratepayer, and the costs per household or per ratepayer shall be divided by the MHI to obtain the ratio.

f. *Ratio.* The director shall not consider a regulated entity or affected community a disadvantaged community if the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is less than 1 percent. The director shall consider a regulated entity or affected community a disadvantaged community if the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is greater than or equal to 2 percent. If the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is greater than or equal to 1 percent and less than 2 percent, the director shall use the DCM to determine if the community is disadvantaged. The ratio of compliance costs to MHI shall be the ratio of the total annual project costs per household to MHI as calculated in the DCM.

g. *Compliance schedule for a disadvantaged community.* A schedule of compliance established in an NPDES permit for a disadvantaged community as a result of SWESI may contain one or two parts as necessary to comply with the applicable federal regulations and requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64.

(1) The first part of a schedule of compliance for a disadvantaged community shall encompass one five-year NPDES permit cycle and shall require the permit holder to submit an alternatives report, an alternatives implementation compliance plan (AICP), and annual reports of progress that contain brief updates regarding the completion of the alternatives report and the AICP.

1. Alternatives report. The alternatives report must detail the alternative pollution control measures that will be investigated and contain an examination of all other appropriate measures that may achieve compliance with applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department without creating SWESI. The alternatives report must describe which measures will be evaluated for feasibility and affordability during the next portion of the compliance schedule. Alternative pollution control measures may include, but are not limited to, facility upgrades, construction of a new facility, relocation of the discharge point(s), regionalization, or outfall consolidation. Other appropriate measures may include, but are not limited to, mixing zone studies, consideration of seasonal limitations or site-specific data, alteration of current facility operations, intermittent discharges, source reduction, effluent recycling or reuse, or renegotiation of treatment agreements. The alternatives report must also include a plan for pursuing funding options, including grants and low-interest loans. The alternatives report shall be submitted no later than two years after permit issuance.

2. Alternatives implementation compliance plan (AICP). The AICP shall include the results of the investigation detailed in the alternatives report, a description of any feasible and affordable alternative(s) that will be implemented, a schedule of the time necessary to implement the alternative(s), and an updated DCA. The AICP shall be submitted no later than 4½ years after permit issuance.

(2) If the entity or community continues to qualify as disadvantaged according to the DCM evaluation based on the DCA submitted with the AICP, the entity or community may receive a second schedule of compliance as specified in this subrule. The second schedule of compliance for a disadvantaged community may contain either the implementation schedule from the AICP or a schedule for submittal of a future compliance plan (FCP).

1. AICP implementation schedule. If the AICP proposes a schedule for implementation of one or more feasible alternatives, the proposed schedule shall be included in the reissued NPDES permit for the disadvantaged community.

2. Future compliance plan (FCP). The submittal of an FCP will be necessary only if the AICP concludes that the disadvantaged community cannot feasibly implement any alternatives and if the community is still disadvantaged according to the updated information in the DCA submitted with the AICP. The FCP shall detail how the disadvantaged community will meet the applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department and the period necessary to do so. An FCP shall review the types of technology capable of treating the pollutant of concern, as well as the costs of installing and operating each type of technology. All technically feasible alternatives shall be explored. The FCP shall be submitted no later than three years after permit issuance. A schedule of compliance requiring the submittal of an FCP shall also require the submittal of annual reports of progress that contain updated financial information, an updated DCA, and a brief update regarding the completion or implementation of the FCP. If the DCM evaluation determines that an entity or community is no longer disadvantaged based on the most recent DCA, the NPDES permit may be amended to change the schedule of compliance.

3. Schedule extension. The second part of a schedule of compliance for a disadvantaged community may be extended at the discretion of the director.

(3) Schedules of compliance issued in accordance with this subrule shall comply with paragraphs 64.7(4)*"b"* through *"e."*

64.7(6) *Disadvantaged unsewered communities.* If compliance with applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department will result in substantial and widespread economic and social impact (SWESI) to the ratepayers of an unsewered community, the director may negotiate a compliance agreement that will result in an improvement of water quality and reasonable progress toward complying with the applicable requirements but does not result in SWESI.

a. Disadvantaged unsewered community status. The director shall find that an unsewered community is a disadvantaged unsewered community by evaluating all of the following:

(1) The ability of the unsewered community to pay for a project based on the ratio of the total annual project costs per household to MHI,

(2) The unemployment rate in the county where the unsewered community is located, and

(3) The MHI of the unsewered community.

b. Disadvantaged unsewered community analysis (DUCA). To be considered for disadvantaged unsewered community status, an unsewered community may submit a disadvantaged unsewered community analysis (DUCA) to the director prior to the issuance of or amendment to an administrative order with requirements that could result in SWESI and that are based on applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department. Only unsewered communities may submit a DUCA under this subrule. For the purposes of this subrule, an unsewered community is defined as a grouping of ten or more residential houses with a density of one house or more per acre and with either no wastewater treatment or inadequate wastewater treatment. An entity defined in rule 567—60.2(455B) as a private sewage disposal system may not submit a DUCA or qualify for a disadvantaged unsewered community compliance agreement under paragraph 64.7(6)*"g."* A DUCA may also be submitted for consideration of a disadvantaged community loan interest rate under the clean water state revolving fund.

c. Contents of a DUCA. A DUCA must contain:

(1) Proposed total annual project costs as defined in paragraph 64.7(6)*"d"*;

(2) The number of households in the unsewered community and source of household information;

(3) Total amount of any awarded grant funding;

(4) An explanation of why the unsewered community believes that compliance with the proposed requirements will result in SWESI.

If no MHI information is available for the unsewered community, the community should conduct a rate survey to determine the MHI. The survey must be conducted in accordance with the Iowa community development block grant income survey guidelines. In addition, the survey must be attached to the DCA.

d. Definition of total annual project costs. "Total annual project costs" means the future costs of proposed wastewater system installation or improvements that will meet or exceed all applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or requirements of an order of the department. Total annual project costs shall include the proposed facility operation and maintenance (O&M) costs and the proposed debt of the system as expressed in the proposed sewer rates. The costs of the proposed wastewater treatment shall assume a 30-year loan period at an interest rate equal to the current state revolving fund interest rate. Awarded grant funding must be subtracted from the total annual project costs.

The formula for the calculation of total annual project costs for an unsewered community is: total annual project costs = [(Estimated costs to design and build proposed project - Awarded grant funding) amortized over 30 years] + Future annual O&M costs.

e. Disadvantaged unsewered community matrix (DUCM). The department hereby incorporates by reference "Disadvantaged Unsewered Community Matrix," DNR Form 542-1247, effective January 16, 2013. This document may be obtained on the department's NPDES Web site.

Upon receipt of a complete DUCA, the director shall use the disadvantaged unsewered community matrix (DUCM) to evaluate the disadvantaged status of the unsewered community. Compliance with applicable federal regulations, requirements in 567—Chapters 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, or an order of the department shall be considered to result in SWESI, and the unsewered community shall be considered a disadvantaged unsewered community, if the point total derived from the DUCM is equal to or greater than 10. The following data sources shall be used to derive the point total in the DUCM:

(1) The total annual project costs as stated in the DUCA;

(2) The number of households in the unsewered community as stated in the DUCA;

(3) The MHI of the unsewered community as found in the most recent American Community Survey or United States Census or as stated in an income survey that is conducted by the regulated entity or community and is based on the Iowa community development block grant income survey guidelines; and

(4) The unemployment rate of the county where the unsewered community is located and of the state as found in the most recent Iowa Workforce Information Network unemployment data.

The ratio of the total annual project costs per household to MHI shall be calculated in the DUCM as follows: the total annual project costs shall be divided by the number of households in the unsewered community to obtain the costs per household, and the costs per household shall be divided by MHI to obtain the ratio.

f. Ratio and other considerations. The director shall not consider an unsewered community a disadvantaged unsewered community if the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is below 1 percent. The director shall consider an unsewered community a disadvantaged unsewered community if the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is greater than or equal to 2 percent. If the ratio of compliance costs to MHI is greater than or equal to 1 percent, and less than 2 percent, the director shall use the DUCM to determine if the unsewered community is disadvantaged. The ratio of compliance costs to MHI shall be the ratio of the total annual project costs per household to MHI as calculated in the DUCM. The director shall not require installation of a wastewater treatment system by an unsewered community if the director determines that such installation would create SWESI.

g. Compliance agreement for a disadvantaged unsewered community. A compliance agreement negotiated with a disadvantaged unsewered community as a result of SWESI shall require the unsewered community to submit an alternatives report and an alternatives implementation compliance plan (AICP).

(1) Alternatives report. The alternatives report must detail the alternative pollution control measures that will be investigated and contain an examination of all other appropriate measures that may achieve compliance with the water quality standards without creating SWESI. The alternatives report must describe which measures will be evaluated for feasibility and affordability after the report submittal. Alternative pollution control measures may include, but are not limited to, upgrades of existing infrastructure, construction of a new facility, relocation of the discharge point(s), regionalization, or outfall consolidation. Other appropriate measures may include, but are not limited to, mixing zone studies, consideration of seasonal limitations or site-specific data, alteration of current facility operations, intermittent discharges, source reduction, effluent recycling or reuse, or renegotiation of treatment agreements. The alternatives report shall also include a plan for pursuing funding options, including grants and low-interest loans. The alternatives report shall be submitted no later than two years after an unsewered community has been determined to be a disadvantaged unsewered community.

(2) Alternatives implementation compliance plan (AICP). The AICP shall include the results of the investigation detailed in the alternatives report, a description of any feasible and affordable alternative(s) that will be implemented, a schedule of the time necessary to implement the alternative(s), and an updated DUCA. The AICP shall be submitted no later than 4½ years after an unsewered community has been determined to be a disadvantaged unsewered community.

(3) AICP implementation schedule. If the AICP proposes a schedule for implementation of one or more feasible alternatives, the proposed schedule shall be included in an administrative order between the department and the unsewered community. If the feasible alternative that will be implemented requires a construction permit, an operation permit, or an NPDES permit, the unsewered community shall comply with the rules regarding those permits in this chapter.

(4) Future compliance plan (FCP). The submittal of an FCP will be necessary only if the AICP concludes that the unsewered community cannot feasibly implement any alternatives and if the community is still disadvantaged according to the updated information in the DUCA submitted with the AICP. The FCP shall detail how the unsewered community will meet the water quality standards and the period necessary to do so. An FCP shall review the types of technology capable of treating the pollutant of concern, as well as the costs of installing and operating each type of technology. All technically feasible alternatives shall be explored. The FCP shall be submitted no later than seven years after an unsewered community has been determined to be a disadvantaged unsewered community. An administrative order requiring the submittal of an FCP shall also require the submittal of biennial progress reports that contain an updated DUCA. If the DUCM evaluation determines that an unsewered community is no longer disadvantaged based on the most recent DUCA, the order may be amended at the discretion of the director.

64.7(7) *Other terms and conditions of issued NPDES permits.* Each issued NPDES permit shall provide for and ensure the following:

a. That all discharges authorized by the NPDES permit shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of the permit; that facility expansions, production increases, or process modifications which result in new or increased discharges of pollutants must be reported by submission of a new NPDES application or, if such discharge does not violate effluent limitations specified in the NPDES permit, by submission to the director of notice of such new or increased discharges of pollutants; that the discharge of any pollutant more frequently than or at a level in excess of that identified and authorized by the permit shall constitute a violation of the terms and conditions of the permit; that if the terms and conditions of a general permit are no longer applicable to a discharge, the applicant shall apply for an individual NPDES permit;

b. That the permit may be amended, revoked and reissued, or terminated in whole or in part for the causes provided in 64.3(11)*"b."*

c. That the permittee shall permit the director or the director's authorized representative upon the presentation of credentials:

(1) To enter upon permittee's premises in which an effluent source is located or in which any records are required to be kept under terms and conditions of the permit;

(2) To have access to and copy any records required to be kept under terms and conditions of the permit;

(3) To inspect any monitoring equipment or method required in the permit; or

(4) To sample any discharge of pollutants.

d. That, if the permit is for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works, the permittee shall provide notice to the director of the following:

(1) One hundred eighty days in advance of any new introduction of pollutants into such treatment works from a new source as defined in 567—Chapter 60 if such source were discharging pollutants;

(2) Except as specified below, 180 days in advance of any new introduction of pollutants into such treatment works from a source which would be subject to Section 301 of the Act if such source were discharging pollutants. However, the connection of such a source need not be reported if the source contributes less than 25,000 gallons of process wastewater per day at the average discharge, or contributes less than 5 percent of the organic or hydraulic loading of the treatment facility, or is not subject to a federal pretreatment standard adopted by reference in 567—Chapter 62, or does not contribute pollutants that may cause interference or pass through; and

(3) Sixty days in advance of any substantial change in volume or character of pollutants being introduced into such treatment works by a source introducing pollutants into such works at the time of issuance of the permit.

Such notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent to be introduced into such treatment works and any anticipated impact of such change in the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from such publicly owned treatment works.

e. That, if the permit is for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works, the permittee shall require any industrial user of such treatment works to comply with the requirements of Sections 204(b), 307, and 308 of the Act. As a means of ensuring such compliance, the permittee shall require that each industrial user subject to the requirements of Section 307 of the Act give to the permittee periodic notice (over intervals not to exceed six months) of progress toward full compliance with Section 307 requirements. The permittee shall forward a copy of the notice to the director.

f. That the permittee at all times shall maintain in good working order and operate as efficiently as possible any facilities or systems of treatment and control which have been installed or are used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance also include adequate laboratory control and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems which have been installed by the permittee only when such operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.

g. That if a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any schedule of compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under Section 307(a) of the Act for a toxic pollutant which is present in the permittee's discharge and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in the NPDES permit, the director shall revise or modify the permit in accordance with the toxic effluent standard or prohibition and so notify the permittee.

h. If an applicant for an NPDES permit proposes to dispose of pollutants into wells as part of a program to meet the proposed terms and conditions of an NPDES permit, the director shall specify additional terms and conditions of the issued NPDES permit which shall prohibit the proposed disposal or control the proposed disposal in order to prevent pollution of ground and surface water resources and to protect the public health and welfare. (See rule 567—62.9(455B) which prohibits the disposal of pollutants, other than heat, into wells within Iowa.)

i. That the permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

j. It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the terms of this permit.

64.7(8) *POTW compliance—plan of action required.* The owner of a publicly owned treatment works (POTW) must prepare and implement a plan of action to achieve and maintain compliance with final effluent limitations in its NPDES permit, as specified below:

a. The director shall notify the owner of a POTW of the plan of action requirement, and of an opportunity to meet with department staff to discuss the plan of action requirements. The POTW owner shall submit a plan of action to the appropriate regional field office of the department within six months of such notice, unless a longer time is needed and is authorized in writing by the director.

b. The plan of action will vary in length and complexity depending on the compliance history and physical status of the particular POTW. It must identify the deficiencies and needs of the system, describe the causes of such deficiencies or needs, propose specific measures (including an implementation schedule) that will be taken to correct the deficiencies or meet the needs, and discuss the method of financing the improvements proposed in the plan of action. A plan may include the submittal of a disadvantaged community analysis in accordance with subrule 64.7(5), at the discretion of the POTW.

The plan may provide for a phased construction approach to meet interim and final limitations, where financing is such that a long-term project is necessary to meet final limitations, and shorter term projects may provide incremental benefits to water quality in the interim.

Information on the purpose and preparation of the plan can be found in the departmental document entitled "Guidance on Preparing a Plan of Action," available from the department's regional field offices.

c. Upon submission of a complete plan of action to the department, the plan should be reviewed and approved or disapproved within 60 days unless a longer time is required and the POTW owner is so notified.

d. The NPDES permit for the facility shall be amended to include the implementation schedule or other actions developed through the plan to achieve and maintain compliance.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code chapter 455B, division III, part 1 (455B.171 to 455B.187).

[**ARC 7625B**, IAB 3/11/09, effective 4/15/09; **ARC 0529C**, IAB 12/12/12, effective 1/16/13]