STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 1 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

9 VAC 25-720-50. Potomac - Shenandoah River Basin.

A. Total maximum daily load (TMDLs).

| TMDL# | Stream Name | TMDL Title | City/County | WBID | Pollutant | WLA | Units |
|-------|---------------|--|---------------------------|------|------------|------------|-------|
| 1. | Muddy Creek | Nitrate TMDL Development for Muddy Creek/Dry River, Virginia | Rockingham | B21R | Nitrate | 49,389.00 | LB/YR |
| 2. | Blacks Run | TMDL Development for Blacks Run and Cooks Creek | Rockingham | B25R | Sediment | 32,844.00 | LB/YR |
| 3. | Cooks Creek | TMDL Development for Blacks Run and Cooks Creek | Rockingham | B25R | Sediment | 69,301.00 | LB/YR |
| 4. | Cooks Creek | TMDL Development for Blacks Run and Cooks Creek | Rockingham | B25R | Phosphorus | 0 | LB/YR |
| 5. | Muddy Creek | TMDL Development for Muddy Creek and Holmans Creek, Virginia | Rockingham | B22R | Sediment | 286,939.00 | LB/YR |
| 6. | Muddy Creek | TMDL Development for Muddy Creek and Holmans Creek, Virginia | Rockingham | B22R | Phosphorus | 38.00 | LB/YR |
| 7. | Holmans Creek | TMDL Development for Muddy Creek and Holmans Creek, Virginia | Rockingham/ Shenandoah | B45R | Sediment | 78,141.00 | LB/YR |
| 8. | Mill Creek | TMDL Development for Mill Creek and Pleasant Run | Rockingham | B29R | Sediment | 276.00 | LB/YR |
| 9. | Mill Creek | TMDL Development for Mill Creek and Pleasant Run | Rockingham | B29R | Phosphorus | 138.00 | LB/YR |
| 10. | Pleasant Run | TMDL Development for Mill Creek and Pleasant Run | Rockingham | B27R | Sediment | 0.00 | LB/YR |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 2 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | | <u> </u> | | 1 | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|----------|---------|
| | | | | | | | |
| 11. | Pleasant Run | TMDL Development for | Rockingham | B27R | Phosphorus | 0.00 | LB/YR |
| | | Mill Creek and Pleasant | | | | | |
| | | Run | | | | | |
| 12. | Linville Creek | Total Maximum Load | Rockingham | B46R | Sediment | 5.50 | TONS/YR |
| | | Development for Linville | | | | | |
| | | Creek: Bacteria and | | | | | |
| | | Benthic Impairments | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 13. | Quail Run | Benthic TMDL for Quail | Rockingham | B35R | Ammonia | 7,185.00 | KG/YR |
| | | Run | | | | | |
| 14. | Quail Run | Benthic TMDL for Quail | Rockingham | B35R | Chlorine | 27.63 | KG/YR |
| | | Run | | | | | |
| 45 | | | 2.01.1 | D.115 | 505 | 470.00 | 0.4/5 |
| 15. | Shenandoah River | Development of | Warren & Clarke | | PCBs | 179.38 | G/YR |
| | | Shenandoah River PCB | | B55R, | | | |
| | | TMDL (South Fork and | | B57R, | | | |
| | | Main Stem) | | B58R | | | |
| 16. | Shenandoah River | Development of | Warren & Clarke | B51R | PCBs | 0.00 | G/YR |
| | | Shenandoah River PCB | | | | | |
| | | TMDL (North Fork) | | | | | |
| 17. | Shenandoah River | Development of | Warren & Clarke | WV | PCBs | 179.38 | G/YR |
| | | Shenandoah River PCB | | | | | |
| | | TMDL (Main Stem) | | | | | |
| 18. | Cockran Spring | Benthic TMDL Reports | Augusta | B10R | Organic Solids | 1,556.00 | LB/YR |
| | | for Six Impaired Stream | | | | | |
| | | Segments in the | | | | | |
| | | Potomac-Shenandoah | | | | | |
| | | and James River Basins | | | | | |
| 19. | Lacey Spring | Benthic TMDL Reports | Rockingham | B47R | Organic Solids | 680.00 | LB/YR |
| | | for Six Impaired Stream | | | | | |
| | | Segments in the | | | | | |
| | | Potomac-Shenandoah | | | | | |
| | | and James River Basins | | | | | |
| 20. | Orndorff Spring | Benthic TMDL Reports | Shenandoah | B52R | Organic Solids | 103.00 | LB/YR |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 3 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | T | Mar O'r I was in a l O'r a a a | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
|-----|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------|----------|-------|------|
| | | for Six Impaired Stream | | | | | |
| | | Segments in the | | | | | |
| | | Potomac-Shenandoah | | | | | |
| | | and James River Basins | | | | | |
| 21. | Toms Brook | Benthic TMDL for Toms | Shenandoah | B50R | Sediment | 8.1 | T/YR |
| | | Brook in Shenandoah | | | | | |
| | | County, Virginia | | | | | |
| 22. | Goose Creek | Benthic TMDLs for the | Loudoun, | A08R | Sediment | 1,587 | T/YR |
| | | Goose Creek | Fauquier | | | | |
| | | Watershed | | | | | |
| 23. | Little River | Benthic TMDLs for the | Loudoun | A08R | Sediment | 105 | T/YR |
| | | Goose Creek | | | | | |
| | | Watershed | | | | | |
| 24. | Christians Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Augusta | B14R | Sediment | 145 | T/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for | | | | | |
| | | Impaired Streams in the | | | | | |
| | | Middle River and Upper | | | | | |
| | | South River | | | | | |
| | | Watersheds, Augusta | | | | | |
| | | County, VA | | | | | |
| 25. | Moffett Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Augusta | B13R | Sediment | 0 | T/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for | | | | | |
| | | Impaired Streams in the | | | | | |
| | | Middle River and Upper | | | | | |
| | | South River | | | | | |
| | | Watersheds, Augusta | | | | | |
| | | County, VA | | | | | |
| 26. | Upper Middle River | Fecal Bacteria and | Augusta | B10R | Sediment | 1.355 | T/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for | | | | | |
| | | Impaired Streams in the | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 1 | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 4 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | | Middle River and Upper | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| | | South River | | | | | |
| | | Watersheds, Augusta | | | | | |
| | | County, VA | | | | | |
| 27. | Mossy Creek | Total Maxiumum Daily | Rockingham | B19R | Sediment | 0.04 | T/YR |
| | | Load Development for | | | | | |
| | | Mossy Creek and Long | | | | | |
| | | Glade Run: Bacteria | | | | | |
| | | and General Standard | | | | | |
| | | (Benthic) Impairments | | | | | |
| 28. | Smith Creek | Total Maxiumum Daily | Rockingham, | B47R | Sediment | 353,867 | LB/YR |
| | | Load (TMDL) | Shenandoah | | | | |
| | | Development for Smith | | | | | |
| | | Creek | | | | | |
| <u>29.</u> | Abrams Creek | Opequon Watershed | Frederick | <u>B09R</u> | Sediment | 478 | T/YR |
| | | TMDLs for Benthic | | | | | |
| | | Impairments: Abrams | | | | | |
| | | Creek and Lower | | | | | |
| | | Opequon Creek, | | | | | |
| | | Frederick and Clarke | | | | | |
| | | Counties, Virginia | | | | | |
| 30. | Lower Opequon | Opequon Watershed | Frederick, | <u>B09R</u> | Sediment | 1,039 | <u>T/YR</u> |
| | Creek | TMDLs for Benthic | <u>Clarke</u> | | | | |
| | | Impairments: Abrams | | | | | |
| | | Creek and Lower | | | | | |
| | | Opequon Creek, | | | | | |
| | | Frederick and Clarke | | | | | |
| | | Counties, Virginia | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

B. Stream segment classifications, effluent limitations including water quality based effluent limitations, and waste load allocations.

TABLE B1 - POTOMAC RIVER SUB-BASIN RECOMMENDED SEGMENT CLASSIFICATIONS

| SEGMENT | | | |
|---------|------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| NUMBER | DESCRIPTION OF SEGMENT | MILE TO MILE | CLASSIFICATION |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 5 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 1-23 | Potomac River tributaries from the Virginia-West Virginia state line downstream to the | 176.2 – 149.0 | WQ |
|------|---|---------------|----|
| | boundary of the Dulles Area Watershed Policy | | |
| 1-24 | Potomac River tributaries located within the boundaries of the Dulles Area Watershed | 149.0 – 118.4 | WQ |
| | Policy | | |
| 1-25 | Potomac River tributaries from the downstream limit of the Dulles Area Watershed Policy | 118.4 – 107.6 | WQ |
| | to Jones Point | | |
| 1-26 | Potomac River tributaries from Jones Point downstream to Route 301 bridge | 107.6 – 50.2 | WQ |
| 1-27 | All Streams included in the Occoquan Watershed Policy | | WQ |
| 1-28 | Potomac tributaries from Route 301 bridge downstream to the mouth of the Potomac River | 50.2-0.0 | EL |

TABLE B2 - POTOMAC RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR WASTEWATER FACILITIES

| FACILITY | | RECEIVING | RECOMMENDED | | TREATMENT | | | | | INSTITUTIONAL |
|----------|------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----|-----|---|----------------------|
| NUMBER | NAME | STREAM | ACTION | SIZE | LEVEL (4) | BOD ₅ | OUD | TKN | Р | ARRANGEMENT |
| 1 | Hillsboro | North Fork | Construct new | .043(2) | AWT | 7 ⁽⁷⁾ | - | - | - | Loudoun County |
| | | Catoctin Creek | facility | | | | | | | Sanitation Authority |
| | | WQ (1 -23) | | | | | | | | (LCSA) |
| 2 | Middleburg | Wancopin | Construct new | .135 | AST | 14 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | - | LCSA |
| | | Creek WQ (1- | facility; abandon | | | | | | | |
| | | 23) | old facility | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Middleburg | Unnamed | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | East and | tributary to | to new facility | | | | | | | |
| | West | Goose Creek | | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1 -23) | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Round Hill | North Fork | No further action | .2 | AWT | 10 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | - | Town of Round Hill |
| | | Goose Creek | recommended | | | | | | | |
| 5 | St. Louis | Beaver Dam | Construct new | .086 | AST | 20 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | - | LSCA |
| | | Creek WQ (1- | facility | | | | | | | |
| | | 23) | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Waterford | South Fork | No further action | .058 | AST | 24 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | - | LSCA |
| | | Catoctin Creek | recommended | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-23) | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Hamilton | Unnamed | Upgrade and or | .605 ⁽²⁾ | AWT | 7 ⁽⁷⁾ | - | - | - | Town of Hamilton |
| | | tributary to | expand | | | | | | | |
| | | South Fork of | | | | | | | | |
| | | Catoctin Creek | | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-23) | | | | | | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 6 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 8 | Leesburg | Tuscarora | Upgrade and or | 2.5 | AWT | 1 ⁽⁹⁾ | - | 1 | 0.1 | Town of Leesburg |
|----|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----|-------------------|---|---|-----|----------------------|
| | | Creek (1-24) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Lovettesville | Dutchman | Upgrade and or | .269 ⁽²⁾ | AWT | 7 ⁽⁷⁾ | - | - | - | Town of |
| | | Creek WQ (1- | expand | | | | | | | Lovetteville |
| | | 23) | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Purcellville | Unnamed | No further action | .5 | AST | 15 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | - | Town of Purcellville |
| | | tributary to | recommended | | | | | | | |
| | | North Fork | | | | | | | | |
| | | Goose Creek | | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-23) | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Paeonian | Unnamed | Construct new | .264 ⁽²⁾ | AWT | 7 ⁽⁷⁾ | - | - | - | LCSA |
| | Springs | tributary to | facility | | | | | | | |
| | | South Fork of | | | | | | | | |
| | | Catoctin Creek | | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-23) | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Cedar Run | Walnut Branch | Construct new | 1.16 ⁽²⁾ | AWT | 1 ⁽⁶⁾ | - | 1 | 0.1 | Fauquier County |
| | Regional | or Kettle Run | facility | | | | | | | Sanitation Authority |
| | | WQ (1-27) | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Vint Hill | South Run (1- | Upgrade and/or | .246 | AST | 14 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | 2.5 | U.S. Army |
| | Farms | 27) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Arlington | Four Mile Run | Upgrade and/or | 30 ⁽³⁾ | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | 0.2 | Arlington County |
| | | WQ (1-25) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Alexandria | Hunting Creek | Upgrade and/or | 54 | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | .02 | Alexandria |
| | | WQ (1-26) | expand | | | | | | | Sanitation Authority |
| 16 | Westgate | Potomac River | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | - |
| | Ŭ | WQ (1-26) | to Alexandria | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Lower | Pohick Creek | Upgrade and/or | 36(3) | AWT | 3/8 | - | 1 | 0.2 | Fairfax County |
| | Potomac | WQ (1-26) | expand | (-) | | | | | | |
| 18 | Little Hunting | Little Hunting | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | Creek | Creek WQ (1- | to Lower Potomac | | | | | | | |
| | Orcck | 26) | to Lower Fotomac | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Doque | Doque Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Creek | WQ (1-26) | to Lower Potomac | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Fort Belvoir | Doque Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | 1 and 2 | WQ (1-26) | to Lower Potomac | | | | | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 7 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 21 | Lorton | Mills Branch | Upgrade and/or | 1.0 | AWT | 3 ⁽¹¹⁾ | - | 1 | 0.1 | District of Columbia |
|----|--------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|---|---|-----|----------------------|
| | | WQ (1-26) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 22 | UOSA | Tributary to | Expanded | 10.9 ⁽³⁾ | AWT | 1 ⁽⁶⁾ | - | 1 | 0.1 | USOA |
| | | Bull Run WQ | capacity by 5 mgd | | | | | | | |
| | | (1-27) | increments | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Gainesville | Tributary Rock | Abandon Pump to | | | | | | | |
| | Haymarket | Branch WQ (1- | UOSA | | | | | | | |
| | | 27) | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Potomac | Neabsco Creek | Construct new | 12 ⁽³⁾ | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | 0.2 | Occoquan- |
| | (Mooney) | WQ (1-26) | facility | | | | | | | Woodbridge |
| | | | | | | | | | | Dumfries-Triangle |
| | | | | | | | | | | Sanitary District |
| 25 | Belmont | Marumsco | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | | Creek WQ (1- | to Potomac | | | | | | | |
| | | 26) | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Featherston | Farm Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | е | WQ (1-26) | to Potomac | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Neabsco | Neabsco Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-26) | to Potomac | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Dumfries | Quantico Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-26) | to Potomac | | | | | | | |
| 29 | Dale City #1 | Neabsco Creek | Upgrade and /or | 4.0 | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | 0.2 | Dale Service |
| | | WQ (1-26) | expand | | | | | | | Corporation (DSC) |
| 30 | Dale City #8 | Neabsco Creek | Upgrade and /or | 2.0 | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | 1 | 1 | 0.2 | DSC |
| | | WQ (1-26) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Quantico | Potomac River | Upgrade and /or | 2.0 | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | 0.2 | U.S. Marine Corps |
| | Mainside | WQ (1-26) | expand | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Aquia Creek | Austin Run WQ | Construct new | 3.0 | AWT | 3 ⁽⁸⁾ | - | 1 | 0.2 | Aquia Sanitary |
| | | (1-26) | facility | | | | | | | District |
| 33 | Aquia | Aquia Creek | Abandon- pump | | | | | | | |
| | | WQ (1-26) | to new facility | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Fairview | Potomac River | Construct new | .05 | Secondary | Secondar | - | - | - | Fairview Beach |
| | Beach | (estuary) | facility | | | у | | | | Sanitary District |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 8 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 35 | Dahlgren | Upper | Upgrade and/or | .2 | Secondary | Secondar | - | - | - | Dahlgren Sanitary |
|----|-------------|--------------|-------------------|------|-------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| | | Machodoc | expand | | | у | | | | District |
| | | Creek WQ (1- | | | | | | | | |
| | | 28) | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Colonial | Monroe Creek | No further action | .85 | Secondary | 28 ^{(5) (13)} | | | | Town of Colonial |
| | Beach | EL (1-28) | recommended | | | | | | | Beach |
| 37 | Machodoc | | Construct new | .89 | Secondary & | 48 ^{(10) (13)} | - | - | - | Machodoc Kinsale |
| | Kinsale | | facility | | Spray | | | | | Sanitary District |
| | | | | | Irrigation | | | | | |
| 38 | Callao | | Construct new | .25 | Secondary & | 48 ^{(10) (13)} | - | - | - | Callao Sanitary |
| | | | facility | | Spray | | | | | District |
| | | | | | Irrigation | | | | | |
| 39 | Heathsville | | Construct new | .10 | Secondary & | 48 ^{(10) (13)} | - | - | - | Heathsville |
| | | | facility | | Spray | | | | | Sanitary District |
| | | | | | Irrigation | | | | | |
| 40 | King George | Pine Creek | Construct new | .039 | Secondary | 30 ⁽¹³⁾ | - | - | - | King George |
| | Courthouse | | facility | | | | | | | County |

TABLE B2 - NOTES: POTOMAC RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

FACILITIES

- (1) Year 2000 design flow 201 Facility Plan, P.L. 92-500, unless otherwise noted.
- (2) Year 2000 average flow from Potomac/Shenandoah 303(e) Plans, Vol V-A Appendix, 1975 pp. B-33-B-44.
- (3) Future expansion at unspecified date.
- ⁽⁴⁾ Secondary treatment: 24-30 mg/l BOD₅, advanced secondary treatment (AST): 11-23 mg/l, advanced wastewater treatment (AWT): <10mg/l BOD₅. A range is given to recognize that various waste treatment.processes have different treatment efficiencies.
- (5) Effluent limits calculated using mathematical modeling.
- ⁽⁶⁾ Effluent limits based on Occoquan Watershed Policy, presented under reevaluation.
- (7) Effluent limits based on treatment levels established by the Potomac/Shenandoah 303(e) Plan, Vol. V-A 1975, p. 237, to protect low flow streams and downstream water supply.
- (8) Effluent limits based on Potomac River Embayment Standards, presently under reevaluation. Nitrogen removal limits deferred until reevaluation is complete.
- (9) Effluent limits based on Dulles Watershed Policy, recommended for reevaluation. Interim effluent limits of 12 mg/l BOD₅ and 20 mg/l Suspended Solids will be met until the Dulles Area Watershed Standards are reevaluated.
- (10) Effluent limits based on Virginia Sewerage Regulation, Section 33.02.01.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 9 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

- (11) Interim effluent limits of 30 mg/l BOD₅, 30mg/l Suspended Solids, and 4 mg/l Phosphorus, will be effective until average daily flows exceeds 0.75 MGD. At greater flows than 0.75 MGD, the effluent limitations will be defined by the Potomac Embayment Standards.
- (12) Secondary treatment is permitted for this facility due to the extended outfall into the main stem of the Potomac River.
- ⁽¹³⁾ This facility was also included in the Rappahannock Area Development Commission (RADCO) 208 Areawide Waste Treatment Management Plan and Potomac-Shenandoah River Basin 303 (e) Water Quality Management Plan.

TABLE B3 - SHENANDOAH RIVER SUB-BASIN RECOMMENDED SEGMENT CLASSIFICATIONS

| SEGMENT | | | |
|---------|---|--------------|----------------|
| NUMBER | DESCRIPTION OF SEGMENT | MILE TO MILE | CLASSIFICATION |
| 1-1 | North River-main stream and tributaries excluding segments 1-1a, 1-1b | 56.4-0.0 | EL |
| 1-1a | Muddy Creek-main stream and War Branch, RM 0.1-0.0 | 3.7 - 1.7 | WQ |
| 1-1b | North River-main stream | 16.1 - 4.6 | WQ |
| 1-2 | Middle River-main stream and tributaries excluding segments 1-2a, 1-2b | 69.9 - 0.0 | EL |
| 1-2a | Middle River-main stream | 29.5 - 17.9 | WQ |
| 1-2b | Lewis Creek-main stream | 9.6 - 0.0 | WQ |
| 1-3 | South River-main stream and tributaries excluding segment 1-3a | 52.2 - 0.0 | EL |
| 1-4 | South Fork Shenandoah-main stream and tributaries excluding segments 1-4a, 1- | 102.9 - 0.0 | EL |
| | 4b, 1-4c | | |
| 1-4a | South Fork Shenandoah-main stream | 88.1 - 78.2 | WQ |
| I-4b | Hawksbill Creek-main stream | 6.20 - 0.0 | WQ |
| 1-4c | Quail Run-main stream | 5.2 - 3.2 | WQ |
| 1-5 | North Fork Shenandoah- main stream and tributaries excluding segment 1-5a, 1- | 108.9 – 0.0 | EL |
| | 5h | | |
| 1-5a | Stony Creek-main stream | 19.9 - 14.9 | WQ |
| 1-5b | North Fork Shenandoah-main stream | 89.0 - 81.4 | WQ |
| 1-6 | Shenandoah River-main stream and tributaries excluding segments 1-6a, 1-6b | 57.4 - 19.8 | EL |
| 1- 6a | Stephens Run-main stream | 8.3 - 0.0 | WQ |
| 1-6b | Dog Run-main stream | 5.2 - 0.0 | WQ |
| 1-7 | Opequon Creek-main stream and tributaries excluding segments 1-7a, 1-7b | 54.9 - 23.6 | EL |
| I-7a | Opequon Creek-main stream | 32.3 - 23.6 | WQ |
| 1-7b | Abrams Creek-main stream | 8.7 - 0.0 | WQ |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 10 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 1-8 | All Virginia streams upstream of Opequon-Potomac confluence that have | EL |
|-----|---|--------|
| | headwaters in Frederick County | |
| 1-9 | All Virginia streams upstream of Opequon-Potomac confluence that have | EL |
| | headwaters in Highland County | |

^{*} R.M. = River Mile, measured from the river mouth

TABLE B4 - SHENANDOAH RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR SELECTED INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

| EAOU ITV | | | DECENTING OTDEANA | RE | COMMEND | ED | COMPLIANCE |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| FACILITY NUMBER | NAME ⁽¹⁾ | INDUSTRIAL CATEGORY | RECEIVING STREAM CLASSIFICATION | WASTEL | OAD ALLO | CATION ⁽²⁾ | COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE |
| NUMBER | | | CLASSIFICATION | BOD ₅ | TKN | NH ₃ -N | SCHEDULE |
| 1 | Wampler | Food Processing | War Branch WQ (1-1a) | 84 ⁽³⁾ | - | - | None |
| 6 | Wayn-Tex | Plastic and Synthetic | South River WQ (I-3a) | 44 ⁽⁵⁾ | - | - | None |
| | | Materials Mfg.* | | | | | |
| 7 | DuPont | Plastic and Synthetic | South River WQ (I-3a) | 600 | - | 50 | None |
| | | Materials Mfg.* | | | | | |
| 8 | Crompton- | Textile Mills* | South River WQ (1-3a) | 60 | 173 ⁽⁴⁾ | 88 | None |
| | Shenandoah | | | | | | |
| 10 | General Electric | Electroplating* | South River WQ (1-3a) | ВРТ | Effluent Li | mits | None |
| 12 | Merck | Miscellaneous Chemicals | S. F. Shenandoah River WQ | 3454 | 2846 | 1423 | Consent Order |
| | | (Pharmaceutical)* | (1-4a) | | | | |
| 17 | VOTAN | Leather, Tanning and | Hawksbill Creek WQ (I-4b) | 240 | 75 | - | None |
| | | Finishing* | | | | | |
| 21 | National Fruit | Food Processing | N. F. Shenandoah River WQ | (6) | (6) | (6) | None |
| | | | (1-5b) | | | | |
| 22 | Rockingham | Food Processing | N. F. Shenandoah River WQ | (6) | (6) | (6) | None |
| | Poultry | | (1-5b) | | | | |
| 23 | Shen-Valley | Food Processing | N. F. Shenandoah River WQ | (6) | (6) | (6) | None |
| | Meat Packers | | (1-5b) | | | | |
| 35 | O'Sullivan | Rubber Processing* | Abrams Creek WQ (I-7b) | BPT | Effluent Li | mits | None |
| | | Machinery and Mechanical | | | | | |
| | | Products Manufacturing | | | | | |

TABLE B4 - NOTES: SHENANDOAH RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN SELECTED INDUSTRIAL

WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

⁽¹⁾ An * identifies those industrial categories that are included in EPA's primary industry classification for which potential priority toxic pollutants have been identified.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 11 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

- (2) Allocation (lb/d) based upon 7Q10 stream flow. Tiered permits may allow greater wasteloads during times of higher flow. BPT = Best Practicable Technology.
- (3) A summer 1979 stream survey has demonstrated instream D.O. violations. Therefore, the identified wasteload allocation is to be considered as interim and shall be subject to further analysis.
- (4) The NPDES permit does not specify TKN but does specify organic-N of 85 lb/d. TKN is the sum of NH -N and organic -N.
- (5) This allocation is based upon a flow of 0.847 MGD.
- (6) The total assimilative capacity for segment WQ (1-5b) will be developed from an intensive stream survey program and development of an appropriate calibrated and verified model. Wasteload allocations for National Fruit, Rockingham Poultry and Shen-Valley will be determined after the development of the calibrated and verified model and the determination of the segment's assimilative capacity.

TABLE B5 - SHENANDOAH RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR SELECTED MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

| EAOU ITV | | RECOMMENDED | F | ACILITY | | WASTELOAD | INIOTITUTIONIAL | 000401140105(4) |
|----------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| FACILITY | NAME | RECEIVING | RECOMMENDED | SIZE ⁽¹⁾ | TREATMENT ⁽²⁾ | ALLOCATION ⁽³⁾ | INSTITUTIONAL | COMPLIANCE ⁽⁴⁾ |
| NUMBER | | CTDEAM | | | | | ARRANGEMENT | SCHEDULE |
| | | STREAM | ACTION | | LEVEL | lb/d BOD ₅ | | |
| 2 | Harrisonburg | North River WQ | Correct I/I | 12.0 ⁽⁵⁾ | AST | 2,0002 ⁽⁶⁾ | Harrisonburg- | None |
| | Rockingham | (1-1) | | | | | Rockingham | |
| | Reg. Sewer | | | | | | Regional Sewer | |
| | Auth. | | | | | | Authority | |
| 3 | Verona | Middle River WQ | Construct new | 0.8 | Secondary | Secondary | Augusta County | July 1, 1983 |
| | | (1-2a) | facility, abandon | | | Limits | Service Authority | |
| | | | old plant, correct | | | | | |
| | | | 1/1 | | | | | |
| 4 | Staunton | Middle River WQ | Upgrade, provide | 4.5 | Secondary | Secondary | City of Staunton | July 1, 1983 |
| | | (1-2a) | outfall to Middle | | | Limits | | |
| | | | River, correct I/I | | | | | |
| 5 | Fishersville | Christians Creek | No further action | 2.0 | Secondary | Secondary | Augusta County | None |
| | | EL (1-2) | recommended | | | Limits | Service Authority | |
| 9 | Waynesboro | South River WQ | Upgrade, correct | 4.0 | AWT with | 250 ⁽⁵⁾ | City of | July 1, 1983 |
| | | (1-3a) | 1/1 | | nitrification | | Waynesboro | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 12 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 11 | Grottoes | South River EL | Construct new | 0.225 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Grottoes | No existing |
|----|-------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|
| | | (1-3) | facility | | | Limits | | facility |
| 13 | Elkton | S.F. Shenandoah | Construct new | 0.4 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Elkton | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River WQ (1-4a) | facility, abandon | | | Limits | | |
| | | | old plant | | | | | |
| 14 | Massanutten | Quail Run WQ (1- | No further action | 1.0 | AWT | 84.0 ⁽⁸⁾ | Private | None |
| | Public | 4c) | recommended | | | | | |
| | Service | | | | | | | |
| | Corporation | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Shenandoah | S.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | 0.35 | Secondary | Secondary limits | Town of | No existing |
| | | River EL (1-4) | correct I/I | | | | Shenandoah | facility |
| 16 | Stanley | S.F. Shenandoah | Construct new | 0.3 | Secondary | Secondary limits | Town of Stanley | No existing |
| | | River EL (1-4) | facility | | | | | facility |
| 18 | Luray | Hawksbill Creek | Construct new | 0.8 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Luray | July 1, 1983 |
| | | WQ (1-4b) | facility, abandon | | | Limits | | |
| | | | old plant, correct | | | | | |
| | | | 1/1 | | | | | |
| 19 | Front Royal | Shenandoah | Construct new | 2.0 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Front | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River EL (1-6) | facility, abandon | | | Limits | Royal | |
| | | | old plant, correct | | | | | |
| | | | 1/1 | | | | | |
| 20 | Broadway | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | (6) | (6) | (6) | Town of | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River WQ (1-5b) | investigate I/I | | | | Broadway | |
| 24 | Timberville | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | (6) | (6) | (6) | Town of | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River WQ (1-5b) | investigate I/I | | | | Timberville | |
| 25 | New Market | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, | 0.2 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of New | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River EL (1-5) | investigate I/I | | | Limits | Market | |
| 26 | Mount | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | .0.2 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Mount | July 1, 1983 |
| | Jackson | River EL (1-5) | correct I/I | | | Limits | Jackson | |
| 27 | Edinburg | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | 0.15 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Edinburg | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River EL (1-5) | investigate I/I | | AST | Limits 65 | Public | None |
| 28 | Stony Creek | River EL (1-5) | No further action | 0.6 | AST | 65 | Public | |
| | Sanitary | Stony Creek WQ | required | | | | | |
| | Sariitary | Otorry Orock WW | .09000 | | | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 13 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 29 | Woodstock | N.F. Shenandoah | | 0.5 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of | July 1, 1983 |
|----|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | River EL (1-5) | | | | Limits | Woodstock | |
| 30 | Toms Brook- | Toms Brook EL | Construct new | 0.189 | Secondary | Secondary | Toms Brook | No existing |
| | Mauertown | (1-5) | facility | | | Limits | | facility |
| 31 | Strasburg | N.F. Shenandoah | Upgrade, expand, | 0.8 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River EL (1-5) | correct I/I | | | Limits | Strasburg | |
| 32 | Middletown | Meadow Brook | Upgrade, expand | 0.2 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of | July 1, 1983 |
| | | EL (1-5) | | | | | Middletown | |
| 33 | Stephens | Stephens Run EL | Upgrade, expand | 0.54 | AST | 72 | Frederick- | July 1, 1983 |
| | City | (1-6a) | | | | | Winchester | |
| | Stephens | | | | | | Service Authority | |
| | Run | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Berryville | Shenandoah | Upgrade, provide | 0.41 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Berryville | July 1, 1983 |
| | | River EL (1-6) | outfall to | | | Limits | | |
| | | | Shenandoah | | | | | |
| | | | River, investigate | | | | | |
| | | | 1/1 | | | | | |
| 36 | Frederick- | Opequon Creek | Construct new | 6.0 | AWT with | 456 ⁽⁷⁾ | Frederick- | July 1, 1983 |
| | Winchester | WQ (1-7a) | facility, abandon | | nitrification | | Winchester | |
| | Regional | | county and city | | | | Service Authority | |
| | | | plans, correct I/I | | | | | |
| 37 | Monterey | West Strait Creek | Upgrade, correct | 0.075 | Secondary | Secondary | Town of Monterey | July 1, 1983 |
| | | EL (1-9) | 1/1 | | | Limits | | |
| | | 1 | 1 | | l | 1 | | 1 |

TABLE B5 - NOTES: SHENANDOAH RIVER SUB-BASIN - RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR SELECTED MUNICIPAL

WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

Tiered permits may allow greater wasteloads during periods of higher stream flows. Allocations other than BOD₅ are noted by footnote.

⁽¹⁾ Year 2000 design flow (MGD) unless otherwise noted.

⁽²⁾ Secondary treatment: 24-30 mg/l BOD₅, advanced secondary treatment (AST): 11-23 mg/l BOD₅, advanced wastewater treatment (AWT): <10 mg/l BOD₅. A range is given to recognize that various waste treatment processes have different treatment efficiencies.

⁽³⁾ Recommended wasteload allocation calculated using mathematical modeling based upon 7Q10 stream flows.

⁽⁴⁾ The July 1, 1983, data is a statutory deadline required by P.L. 92-500, as amended by P.L. 92-217. The timing of construction grant funding may result in some localities to miss this deadline.

⁽⁵⁾ Year 2008 design.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 14 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

9 VAC 25-720-90. Tennessee-Big Sandy River Basin.

A. Total maximum Daily Load (TMDLs).

| TMDL# | Stream Name | TMDL Title | City/ | WBID | Pollutant | WLA | Units |
|-------|------------------|--|------------|------|-----------|------------------------------------|-------|
| | | | County | | | | |
| 1. | Guest River | Guest River Total | Wise | P11R | Sediment | 317.52 | LB/YR |
| | | Maximum Load Report | | | | | |
| 2. | Cedar Creek | Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Development for Cedar Creek, Hall/Byers Creek | Washington | O05R | Sediment | 1,789.93 | LB/YR |
| 3. | Hall/Byers Creek | and Hutton Creek Total Maximum Daily | Washington | O05R | Sediment | 57,533.49 | LB/YR |
| 3. | Hall/Byers Creek | Load (TMDL) Development for Cedar Creek, Hall/Byers Creek and Hutton Creek | | OUSK | Seument | 37,333.49 | LB/TK |
| 4. | Hutton Creek | Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Development for Cedar Creek, Hall/Byers Creek and Hutton Creek | Washington | O05R | Sediment | 91.32 | LB/YR |
| 5. | Clinch River | Total Maximum Daily Load Development for the Upper Clinch River Watershed | Tazewell | P01R | Sediment | 206,636 | LB/YR |
| 6. | Lewis Creek | Total Maximum Daily Load Development for the Lewis Creek Watershed | Russell | P04R | Sediment | 21,732 <u>40,008</u> | LB/YR |
| 7. | Black Creek | General Standard Total Maximum Daily Load | Wise | P17R | Manganese | 2,127 | KG/YR |

 $^{^{(6)}}$ This BOD loading is based on a 7QI0 flow rate of 26.8 cfs at the HRRSA discharge.

 $^{^{(7)}}$ NH₃ -N = 50 lb/d.

 $^{^{(8)}}$ This allocation is based on a TKN loading no greater than 84 lb/day.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 15 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | | Development for Black Creek, Wise County, Virginia | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---|------------|------|---------------------------|-----------|-------|
| 8. | Dumps Creek | General Standard Total Maximum Daily Load Development for Dumps Creek, Russell County, Virginia | Russell | P08R | Total Dissolved Solids | 1,631,575 | KG/YR |
| 9. | Dumps Creek | General Standard Total Maximum Daily Load Development for Dumps Creek, Russell County, Virginia | Russell | P08R | Total Suspended Solids | 316,523 | KG/YR |
| 10. | Beaver Creek | Total Maximum Daily Load Development for the Beaver Creek Watershed | Washington | O07R | Sediment | 784,036 | LB/YR |

B. Stream segment classifications, effluent limitations including water quality based effluent limitations, and waste load allocations.

TABLE B1 - SEWERAGE SERVICE AREAS

| | | | | NPDES LIM | ITS ³ | |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|---|
| | | Receiving | | | 1 | |
| Map ¹ | | Stream | FLOW | BOD₅ | SS | Status of Applicable ⁴ Section 201 Programs (March |
| No. | Locality | Classification ² | (mgd) | (1lbs/day) | (lbs/day) | 1977) |
| 14T | Abingdon | EL | 0.6 | 840 | 840 | Step III at EPA for award. |
| 14B | Amonate | EL | Permit to | be issued in f | future | Not on priority list. |
| 4T | Appalachia | EL | 0.3 | 75 | 75 | To be studied with Big Stone Gap |
| 5T | Big Stone Gap | EL | 0.8 | 240 | 240 | Recommended for FY 77 Step 1. |
| 13B | Bishop | EL | Permit to | be issued in f | future | Not on priority list. |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 16 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | Bristol | EL | Served b | y plant in Ten | nessee | Health hazard area to be served by collection system |
|--------|------------------|------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | funded in FY 76. Extension of existing interceptor into |
| | | | | | | Bearer Creek & Sinking Creek area to be funded by |
| | | | | | | Region IV EPA and Tennessee. Also infiltration/inflow |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | study to be funded in FY 77. |
| 23T | Chilhowie | EL | 0.265 | 68.5 | 79.6 | Proposed Step I study with Marion. |
| | Cleveland | WQ | 0.05 | 12.5 | 12.5 | Step III grant awarded by EPA. |
| | Clinchport | WQ | Not to ex | ceed present | discharge | Town and Country Authority has not yet applied for Step I |
| | | | | | | from FY 76 funds. |
| 2B | Clintwood | WQ | 0.235 | *70.5/117.5 | *70.5/ | On FY 77 list for Step I. |
| | | | | | 117.5 | |
| 11T | Coeburn | WQ | 0.4 | 160 | 160 | On FY 77 list for Step I. |
| | | | | | | · · |
| 18T | Damascus | EL | 0.25 | 62.5 | 62.5 | Final audit and inspection of facility completed. |
| 6T | Duffield | EL | 0.075 | 30 | 30 | Not on priority list. |
| | Dungannon- Fort | WQ | Permit to | be issued in t | future | Not on priority list. |
| | Blackmore | | | | | |
| 10T | Gate City- Weber | EL | 0.504 | *151/252 | *151/252 | Step I in progress. |
| | City | | | | | |
| 3B, 5B | Harmon-Big | | 1.25 | 156 | 312 | System is approved by state and submitted to EPA. |
| | Rock | | | | | |
| 6B, 7B | Grundy-Vansant | WQ | Permit to | be issued in t | future | System is approved and submitted to EPA. |
| 9B | Haysi | WQ | Permit to | be issued in t | future | Step I plan is complete. Town disapproved plan. SWCB |
| | | | | | | evaluating alternatives. |
| OD T | Lluriou | I WO | Dormit to | ha issued in t | ftvo | |
| 8B T | Hurley | WQ | | be issued in t | | Step I plan complete and under review by state. |
| 1T | Jonesville | EL | 0.15 | 38 | 38 | Not on priority list. |
| 13T | Lebanon | WQ | 0.2 | 60 | 60 | Step III application at EPA. |
| 25T | Marion | EL | 1.7 | 510 | 510 | Step I recommended for FY 77. Marion is proceeding on |
| | | | | | | infiltration/inflow study under prior approval from EPA. |
| | Nickelsville | WQ | Permit to | be issued in t | future | Not on priority list. |
| 7T, 8T | Norton | WQ | 0.77, | 832,371 | 640,0184 | Step I in process (with Wise). |
| | | | 0.22 | | | |
| 2T | Pennington Gap | EL | 0.315 | 410 | 315 | Step I recommended for FY 76. Community has not yet |
| | | | | | | completed Step I application. |
| 1 B | Pound | WQ | 0.175 | 44 | 44 | Step III funded by EPA. Facility nearly completed. |
| 19T | Raven-Doran | WQ | 0.26 | 67.2 | 78 | System to remain unchanged. |
| 131 | Navon-Dolan | *** | 0.20 | 01.2 | , 0 | Gyotom to remain unonanged. |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 17 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 20T | Richlands | WQ | 8.0 | 845 | 650 | Step I in process. Step II recommended in FY 77. |
|------|-----------------|----|-----------|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| | Rosedale | WQ | Permit to | Permit to be issued in future | | Not on priority list. |
| | Rose Hill-Ewing | EL | Permit to | Permit to be issued in future | | Not on priority list. |
| 3T | St. Charles | EL | 0.125 | 25 | 25 | Abandonment proposed. Then to be served by |
| | | | | | | Pennington Gap, subject to recommendations of Facility |
| | | | | | | Plan. |
| 12T | St. Paul | WQ | 0.4 | 100 | 100 | Complete and audited by EPA. |
| 22T | Saltville | EL | 0.5 | 125 | 125 | Complete and audited by EPA. |
| | Sugar Grove- | EL | Permit to | be issued in f | future | Not on priority list. |
| | Teas | | | | | |
| 15T | Swords Creek- | EL | 0.144 | 187 | 144 | Step I in FY 76. Step II recommended in FY 77. |
| | Honaker | | | | | |
| 24T | Tazewell, Town | EL | 0.70 | *210/350 | *210/350 | Step I recommended in FY 77. |
| | of | | | | | |
| 10B, | Trammel- | WQ | Permit to | be issued in f | future | Not on priority list. |
| 11B, | McClure | | | | | |
| 12B | | | | | | |
| 9T | Wise | WQ | 0.28 | 112 | 112 | Step I in progress (with Norton). |

¹ Dischargers are shown on Plate 3-B (Map No. with "B" designates Big Sandy) and 3-T (Map No. with "T" designates

Tennessee).

Source: Thompson & Litton and State Water Control Board.

9 VAC 25-720-130. New River.

A. Total maximum Daily Load (TMDLs).

| TMDL# | Stream Name | TMDL Title | City/County | WBID | Pollutant | WLA | Units |
|-------|-----------------|---|-------------|------|-----------|--------|-------|
| 1. | Stroubles Creek | Benthic TMDL for Stroubles Creek in Montgomery County, Virginia | Montgomery | N22R | Sediment | 233.15 | T/YR |
| 2. | Back Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Pulaski | N22R | Sediment | 0.28 | T/YR |

² Effluent Limiting (EL) or Water Quality (WQ).

³ For existing sewage treatment facility.

⁴ For new sewage treatment facility.

^{*}Seasonal NPDES allowable loading: April to September/October to March.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 18 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| | | General Standard Total | | 1 | | | |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for Back | | | | | |
| | | Creek Watershed, | | | | | |
| | | Pulaski County, VA | | | | | |
| 3. | Crab Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Montgomery | N18R | Sediment | 77 | T/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for Crab | | | | | |
| | | Creek Watershed, | | | | | |
| | | Montgomery County, VA | | | | | |
| 4. | Peak Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Pulaski | N17R | Copper | 12 | KG/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for Peak | | | | | |
| | | Creek Watershed, | | | | | |
| | | Pulaski County, VA | | | | | |
| 5. | Peak Creek | Fecal Bacteria and | Pulaski | N17R | Zinc | 57 | KG/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for Peak | | | | | |
| | | Creek Watershed, | | | | | |
| | | Pulaski County, VA | | | | | |
| 6. | Bluestone River | Fecal Bacteria and | Tazewell | N36R | Sediment | 81.4 | T/YR |
| | | General Standard Total | | | | | |
| | | Maximum Daily Load | | | | | |
| | | Development for | | | | | |
| | | Bluestone River | | | | | |
| <u>7.</u> | Hunting Camp Creek | "Total Maximum Daily | Bland | <u>N31R</u> | Sediment | <u>0</u> | LB/YR |
| | | Load (TMDL) | | | | | |
| | | Development for | | | | | |
| | | Hunting Camp Creek | | | | | |
| | | Aquatic Life Use | | | | | |
| | | (Benthic) and E. coli | | | | | |
| | | (Bacteria) Impairments" | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | <u> </u> | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 19 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

B. Stream segment classifications, effluent limitations including water quality based effluent limitations, and waste load allocations.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 20 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

TABLE B1- SEWERAGE SERVICE AREAS

| | | Receiving2 | | NPDES Limits3 | | |
|------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| Map1 | | Stream | | Flow BOD5 SS | | Status of Applicable4 Section 201 |
| No. | Locality | Classification | (n | ngd) (kg/day) (kg/d | lay) | Programs (January 1980) |
| | Abbs Valley | WQ | Permit not n | eeded at present | | Not on priority list |
| | Austinville | EL | Permit not n | eeded at present | | Not on priority list |
| | Bastian | EL | Permit not n | eeded at present | | Continue to use septic tanks for present |
| 1 | Blacksburg | EL | 6.0 | 544.8 | 544.8 | Completed |
| | Bland | EL | Permit to be | issued in future | 1 | Not on priority list |
| 29 | Bluefield | WQ | 3.5 | 106 | 106 | Near Completion |
| | Boissevain | WQ | Effluent trea | ted at Pocahontas | | Redesign to treat at Pocahontas |
| | | | | | | underway |
| 2 | Christiansburg | WQ | 2.0 | 113.5 | 113.5 | Completed |
| 3 | Dublin | EL | .22 | 29.9/49.9 | 29.9/49.9 | To be connected to Pepper's Ferry STP |
| | | | | | | (Radford Cluster) in FY-80 |
| | Elk Creek | EL | Permit not n | eeded at present | | Continue to use septic tanks |
| 4 | Fairlawn | EL | .26 | 47 | 47 | To be connected to Pepper's Ferry STP |
| | | | | | | (Radford Cluster) |
| | Falls Mills | WQ | .144 | 5.5 | 5.5 | Step I approved; limits for new plant |
| | Flat Ridge | EL | Permit not n | eeded at present | | Not on priority list |
| *5 | Floyd | EL | .1 | 59.0 | 45.4 | Small community; Step IV |
| 13 | Fries | EL | .02 | 11.8 | 9.1 | Step I approved |
| 14 | | | .16 | 94.5 | 72.7 | |
| 17 | Galax | EL | 1.5 | 170 | 170 | Not on priority list |
| | Glen Lyn | EL | Permit not n | eeded at present | 1 | Not on priority list |
| 15 | Hillsville | EL | .2 | 23 | 23 | Step I to be approved soon |
| 16 | | | .15 | 17 | 17 | |
| L | | 1 | 1 | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 21 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| *18 | Independence | EL | .2 | 22.7 | 22.7 | Step I approved; selected alternative | | |
|-----|---------------|----|----------------|------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | was for one plant | | |
| 19 | | | .1 | 11.4 | 11.4 | | | |
| | Ivanhoe | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Continue to use septic tanks | | |
| | Max Meadows | EL | Permit to be i | ssued in future | | Not on priority list | | |
| | Mechanicsburg | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Not on priority list | | |
| 6 | Narrows | EL | 0.60 | 0.60 354.0 272.0 | | Step I at EPA; Step II - FY-80 | | |
| | Newport | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Not on priority list | | |
| 7 | Pearisburg | EL | 0.30 | 177.0 | 136.0 | Step I at EPA; Step II - FY-80; Step III | | |
| | | | | | | - FY-84 | | |
| | Pembroke | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Not on priority list | | |
| *30 | Pocahontas | WQ | .15 | 17 | 17 | Step I grant approved to correct I/I | | |
| | | | | | | problems | | |
| 8 | Pulaski | EL | 2.0 | 234/303 | 234 | To be connected to Pepper's Ferry STP | | |
| | | | | | | (Radford Cluster) in FY-80 (Step II) | | |
| 9 | Radford STP | EL | 2.5 | 1475 | 925 | Step II - FY-80 | | |
| *10 | Rich Creek | EL | .12 | 71 | 54 | Step I at EPA, Step IV - FY-83 | | |
| 31 | Riner | EL | .035 | 4.0 | 4.0 | Completed | | |
| | Rocky Gap | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Continue to use septic tanks for present | | |
| 12 | Rural Retreat | EL | 0.15 | 37.5 | 37.5 | Step I to be completed in FY-80 | | |
| | Speedwell | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Continue to use individual septic tanks | | |
| | | | | | | for present | | |
| | Troutdale | EL | Permit not ne | eded at present | | Continue to use individual septic tanks | | |
| | | | | | | for present | | |
| | Woodlawn | EL | Permit to be i | ssued in future | | Not on priority list | | |
| 11 | Wytheville | EL | 20 | 400 | 200 | Sewage treatment plant completed | | |
| | 1 | | | l . | | | | |

1Discharges are shown on Plate 3.

2Effluent Limiting (E.L.) or Water Quality Limiting (WQ).

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 22 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

3For existing sewage treatment facility.

4For new sewage treatment facility.

*Small communities with combined Step II and III Grants.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 23 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

TABLE B2- EFFLUENT LIMITS(1) (4) NEW RIVER BASIN

| - · · | | Maximum BOD5 | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Discharge | Receiving Stream | Loading Limits (kg/day) | | |
| Troutdale | Fox Creek | 6.1 | | |
| Independence | Peachbottom Creek | 13.5 | | |
| Fries | New River | 50.5 | | |
| Galax | Chestnut Creek | 240.3 | | |
| Hillsville | Little Reed Island Creek | 99.6 | | |
| Woodlawn | Crooked Creek | 69.5 | | |
| Speedwell | Cripple Creek | 17.4 | | |
| Austinville | New River | 19.5 | | |
| Rural Retreat | South Fork | 50.5 | | |
| Wytheville | Reed Creek | 298.3 | | |
| Max Meadows | Reed Creek | 82.4 | | |
| (3)Pulaski | Peak Creek | 316.8 | | |
| Floyd | Dodd Creek | 24.1 | | |
| Riner | Mill Creek | 9.8 | | |
| Blacksburg | New River | 583.4 | | |
| Christiansburg | Crab Creek | 359.4 | | |
| (3)Dublin-New River- | New River | 772.7 | | |
| Fairlawn-Radford-Plum | | | | |
| Creek | | | | |
| Newport | Sinking Creek | 2.9 | | |
| Pembroke | New River | 28.4 | | |
| Bland | Walker Creek | 10.3 | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 24 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| Mechanicsburg | Walker Creek | 3.1 |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Narrows-Pearisburg | New River | 110.8 |
| Bastian | Wolf Creek | 10.4 |
| Rocky Gap | Wolf Creek | 9.0 |
| Rich Creek | Rich Creek | 19.9 |
| Glen Lyn | New River | 5.7 |
| Bluefield | Bluestone River | 136.4 |
| (2) Abbs Valley | Laurel Fork | 11.4 |
| (2) Pocahontas | Laurel Fork | 5.5 |
| (2) Boissevain | Laurel Fork | 5.9 |

- (1) Other effluent limitations will be determined by Water Quality Standards and/or Best Available Technology requirements.
- (2) Secondary treatment will be required until a further verification of the model is made to document the need for treatment beyond secondary.
 - (3) To join Radford Cluster.
- (4) This table supersedes Table 152, page 199, Thompson & Litton, Inc., New River Basin Comprehensive Water

 Resources Plan, Volume V-A.

TABLE B3- NEW RIVER BASIN INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS*

Parameters in Average kg/day or (Concentration) as mg/l

FACILITY NUMBER

| MAP NUMBER | BOD5 | SS | OIL & GREASE | IRON | COPPER | |
|------------|------|------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| 20 APCO | | | | | | |
| 004 | | 382 | 192 | | | |
| 401 | 1.14 | | | (1.0) MAX | (1.0) MAX | |
| 501 | | 1.14 | | | | |
| 006 | | 318 | 159 | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 25 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 21 Burlington Industries | BOD5 | SS | PHENOLS | SULFIDE | ALUMINUM | |
|--------------------------|----------|--------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 001 | | | | | | |
| | 346 | 354 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 1.0 | |
| 22 Celanese Fibers Co. | FLOW | BOD5 | SS | COD | | |
| 002 | (MGD) | | | | | |
| 003 | 2.8 | (30) | | | | |
| | 3.5 | 2,999 | 2,023 | 27,694 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 23 Hercules, Inc. | ss | | | | | |
| 001 | 34 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 24 Lynchburg Foundry | SS | OIL & | PHENOLS | | | |
| 001 | | GREASE | | | | |
| | 143 | 53.1 | 1.04 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 25 RAAP Combined Ind. | FLOW | BOD5 | SS | COD | OXIDIZED | SULFATE |
| 026 | (MGD) | | | | NITROGEN | |
| | 1.0 | 114 | 6,714 | 237 | 18,697 | 565 |
| | | | 114 | | | 67 |
| | | | | | | |
| 26 New Jersey Zinc | BOD5 | SS | TOTAL CYANIDE | DISSOLVED LEAD | DISSOLVED ZINC | DISSOLVED IRON |
| 001 | | (38) | | (0.25) | (1.0) | (0.3) |
| 002 | | (.30) | | (0.25) | (1.0) | (0.25) |
| 003 | | (20) | (0.02) | (0.35) | (1.0) | (0.25) |
| 004 | | (30) | (0.02) | (1.0) | (0.25) | |
| 005 | | (30) | (0.25) | (0.25) | (1.0) | (0.25) |
| 006 | 2.3 | 2.3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 27 Elk Creek Raycarl | ss | OIL & | IRON | PHOSPHATE | ZINC | |
| Products | | GREASE | | | | |
| | (5) | (10) | (1) | (2) | (0.5) | |
| | | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | | |

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD Page 26 of 26 CHAPTER 720. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING REGULATION.

| 28 Fields Mfg | BOD5 | SS | OIL | & | GREASE | TEMP. | |
|---------------|------|-----|-----|---|--------|-------|--|
| | 3.6 | 4.1 | 0.8 | | | 75°F | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Certified True and Accurate: | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | Robert G. Burnley | |
| | Director, DEQ | |
| Date: | | |