Bub, Laura A

From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 11:40 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.; Masnado, Robert
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

More fuel for this bomb. I know the Elcho "diffused surface water" discharge was designed to surface in a wetland and I suspect the same is true for Land O Lakes. I don't think the impacts to the wetlands have ever been considered. NR 103 review?

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 10:29 AM
To: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.; Masnado, Robert
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The term "diffused surface water " discharge is new to me. Are you implying that we should be adding surface water discharge limits to their permit?

How do we know the ammomia is nitrifying before it reaches the surface water? Are the facilities monitoring the surface waters? I thought this was just a way to avoid the groundwater nitrogen limits by saying that the effluent surfaces before it leaves the facility property boundaries.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Watson, Susan S.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:49 AM
To: Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

I believe NOR has Land O'Lakes, Elcho S.D., and Village of Bruce that are designated as having a diffused surface water discharge. Although, these are listed as groundwater dischargers in SWAMP. Now that I think about it, I wonder if they may be more appropriately designated as "both"? I know there are other such dischargers in other regions.

As far as I know, the reason for this designation in all three cases is not to require the facilities to nitrify since that happens in the ground before the discharge reaches the waters edge as nitrate-nitrite which we don't have a surface water standard for. Because the facility is considered a diffused surface water discharger rather than a strict groundwater discharger, it does not get a total nitrogen limit on the discharge to the seepage cells.

I guess the question is, do we need to have the surface waters they are discharging into classified to protect their water quality? For example, to calculate ammonia limits so we determine if ammonia is a concern, i.e, are they are meeting the ammonia limits or any other parameter limits that might be a concern in the future. We have always assumed this won't be a problem. This seems like it might be a broader question on how to define and deal with these types of dischargers.

Personally, I think it's counterproductive to declassify a stream to "default" when we have some information to indicate it is a variance stream. For Land O'Lakes maybe we just need to do a complete review and varify the classification?

Sorry to complicate this matter,

Susan

-----Original Message-----
From: Ohm, Steven H.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:02 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

A point of clarification which may be relevant from the NR 104 drop/delete perspective is the Land O Lakes discharge is actually considered a diffused **surface water** discharge through the ground. There are several of these throughout the State.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 5:07 PM
To: Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Kreitlow, James D.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The Town of Land O Lakes in Vilas County has not had a surface water discharge since January 2002. They built a new treatment plant and now discharge to groundwater.

As for the "drop delete", that has been somewhat controversial for our wastewater staff but I will say I don't think we have adequate documentation to support the LAL classification for the unamed tributary.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Bub, Laura A
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 11:04 AM
To: Jaeger, William
Subject: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

Hi Bill--

I have a note that Trib to Wisconsin River, Land o Lakes in Vilas Co should be "drop deleted" from NR 104. Can you please confirm that this is correct, and could you also let me know if the reason for this deletion from NR 104 is due to a cease in discharge at the location, or the finding of an FAL community?

Thanks-
Laura

Bub, Laura A

From: Ohm, Steven H.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 11:40 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Watson, Susan S.; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.; Masnado, Robert
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The guidance on wastewater land application systems located in areas of groundwater discharge to surface water goes back to 1996. The only places where it's been allowed to my knowledge is where there's been a confirmation of groundwater flow discharge to surface water within the point of standards application. That confirmation is done typically during facility planning. It is re-evaluated as part of a groundwater evaluation during permit reissuance.

One of the concerns is that we also be confident that the discharge of the impacted groundwater to surface water would not adversely effect surface water quality. The way that is done in most cases is through groundwater monitoring related to a defined point of standards application to monitor groundwater flow and to assess ground water quality and evaluate additional treatment taking place in the soil beneath the site. That monitoring is relative to both ground water and suface water quality.

While surface water discharge limits in the permit likely in most cases would not be applicable, it would seem to me that it would be preferrable in any surface water discharge situation, that we know the stream classification whether the discharge be a direct or diffused surface water discharge.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 10:29 AM
To: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.; Masnado, Robert
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The term "diffused surface water " discharge is new to me. Are you implying that we should be adding surface water discharge limits to their permit?

How do we know the ammomia is nitrifying before it reaches the surface water? Are the facilities monitoring the surface waters? I thought this was just a way to avoid the groundwater nitrogen limits by saying that the effluent surfaces before it leaves the facility property boundaries.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Watson, Susan S.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:49 AM
To: Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

I believe NOR has Land O'Lakes, Elcho S.D., and Village of Bruce that are designated as having a diffused surface water discharge. Although, these are listed as groundwater dischargers in SWAMP. Now that I think about it, I wonder if they may be more appropriately designated as "both"? I know there are other such dischargers in other regions.

As far as I know, the reason for this designation in all three cases is not to require the facilities to nitrify since that happens in the ground before the discharge reaches the waters edge as nitrate-nitrite which we don't have a surface water standard for. Because the facility is considered a diffused surface water discharger rather than a strict groundwater discharger, it does not get a total nitrogen limit on the discharge to the seepage cells.

I guess the question is, do we need to have the surface waters they are discharging into classified to protect their water quality? For example, to calculate ammonia limits so we determine if ammonia is a concern, i.e, are they are meeting the ammonia limits or any other parameter limits that might be a concern in the future. We have always assumed this won't be a problem. This seems like it might be a broader question on how to define and deal with these types of dischargers.

Personally, I think it's counterproductive to declassify a stream to "default" when we have some information to indicate it is a variance stream. For Land O'Lakes maybe we just need to do a complete review and varify the classification?

Sorry to complicate this matter,

Susan

-----Original Message-----
From: Ohm, Steven H.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:02 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

A point of clarification which may be relevant from the NR 104 drop/delete perspective is the Land O Lakes discharge is actually considered a diffused **surface water** discharge through the ground. There are several of these throughout the State.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 5:07 PM
To: Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Kreitlow, James D.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The Town of Land O Lakes in Vilas County has not had a surface water discharge since January 2002. They built a new treatment plant and now discharge to groundwater.

As for the "drop delete", that has been somewhat controversial for our wastewater staff but I will say I don't think we have adequate documentation to support the LAL classification for the unamed tributary.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Bub, Laura A
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 11:04 AM
To: Jaeger, William
Subject: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

Hi Bill--

I have a note that Trib to Wisconsin River, Land o Lakes in Vilas Co should be "drop deleted" from NR 104. Can you please confirm that this is correct, and could you also let me know if the reason for this deletion from NR 104 is due to a cease in discharge at the location, or the finding of an FAL

Bub, Laura A

From: Peerenboom, Daniel J
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 10:43 AM
To: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Prusak, Peter J.; Franson, Lonn J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

I agree with Susan that we should reclassify water bodies based on complete review and field verification rather than declassify to a default status.

At one time Elcho and Land O' Lakes were direct surface water discharges (I don't know about Bruce) but are now diffuse surface water discharges - Elcho went to the Hunting River (FFAL I assume) and LOL went to a noncontinuous stream tributary to an unnamed lake (currently listed in NR 104 as a variance water - LAL).

Regarding ammonia - I'm not sure how we'd go about setting limits for a diffuse discharge - but generally I think land treatment systems do nitrify pretty well so ammonia toxicity may not be that big of a concern - most of the GW monitoring data I've seen indicates elevated TDS, chlorides and nitrogen in the form of nitrates when compared to background water quality.

-----Original Message-----
From: Watson, Susan S.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:49 AM
To: Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

diffuse SW vs. Groundwater discharge

I believe NOR has Land O'Lakes, Elcho S.D., and Village of Bruce that are designated as having a diffused surface water discharge. Although, these are listed as groundwater dischargers in SWAMP. Now that I think about it, I wonder if they may be more appropriately designated as "both"? I know there are other such dischargers in other regions.

As far as I know, the reason for this designation in all three cases is not to require the facilities to nitrify since that happens in the ground before the discharge reaches the waters edge as nitrate-nitrite which we don't have a surface water standard for. Because the facility is considered a diffused surface water discharger rather than a strict groundwater discharger, it does not get a total nitrogen limit on the discharge to the seepage cells.

I guess the question is, do we need to have the surface waters they are discharging into classified to protect their water quality? For example, to calculate ammonia limits so we determine if ammonia is a concern, i.e, are they are meeting the ammonia limits or any other parameter limits that might be a concern in the future. We have always assumed this won't be a problem. This seems like it might be a broader question on how to define and deal with these types of dischargers.

Personally, I think it's counterproductive to declassify a stream to "default" when we have some information to indicate it is a variance stream. For Land O'Lakes maybe we just need to do a complete review and varify the classification?

Sorry to complicate this matter,

Susan

-----Original Message-----
From: Ohm, Steven H.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:02 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

A point of clarification which may be relevant from the NR 104 drop/delete perspective is the Land O Lakes discharge is actually considered a diffused **surface water** discharge through the ground. There are several of

these throughout the State.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 5:07 PM
To: Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Kreitlow, James D.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The Town of Land O Lakes in Vilas County has not had a surface water discharge since January 2002. They built a new treatment plant and now discharge to groundwater.

As for the "drop delete", that has been somewhat controversial for our wastewater staff but I will say I don't think we have adequate documentation to support the LAL classification for the unamed tributary.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932
e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Bub, Laura A
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 11:04 AM
To: Jaeger, William
Subject: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

Hi Bill--

I have a note that Trib to Wisconsin River, Land o Lakes in Vilas Co should be "drop deleted" from NR 104. Can you please confirm that this is correct, and could you also let me know if the reason for this deletion from NR 104 is due to a cease in discharge at the location, or the finding of an FAL community?

Thanks-
Laura

Bub, Laura A

From: Franson, Lonn J.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 11:42 AM
To: Peerenboom, Daniel J; Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Prusak, Peter J.; Hansen, James P.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

OK, here are my initial thoughts, and please read through to the very bottom to get to my suggested answer to Laura's seemingly simple question. For diffuse surface waters at facilities as described below, for compliance and limit determination, they are definitely tweeners, but are still GW dischargers! They are systems (those that I'm familiar with) that discharge to GW adjacent to surface water. As such the GW discharge is likely providing base flow to the surface water. They historically were built as GW dischargers prior to implementation of GW standards. But, and as current guidance (and I think correctly) provides for such systems, we can relax strict enforcement of the GW standards (typically for nitrate) if there is confidence the GW flow is indeed base flow. But I think it should be qualified that I believe this only applies to existing systems, not new, otherwise a facility planning nightmare.

My belief is, that ultimately these situations make good environmental sense. There is no down gradient GW user effected because of discharge to base flow, and the base flow that is seen from this GW is really well treated and the surface water will see little to no impact from conventional pollutants! To develop effluent limits for BOD and/or ammonia are impossible for these situations, and should not, and have not been attempted for a myriad of good reasons.

As for the question for whether or not the surface water needs classification, FFAL or otherwise, why should it matter because we are not going to calculate surface water quality standards for them anyway!

As for the initial and real question, on the drop delete for facilities that no longer have a pipe running to these variance surface waters, I think the answer lies in how any proposed revised code will provide for future department response and flexibility to provide for new and future limits in proposed variance waters, (listed or not). The approach needs to avoid the situation we are now in where if a discharge is proposed to what a biologists classifies as surface water as meeting variance definition by guidance, it doesn't matter and the default FFAL for limit determination needs to be used. So, if a variance water isn't listed as a variance water in code, we can still provide variance limits to a new proposed facility. Thus the code should provide flexibility for growth. Any good document, or code recognizes the need to change and grow as a living document, not one that ties our hands to achieve our environmental goals and provide public service.

Thus, my suggested answer to Laura's question is that unless the flexibility as described above is not provided, don't drop anything for any reason. As for the issue of "diffuse surface water " for the situations described above, I don't care what the surface water ultimately being discharged to is classified as, they are not going to get surface water quality limits calculated for them because they are GW dischargers. ?

Now doesn't that make sense?

There's my ramble for the month, haven't had one in quite awhile! I'm trying to cut back.
Have a good one,
Lonn

-----Original Message-----
From: Peerenboom, Daniel J
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 10:43 AM
To: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Prusak, Peter J.; Franson, Lonn J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

I agree with Susan that we should reclassify water bodies based on complete review and field verification rather than declassify to a default status.

At one time Elcho and Land O' Lakes were direct surface water discharges (I don't know about Bruce) but are now diffuse surface water discharges - Elcho went to the Hunting River (FFAL I assume) and LOL went to a noncontinuous stream tributary to an unnamed lake (currently listed in NR 104 as a variance water - LAL).

Regarding ammonia - I'm not sure how we'd go about setting limits for a diffuse discharge - but generally I think land treatment systems do nitrify pretty well so ammonia toxicity may not be that big of a concern - most of the GW monitoring data I've seen indicates elevated TDS, chlorides and nitrogen in the form of nitrates when compared to

background water quality.

-----Original Message-----
From: Watson, Susan S.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:49 AM
To: Ohm, Steven H.; Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J; Prusak, Peter J.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

I believe NOR has Land O'Lakes, Elcho S.D., and Village of Bruce that are designated as having a diffused surface water discharge. Although, these are listed as groundwater dischargers in SWAMP. Now that I think about it, I wonder if they may be more appropriately designated as "both"? I know there are other such dischargers in other regions.

As far as I know, the reason for this designation in all three cases is not to require the facilities to nitrify since that happens in the ground before the discharge reaches the waters edge as nitrate-nitrite which we don't have a surface water standard for. Because the facility is considered a diffused surface water discharger rather than a strict groundwater discharger, it does not get a total nitrogen limit on the discharge to the seepage cells.

I guess the question is, do we need to have the surface waters they are discharging into classified to protect their water quality? For example, to calculate ammonia limits so we determine if ammonia is a concern, i.e, are they are meeting the ammonia limits or any other parameter limits that might be a concern in the future. We have always assumed this won't be a problem. This seems like it might be a broader question on how to define and deal with these types of dischargers.

Personally, I think it's counterproductive to declassify a stream to "default" when we have some information to indicate it is a variance stream. For Land O'Lakes maybe we just need to do a complete review and varify the classification?

Sorry to complicate this matter,

Susan

-----Original Message-----
From: Ohm, Steven H.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2004 9:02 AM
To: Jaeger, William; Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Kreitlow, James D.; Peerenboom, Daniel J
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

A point of clarification which may be relevant from the NR 104 drop/delete perspective is the Land O Lakes discharge is actually considered a diffused **surface water** discharge through the ground. There are several of these throughout the State.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, William
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 5:07 PM
To: Bub, Laura A
Cc: Watson, Susan S.; Ohm, Steven H.; Kreitlow, James D.
Subject: RE: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

The Town of Land O Lakes in Vilas County has not had a surface water discharge since January 2002. They built a new treatment plant and now discharge to groundwater.

As for the "drop delete", that has been somewhat controversial for our wastewater staff but I will say I don't think we have adequate documentation to support the LAL classification for the unamed tributary.

William C. Jaeger
Water Quality Biologist
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wi. 54501
phone: (715) 365-8971
fax: (715) 365-8932

e-mail: william.jaeger@dnr.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Bub, Laura A
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 11:04 AM
To: Jaeger, William
Subject: Land O Lakes--Vilas Co

Hi Bill--

I have a note that Trib to Wisconsin River, Land o Lakes in Vilas Co should be "drop deleted" from NR 104. Can you please confirm that this is correct, and could you also let me know if the reason for this deletion from NR 104 is due to a cease in discharge at the location, or the finding of an FAL community?

Thanks-
Laura