receiving water. The locational data requested by this question also supports the Watershed Protection Approach, because it provides Federal and State environmental managers with information they need to geographically locate discharge points.

Latitude and longitude would be required to be reported to the nearest second. This is consistent with EPA's Locational Data Policy (LDP) (See "Locational Data Policy Implementation Guidance, Guide to the Policy (March 1992)"). In accordance with this policy, all latitude/longitude measurements in Agency data collection should have accuracies of better than 25 meters (i.e., roughly, one second).

Proposed § 122.21(j)(2)(i) would require information about the interval and duration of effluent discharges that are seasonal or periodic. Such discharges arise from certain conditions, usually related to the process at an industrial user, whereby the industrial user discharges intentionally at specified times following treatment. For each outfall with an intermittent discharge, the applicant must report the annual frequency, duration, flow, and the months in which the discharge occurs. The permit writer uses this information to develop permit limits that reflect the intermittent nature of such discharges

Proposed § 122.21(j)(2)(i) would also require the applicant to specify whether the outfall is equipped with a diffuser and the type of diffuser (e.g., high-rate) used. The permit writer uses this information to make mixing zone calculations. (See "Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control," EPA/505/2–90–001, March 1991.)

Most POTWs discharge treated effluent to surface waters such as streams or rivers. Proposed § 122.21(j)(2)(ii) solicits information that describes and identifies the receiving waters into which each outfall discharges. Information about the type of receiving water is useful to the permit writer because mixing zones and wasteload allocations may be calculated differently for different types of receiving waters.

This provision would also require the name of the watershed, the Soil Conservation Service watershed code, the name of the State management basin, and the United States Geological Survey hydrologic code. This locational information supports the Watershed Protection Approach, by providing Federal and State environmental managers with a means of locating dischargers within the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed categorization system, a State's river basin categorization system, and the U.S. Geological Survey cataloging scheme. Some States, as well as EPA Regions, are implementing a basin management approach to watershed protection and will require the information requested by this question.

Proposed § 122.21(j)(2)(iii) would require information on the level of treatment for discharges from each outfall. The CWA requires POTWs, with some exceptions, to treat influent to the level of secondary treatment prior to discharge. Secondary treatment is defined at 40 CFR 133.102 in terms of five-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (SS or TSS), and pH. Part 133 allows adjustments to the secondary treatment requirements for POTWs that meet certain criteria. In addition, some POTWs are subject to requirements for "treatment equivalent to secondary treatment," as described in §133.105. Finally, some POTWs may have more advanced levels of treatment necessary, for example, to meet water-quality based standards for certain pollutants, such as nitrogen and phosphorous.

This provision would require data on design removal efficiencies for BOD_5 and SS. Information on these parameters is necessary in order for the permit writer to set pollutant limits that accurately reflect the pollutant removal that the POTW can achieve. It may also alert the permitting authority to the need for improvements to the treatment facility.

Proposed § 122.21(j)(2)(iii) would also require information on disinfection, which usually follows secondary or advanced treatment and which destroys bacteria, viruses, and other pathogens in the wastewater. Disinfection most commonly occurs through chlorination. Many POTWs also dechlorinate their effluent prior to discharge because excessive free chlorine in a wastewater discharge can cause aquatic toxicity in the receiving water.

3. Effluent Monitoring for Specific Parameters

The purpose of proposed § 122.21(j) and proposed Form 2A is to provide the permit writer with the minimum information necessary to issue to a POTW an NPDES permit that contains effluent limitations consistent with the goals of the CWA. EPA recognizes that the quality of a POTW's effluent depends on several factors, such as the number and type of industrial users of the POTW, and that not all POTWs need to report the same information to ensure developing NPDES permits to achieve designated uses of the Nation's waters. Hence, EPA proposes a tiered approach to collect needed effluent monitoring information.

The Agency proposes to require all POTWs to report effluent monitoring information for the 17 parameters listed at proposed 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix J, Table 1 ("Effluent Parameters For All POTWs") (see also proposed Form 2A, Basic Application Information, question 19). These parameters have a high likelihood of being present in most POTW effluents.

EPA is proposing to require additional reporting of pollutant-specific data for POTWs with a design flow greater than or equal to 1.0 mgd; POTWs that have or are required to have a pretreatment program; and other POTWs required to provide this information to the permitting authority. In general, the pollutants for which additional data would be required are those for which there are State water quality standards, other than dioxin, asbestos, and "priority pollutant" pesticides. Thus, the Agency would require, at a minimum, data on those pollutants listed at proposed 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix J, Table 2 ("Effluent Parameters For Selected POTWs and Treatment Works Treating Domestic Sewage'') (see also proposed Form 2A, Part A, Supplemental Application Information: Expanded Effluent Testing). The Agency would not require data, unless otherwise specified by the permitting authority, on those pollutants listed at proposed 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix J, Table 3 ("Other Parameters for Treatment Works Treating Domestic Sewage And Selected POTWs'')

Proposed § 122.21(j)(3) would require that data be separately provided for each outfall through which treated sanitary effluent is discharged to waters of the United States. Further, EPA recognizes that a POTW's effluent may have similar qualities at more than one of its outfalls. EPA thus proposes to allow applicants to provide the effluent data from only one outfall as representative of all such outfalls, where two or more outfalls with substantially identical effluents, and with the approval of the permitting authority on a case-by-case basis. For outfalls to be considered substantially identical, they should, at a minimum, be located at the same plant, be subject to the same level of treatment, and have passed through the same types of treatment processes. The Agency solicits comment on this approach and, particularly, on whether data should be separately collected from all such outfalls. Alternatively, should applicants generally be encouraged to follow this approach rather than