5.0 Potential Sources

The Concord River watershed has 12 segments, located throughout the watershed, that are listed as pathogen impaired requiring a TMDL. These segments represent 32.7% of the river miles and 0.7% of the lake area assessed. Sources of indicator bacteria in the Concord River watershed are many and varied. A significant amount of work has been done in the last decade to improve the water quality in the Concord River watershed.

Largely through the efforts of the OAR, USACE and MADEP field staff, numerous point and non-point sources of pathogens have been identified. Table 5-1 summarizes the river segments impaired due to measured indicator bacteria densities and identifies some of the suspected and known sources described in past literature.

Some dry weather sources include:
- leaking sewer pipes,
- storm water drainage systems (illicit connections of sanitary sewers to storm drains),
- failing septic systems,
- recreational activities, and
- wildlife, including birds.

Some wet weather sources include:
- wildlife and domesticated animals (including pets),
- storm water runoff including municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4),
- combined sewer overflows (CSOs); and
- sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs).

It is difficult to provide accurate quantitative estimates of indicator bacteria contributions from the various sources in the Concord River watershed, because many of the sources are diffuse and intermittent, and extremely difficult to monitor or accurately model. Therefore, a general level of quantification according to source category is provided (e.g., see Tables 5-2 and 5-3). This approach is suitable for the TMDL analysis, because it indicates the magnitude of the sources and illustrates the need for controlling them. Additionally, many of the sources (failing septic systems, leaking sewer pipes, sanitary sewer overflows, and illicit sanitary sewer connections) are prohibited because they indicate a potential health risk and, therefore, must be eliminated. However, estimating the magnitude of overall indicator bacteria loading (the sum of all contributing sources) is achieved for wet and dry conditions using the extensive ambient data available that define baseline conditions (see segment summary tables and WQA).
Table 5-1. Some of the Potential Sources of Bacteria in Pathogen Impaired Segments in the Concord River Basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment ID</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-01</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-02</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-03</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Municipal point source discharge, MS4s, urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-04</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Municipal point source discharge, MS4s, urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-05</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Municipal point source discharge, MS4s, urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82B-07</td>
<td>Assabet River</td>
<td>Unknown, MS4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82055</td>
<td>Grist Mill Pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82056</td>
<td>Hager Pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82A-06</td>
<td>Hop Brook*</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82A-07</td>
<td>Concord River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82A-10</td>
<td>River Meadow Brook</td>
<td>MS4s, urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA82A-09</td>
<td>Concord River</td>
<td>CSOs, MS4s, urbanization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential sources identified in the WQA
MS4 = Municipal separate storm sewers
CSO = Combined sewer overflow

Sanitary Waste
Leaking sewer pipes, illicit sewer connections, sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and failing septic systems represent a direct threat to public health since they result in discharge of partially treated or untreated human wastes to the surrounding environment. Quantifying these sources is extremely speculative without direct monitoring of the source because the magnitude is directly proportional to the volume of the source and its proximity to the surface water. Typical values of fecal coliform in untreated domestic wastewater range from $10^4$ to $10^6$ MPN/100mL (Metcalf and Eddy 1991).

Illicit sewer connections into storm drains result in direct discharges of sewage via the storm drainage system outfalls. The existence of illicit sewer connections to storm drains is well documented in many urban drainage systems, particularly older systems that may have once been combined. It is probable that numerous illicit sewer connections exist in storm drainage systems serving the older developed portions of the Concord River basin.
Monitoring of storm drain outfalls during dry weather is needed to document the presence or absence of sewage in the drainage systems. The majority of the Concord River watershed (63.4%) is classified as Urban Areas by the United States Census Bureau and is therefore subject to the Stormwater Phase II Final Rule that requires the development and implementation of an illicit discharge detection and elimination plan. See Section 7.0 of this TMDL for information regarding illicit discharge detection guidance.

Septic systems designed, installed, operated and maintained in accordance with 310 CMR 15.000: Title 5, are not significant sources of fecal coliform bacteria. Studies demonstrate that wastewater located four feet below properly functioning septic systems contain on average less than one fecal coliform bacteria organism per 100 mL (Ayres Associates 1993). Failed or non-conforming septic systems, however, can be a major contributor of fecal coliform to the Concord River and tributaries. Wastes from failing septic systems enter surface waters either as direct overland flow or via groundwater. Wet weather events typically increase the rate of transport of pollutant loadings from failing septic systems to surface waters because of the wash-off effect from runoff and the increased rate of groundwater recharge.

Recreational use of waterbodies is a source of pathogen contamination. Swimmers themselves may contribute to pathogen impairment at swimming areas. When swimmers enter the water, residual fecal matter may be washed from the body and contaminate the water with pathogens. In addition, small children in diapers may contribute to contamination of the recreational waters. These sources are likely to be particularly important when the number of swimmers is high and the flushing action of waves is low.

**Wildlife and Pet Waste**

Animals that are not pets can be a potential source of pathogens. Geese, gulls, and ducks are speculated to be a major pathogen source, particularly at lakes and storm water ponds where large resident populations have become established (Center for Watershed Protection 1999).

Household pets such as cats and dogs can be a substantial source of bacteria – as much as 23,000,000 colonies/gram, according to the Center for Watershed Protection (1999). A rule of thumb estimate for the number of dogs is ~1 dog per 10 people producing an estimated 0.5 pound of feces per dog per day. Uncollected pet waste is then flushed from the parks, beaches and yards where pets are walked and transported into nearby waterways during wet-weather.

**Storm Water**

Storm water runoff is another significant contributor of pathogens. As discussed above, during rain events fecal matter from domestic animals and wildlife are readily transported to surface waters via the storm water drainage systems and/or overland flow. The natural filtering capacity provided by vegetative cover and soils is dramatically reduced as urbanization occurs because of the increase in impervious areas (i.e., streets, parking lots, etc.) and channelization in the watershed.
Extensive storm water data have been collected and compiled both locally and nationally (e.g., Tables 4-1, 4-2, 5-2 and 5-3) in an attempt to characterize the quality of storm water. Bacteria are easily the most variable of storm water pollutants, with concentrations often varying by factors of 10 to 100 during a single storm. Considering this variability, storm water bacteria concentrations are difficult to accurately predict. Caution must be exercised when using values from single wet weather grab samples to estimate the magnitude of bacteria loading because it is often unknown whether the sample is representative of the "true" mean. To gain an understanding of the magnitude of bacterial loading from storm water and avoid overestimating or underestimating bacteria loading, event mean concentrations (EMC) are often used. An EMC is the concentration of a flow proportioned sample throughout a storm event. These samples are commonly collected using an automated sampler which can proportion sample aliquots based on flow. Typical storm water event mean densities for various indicator bacteria in the Lower Charles River and nationwide are provided in Tables 5-2 and 5-3. These EMCs illustrate that storm water indicator bacteria concentrations from certain land uses (i.e., residential) are typically at levels sufficient to cause water quality problems.
### Table 5-2. Lower Charles River Basin Storm Water Event Mean Bacteria Concentrations (data summarized from USGS 2002) and Necessary Reductions to Meet Class B WQS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Fecal Coliform EMC (CFU/100 mL)</th>
<th>Number of Events</th>
<th>Class B WQS</th>
<th>Reduction to Meet WQS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>2,800 – 94,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,400 – 93,600 (85.7 – 99.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>2,200 – 31,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,800 – 30,600 (81.8 – 98.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>680 – 28,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>280 – 27,600 (41.2 – 98.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Class B Standard: Shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms. Used 400 to illustrate required reductions since a geometric mean of the samples were not provided.

### Table 5-3. Storm Water Event Mean Fecal Coliform Concentrations (as reported in MADEP 2002; original data provided in Metcalf & Eddy, 1992) and Necessary Reductions to Meet Class B WQS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Fecal Coliform1 Organisms / 100 mL</th>
<th>Class B WQS2</th>
<th>Reduction to Meet WQS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>10% of the samples shall not exceed 400 organisms/ 100 mL</td>
<td>36,600 (98.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>10% of the samples shall not exceed 400 organisms/ 100 mL</td>
<td>16,600 (97.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,600 (97.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,600 (97.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Derived from NURP study event mean concentrations and nationwide pollutant buildup data (USEPA 1983).

2 Class B Standard: Shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms. Used 400 to illustrate required reductions since a geometric mean of the samples were not provided.
6.0 Pathogen TMDL Development

Section 303 (d) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to place water bodies that do not meet the water quality standards on a list of impaired waterbodies. The most recent impairment list, 2002 List, identifies 12 segments within the Concord River watershed for use impairment caused by excessive indicator bacteria concentrations.

The CWA requires each state to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for listed waters and the pollutant contributing to the impairment(s). TMDLs determine the amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can safely assimilate without violating the water quality standards. Both point and non-point pollution sources are accounted for in a TMDL analysis. Point sources of pollution (those discharges from discrete pipes or conveyances) subject to NPDES permits receive a waste load allocation (WLA) specifying the amount of pollutant each point source can release to the waterbody. Non-point sources of pollution (all sources of pollution other than point) receive a load allocation (LA) specifying the amount of a pollutant that can be released to the waterbody by this source. In accordance with the CWA, a TMDL must account for seasonal variations and a margin of safety, which accounts for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationship between effluent limitations and water quality. Thus:

\[ \text{TMDL} = \text{WLAs} + \text{LAs} + \text{Margin of Safety} \]

Where:

- \( \text{WLA} \) = Waste Load Allocation which is the portion of the receiving water’s loading capacity that is allocated to each existing and future point source of pollution.
- \( \text{LA} \) = Load Allocation which is the portion of the receiving water’s loading capacity that is allocated to each existing and future non-point source of pollution.

This TMDL uses an alternative standards-based approach which is based on indicator bacteria concentrations, but considers the terms of the above equation. This approach is more in line with the way bacterial pollution is regulated (i.e., according to concentration standards) and achieves essentially the same result as if the equation were to be used.

6.1 Indicator Bacteria TMDL

\text{Loading Capacity}

The pollutant loading that a waterbody can safely assimilate is expressed as either mass-per-time, toxicity or some other appropriate measure (40 CFR § 130.2). Typically, TMDLs are expressed as total maximum daily loads. Expressing the TMDL in terms of daily loads is difficult to interpret given the very high numbers of indicator bacteria and the magnitude of the allowable load is dependent on flow conditions and, therefore, will vary as flow rates change. For example, a very high load of indicator bacteria are allowable if the volume of water that transports indicator bacteria is also high. Conversely, a relatively low load of indicator bacteria may exceed water quality standard if flow rates are low. Therefore, the MADEP believes it is appropriate to express indicator bacteria TMDLs in terms of a concentration because the water quality standard is also expressed in terms of the
concentration of organisms per 100 mL. Since source concentrations may not be directly added due to varying flow conditions, the TMDL equation is modified and reflects a margin of safety in the case of this pathogen concentration based TMDL. To ensure attainment with Massachusetts' WQS for indicator bacteria, all sources (at their point of discharge to the receiving water) must be equal to or less than the WQS for indicator organisms. For all the above reasons the TMDL is simply set equal to the concentration-based standard and may be expressed as follows:

\[ \text{TMDL} = \text{State Standard} = \text{WLA}_{(p1)} = \text{LA}_{(n1)} = \text{WLA}_{(p2)} = \text{etc.} \]

Where:

- \( \text{WLA}_{(p1)} \) = allowable concentration for point source category (1)
- \( \text{LA}_{(n1)} \) = allowable concentration for nonpoint source category (1)
- \( \text{WLA}_{(p2)} \) = allowable concentration for point source category (2) etc.

For Class A surface waters (1) the arithmetic mean of a representative set of fecal coliform samples shall not exceed 20 organisms per 100 mL; and (2) no more than 10% of the samples shall exceed 100 organisms per 100 mL.

For Class B surface waters (1) the geometric mean of a representative set of fecal coliform samples shall not exceed 200 organisms per 100 mL; and (2) no more than 10% of the samples shall exceed 400 organisms per 100 mL.

For freshwater bathing beaches (MADPH standard, not yet adopted by the MADEP) (1) the geometric mean of the most recent five enterococci levels within the same bathing season shall not exceed 33 colonies per 100 mL and (2) no single enterococci sample shall exceed 61 colonies per 100 mL. – OR – (1) the geometric mean of the most recent five E. coli levels within the same bathing season shall not exceed 126 colonies per 100 mL and (2) no single E. coli sample shall exceed 235 colonies per 100 mL.

**Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) and Load Allocations (LAs).**

There are several municipal WWTPs, CSOs, and other NPDES-permitted wastewater discharges within the Concord River watershed. NPDES wastewater discharge WLAs are set at the WQS. In addition there are numerous storm water discharges from storm drainage systems throughout the watershed. All piped discharges are, by definition, point sources regardless of whether they are currently subject to the requirements of NPDES permits. Therefore, a WLA set equal to the WQS will be assigned to the portion of the storm water that discharges to surface waters via storm drains.

WLAs and LAs are identified for all known source categories including both dry and wet weather sources for Class A and Class B segments within the Concord River Basin. Establishing WLAs and LAs that only address dry weather indicator bacteria sources would not ensure attainment of standards because of the significant contribution of wet weather indicator bacteria sources to WQS exceedances. Illicit sewer connections and deteriorating sewers leaking to storm drainage systems represent the primary dry weather point sources of indicator bacteria, while failing septic systems and possibly leaking sewer lines represent the non-point sources. Wet weather point sources include
discharges from storm water drainage systems, sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) and combined sewer overflows (CSOs). Wet weather non-point sources primarily include diffuse storm water runoff.

Table 6-1 presents the indicator bacteria WLAs and LAs for the various source categories. WLAs and LAs will change to reflect the revised indicator organisms (E. coli and enterococci) when the updated WQS have been finalized (See Section 3.0 of this report). Source categories representing discharges of untreated sanitary sewage to receiving waters are prohibited, and therefore, assigned WLAs and LAs equal to zero. There are three sets of WLAs and LAs: Class A waters, Class B waters and freshwater beaches.

The TMDL should provide a discussion of the magnitudes of the pollutant reductions needed to attain the goals of the TMDL. Since accurate estimates of existing sources are generally unavailable, it is difficult to estimate the pollutant reductions for specific sources. For the illicit sources including failing septic systems, the goal is complete elimination (100% reduction). However, overall wet weather indicator bacteria load reductions can be estimated using typical storm water bacteria concentrations, as presented in previous reports (see Section 4.0 of this report for data resources). These data indicate that up to two to three orders of magnitude (i.e., greater than 90%) reductions in storm water fecal coliform loadings generally will be necessary, especially in developed areas. This goal is expected to be accomplished through implementation of the best management practices (BMPs) associated with the Phase II control program in designated Urban Areas. The specific goal for controlling discharges from combined sewer overflows (CSOs) will be based on the site specific studies embodied in the Long Term Control Plan being developed by each community with combined sewers.

The expectation to attain WQS at the point of discharge is environmentally protective, and offers a practical means to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of control measures. In addition, this approach establishes clear objectives that can be easily understood by the public and individuals responsible for monitoring activities.

This TMDL applies to the 12 pathogen impaired segments of the Concord River watershed that are currently listed on the CWA § 303(d) list of impaired waters. MADEP recommends however, that the information contained in this TMDL guide management activities for all other waters throughout the watershed to help maintain and protect existing water quality. For these non-impaired waters, Massachusetts is proposing “pollution prevention TMDLs” consistent with CWA § 303(d)(3).

The analyses conducted for the pathogen impaired segments in this TMDL would apply to the non-impaired segments, since the sources and their characteristics are equivalent. The waste load and/or load allocation for each source and designated use would be the same as specified herein. Therefore, the pollution prevention TMDLs would have identical waste load and load allocations based on the sources present and the designated use of the water body segment (see Table ES-1 and Table 6-1).
Table 6-1. Indicator Bacteria Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) and Load Allocations (LAs) for the Concord River Basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Classification</th>
<th>Pathogen Source</th>
<th>Waste Load Allocation Indicator Bacteria (CFU/100 mL)</th>
<th>Load Allocation Indicator Bacteria (CFU/100 mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>Illicit discharges to storm drains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>Leaking sanitary sewer lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>Failing septic systems</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>NPDES – WWTP</td>
<td>Not to exceed an arithmetic mean of 20 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 100 organisms²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Storm water runoff Phase I and II</td>
<td>Not to exceed an arithmetic mean of 20 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 100 organisms³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Direct storm water runoff not regulated by NPDES and livestock, wildlife &amp; pets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not to exceed an arithmetic mean of 20 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 100 organisms³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms⁴</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NPDES – WWTP</td>
<td>Shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Storm water runoff Phase I and II</td>
<td>Not to exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Direct storm water runoff not regulated by NPDES and livestock, wildlife &amp; pets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not to exceed a geometric mean of 200 organisms in any set of representative samples, nor shall 10% of the samples exceed 400 organisms³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Classification</td>
<td>Pathogen Source</td>
<td>Waste Load Allocation Indicator Bacteria (CFU/100 mL)¹</td>
<td>Load Allocation Indicator Bacteria (CFU/100 mL)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Water Beaches⁵</td>
<td>All Sources</td>
<td>Enterococci not to exceed a geometric mean of 33 colonies of the five most recent samples within the same bathing season, nor shall any single sample exceed 61 colonies OR E. coli not to exceed a geometric mean of 126 colonies of the five most recent samples within the same bathing season, nor shall any single sample exceed 235 colonies</td>
<td>Enterococci not to exceed a geometric mean of 33 colonies of the five most recent samples within the same bathing season, nor shall any single sample exceed 61 colonies OR E. coli not to exceed a geometric mean of 126 colonies of the five most recent samples within the same bathing season, nor shall any single sample exceed 235 colonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A means not applicable

¹ Waste Load Allocation (WLA) and Load Allocation (LA) refer to fecal coliform densities unless specified in table.
² Or shall be consistent with the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.
³ The expectation for WLAs and LAs for storm water discharges is that they will be achieved through the implementation of BMPs and other controls.
⁴ Or shall be consistent with an approved Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) for Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) abatement. If the level of control specified in the LTCP is less than what is necessary to attain Class B water quality standards, then the above criteria apply unless MADEP has proposed and EPA has approved water quality standards revisions for the receiving water.
⁵ Massachusetts Department of Public Health regulations (105 CMR Section 445)
This Concord River watershed TMDL may, in appropriate circumstances, also apply to segments that are listed for pathogen impairment in subsequent Massachusetts CWA § 303(d) Integrated List of Waters. For such segments, this TMDL may apply if, after listing the waters for pathogen impairment and taking into account all relevant comments submitted on the CWA § 303(d) list, the Commonwealth determines with EPA approval of the CWA § 303(d) list that this TMDL should apply to future pathogen impaired segments.

6.2. Margin of Safety
This section addresses the incorporation of a Margin of Safety (MOS) in the TMDL analysis. The MOS accounts for any uncertainty or lack of knowledge concerning the relationship between pollutant loading and water quality. The MOS can either be implicit (i.e., incorporated into the TMDL analysis through conservative assumptions) or explicit (i.e., expressed in the TMDL as a portion of the loadings). This TMDL uses an implicit MOS, through inclusion of two conservative assumptions. First, the TMDL does not account for mixing in the receiving waters and assumes that zero dilution is available. Realistically, influent water will mix with the receiving water and become diluted below the water quality standard, provided that the receiving water concentration does not exceed the TMDL concentration. Second, the goal of attaining standards at the point of discharge does not account for losses due to die-off and settling of indicator bacteria that are known to occur.

6.3. Seasonal Variability
In addition to a Margin of Safety, TMDLs must also account for seasonal variability. Pathogen sources to Concord River waters arise from a mixture of continuous and wet-weather driven sources, and there may be no single critical condition that is protective for all other conditions. This TMDL has set WLAs and LAs for all known and suspected source categories equal to the Massachusetts WQS independent of seasonal and climatic conditions. This will ensure the attainment of water quality standards regardless of seasonal and climatic conditions. Controls that are necessary will be in place throughout the year, protecting water quality at all times. However, for discharges that do not affect intakes for water supplies and primary contact recreation is not taking place (i.e., during the winter months), seasonal disinfection is permitted for NPDES point source discharges.
7.0 Implementation Plan

Setting and achieving TMDLs should be an iterative process, with realistic goals over a reasonable timeframe and adjusted as warranted based on ongoing monitoring. The concentrations set out in the TMDL represent reductions that will require substantial time and financial commitment to be attained. A comprehensive control strategy is needed to address the numerous and diverse sources of pathogens in the Concord River watershed.

Controls on several types of pathogen sources will be required as part of the comprehensive control strategy. Many of the sources in the Concord River watershed including sewer connections to drainage systems, leaking sewer pipes, sanitary sewer overflows, and failing septic systems, are prohibited and must be eliminated. Individual sources must be first identified in the field before they can be abated. Pinpointing sources typically requires extensive monitoring of the receiving waters and tributary storm water drainage systems during both dry and wet weather conditions. A comprehensive program is needed to ensure illicit sources are identified and that appropriate actions will be taken to eliminate them. The MADEP together with the USACE have been successful in carrying out such monitoring, identifying sources, and mobilizing the responsible municipality and other entities to begin to take corrective actions.

Storm water runoff represents another major source of pathogens in the Concord River watershed, and the current level of control is inadequate for standards to be attained. Improving storm water runoff quality is essential for restoring water quality and recreational uses. At a minimum, intensive application of non-structural BMPs is needed throughout the watershed to reduce pathogen loadings as well as loadings of other storm water pollutants (e.g., nutrients and sediments) contributing to use impairment in the Concord River watershed. Depending on the degree of success of the non-structural storm water BMP program, structural controls may become necessary.

For these reasons, a basin-wide implementation strategy is recommended. The strategy includes a mandatory program for implementing storm water BMPs and eliminating illicit sources. The “Mitigation Measures to Address Pathogen Pollution in Surface Water: A TMDL Implementation Guidance Manual for Massachusetts” was developed to support implementation of pathogen TMDLs. TMDL implementation-related tasks are shown in Table 7-1. The MADEP working with EPA and other team partners shall make every reasonable effort to assure implementation of this TMDL. These stakeholders can provide valuable assistance in defining hot spots and sources of pathogen contamination as well as the implementation of mitigation or preventative measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing TMDL</td>
<td>MADEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMDL public meeting</td>
<td>MADEP/Watershed Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to public comment</td>
<td>MADEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization, contacts with volunteer groups</td>
<td>MADEP/OAR/SuAsCo Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of comprehensive storm water management programs including identification and implementation of BMPs</td>
<td>Concord River Basin Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit discharge detection and elimination</td>
<td>Concord River Basin Communities, the SuAsCo Coalition and OAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaking sewer pipes and sanitary sewer overflows</td>
<td>Concord River Basin Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO management</td>
<td>City of Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and upgrade of on-site sewage disposal systems as needed</td>
<td>Homeowners, SuAsCo Coalition, OAR and Concord River Basin Communities (Boards of Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize implementation; work with stakeholders and local officials to identify remedial measures and potential funding sources</td>
<td>MADEP, SuAsCo Coalition, OAR and Concord River Basin Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize and implement education and outreach program</td>
<td>MADEP, SuAsCo Coalition, OAR and Concord River Basin Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write grant and loan funding proposals</td>
<td>SuAsCo Coalition, OAR and Concord River Basin Communities and Planning Agencies with guidance from MADEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of TMDL recommendations in Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) Watershed Action Plan</td>
<td>EOA Watershed Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Monitoring</td>
<td>MADEP, OAR and SuAsCo Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide periodic status reports on implementation of remedial activities</td>
<td>EOE, OAR, SuAsCo Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1. Summary of Activities within the Concord River Watershed

There are number of not-for-profit active stewards of the Concord River watershed, these include:

- Cochituate State Park Lake Monitors,
- Friends of White Pond,
- Hop Brook Protection Association,
- Mill Brook Task Force,
- Organization for the Assabet River (OAR), and
- Sudbury River Watershed and Monitoring Protection.

Contact information for each of these groups can be obtained from the Massachusetts Water Watch Partnership Directory of Massachusetts Volunteer Monitoring Groups website (http://www.umass.edu/tei/mwwp/groups.html). These groups are generally involved in water quality sampling (may or may not be pathogen related) and outreach and education for residents within subwatersheds of the Concord River.

The largest organization is the Organization for the Assabet River (OAR). The mission of OAR is “...to preserve, protect, and enhance the Assabet River, its tributaries, and watershed. Established in 1986 by a group of concerned citizens, OAR currently has approximately 920 members, a 14-member board of directors, and a part-time staff of five. OAR has a three-pronged approach to its mission. Our goals are to:

- **Raise awareness** of the river’s special qualities as well as its problems among its various "stakeholders" - the public, watershed towns, and government agencies;
- **Collect data and advocate for additional information gathering** in order to insure that decisions affecting the river are based on scientific research; and
- **Work with town, government agencies, and others toward solutions** that will improve the Assabet River, and satisfy the state’s standard of a "fishable and swimmable" river. “ (OAR 2004)

Data supporting this TMDL indicate that indicator bacteria enter the Concord River watershed from a number of contributing sources, under a variety of conditions. Activities that are currently ongoing and/or planned to ensure that the TMDL can be implemented include and are summarized in the following subsections. The “Mitigation Measures to Address Pathogen Pollution in Surface Water: A TMDL Implementation Guidance Manual for Massachusetts” provides additional details on the implementation of pathogen control measures summarized below as well as additional measures not provided herein, such as by-law, ordinances and public outreach and education.
7.2. Illicit Sewer Connections, Failing Infrastructure and CSOs.

Elimination of illicit sewer connections, repairing failing infrastructure and controlling impacts associated with CSOs are of extreme importance. Several steps are currently underway in this regard. The City of Lowell and the Lowell Regional Wastewater Utility (LRWWU) has developed a CSO Plan for nine outfalls within the Merrimack, Concord River and Beaver Brook. The permit was submitted in 1998. Details regarding CSO projects by the Lowell community can be found at the following link: http://www.lowellma.gov/depts/dpw/stormwatercompliance/view?searchterm=cso

Guidance for the illicit discharge detection and elimination has been developed by EPA New England (USEPA 2004b). The guidance document provides a plan, available to all Commonwealth communities, to identify and eliminate illicit discharges (both dry and wet weather) to their separate storm sewer systems. Implementation of the protocol outlined in the guidance document satisfies the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination requirement of the NPDES program. A copy of the guidance document is provided in Appendix A.

7.3. Storm Water Runoff

Storm water runoff can be categorized in two forms; 1) point source discharges and 2) non-point source discharges (includes sheet flow or direct runoff). Many point source storm water discharges are regulated under the NPDES Phase I and Phase II permitting programs when discharged to a Waters of the United States. Municipalities that operate regulated municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) must develop and implement a storm water management plan (SWMP), which must employ and set measurable goals for the following six minimum control measures:

1. public education and outreach particularly on the proper disposal of pet waste,
2. public participation/involvement,
3. illicit discharge detection and elimination,
4. construction site runoff control,
5. post construction runoff control, and
6. pollution prevention/good housekeeping.

Portions of towns in this watershed are classified as Urban Areas by the United States Census Bureau and are subject to the Stormwater Phase II Final Rule. This rule requires the development and implementation of an illicit discharge detection and elimination plan.

The NPDES permit does not, however, establish numeric effluent limitations for storm water discharges. Maximum extent practicable (MEP) is the statutory standard that establishes the level of pollutant reductions that regulated municipalities must achieve. The MEP standard is a narrative effluent limitation that is satisfied through implementation of SWMPs and achievement of measurable goals.

Non-point source discharges are generally characterized as sheetflow runoff and are not categorically regulated under the NPDES program and can be difficult to manage. However, some of the same principles for mitigating point source impacts may be applicable. Individual municipalities not regulated under the Phase I or II should implement the exact same six minimum...
control measures minimizing storm water contamination. The OAR, the SuAsCo Coalition, Sudbury Valley Trustees have been active in this regard, producing a plethora of literature for watershed protection and conservation, including newsletters.

7.4. Failing Septic Systems
Septic system bacteria contributions to the Concord River and its tributaries may be reduced in the future through septic system maintenance and/or replacement. Additionally, the implementation of Title 5, which requires inspection of private sewage disposal systems before property ownership may be transferred, building expansions, or changes in use of properties, will aid in the discovery of poorly operating or failing systems. Because systems which fail must be repaired or upgraded, it is expected that the bacteria load from septic systems will be significantly reduced in the future. Regulatory and educational materials for septic system installation, maintenance and alternative technologies are provided by the MADEP on the worldwide web at http://www.mass.gov/dep/brp/wwm/t5pubs.htm.

7.5. Wastewater Treatment Plants
WWTP discharges are regulated under the NPDES program when the effluent is released to surface waters. Each WWTP has an effluent limit included in its NPDES or groundwater permit. Some NPDES permits are listed on the following website: www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/permits_listing_ma.html. Groundwater permits are available at http://www.mass.gov/dep/brp/gw/gwhome.htm.

7.6. Recreational Waters Use Management
Recreational waters receive pathogen inputs from swimmers. To reduce swimmers’ contribution to pathogen impairment, shower facilities can be made available, and bathers should be encouraged to shower prior to swimming. In addition, parents should check and change young children’s diapers when they are dirty.

7.7. Funding/Community Resources
A complete list of funding sources for implementation of nonpoint source pollution is provided in Section VII of the Massachusetts Nonpoint Source Management Plan Volume I (MADEP 2000b) available on line at http://www.mass.gov/dep/brp/wm/nonpoint.htm. This list includes specific programs available for non-point source management and resources available for communities to manage local growth and development. The State Revolving Fund (SRF) provides low interest loans to communities for certain capital costs associated with building or improving wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, many communities in Massachusetts sponsor low cost loans through the SRF for homeowners to repair or upgrade failing septic systems.

For a more complete discussion on ways to mitigate pathogen water pollution, see the “Mitigation Measures to Address Pathogen Pollution in Surface Water: A TMDL Implementation Guidance Manual for Massachusetts” accompanying this document.
8.0 Monitoring Plan

The long term monitoring plan for the Concord River watershed includes several components:

1. continue with the current monitoring of the Concord River watershed (OAR, SuAsCo, Coalition),
2. continue with MADEP watershed five-year cycle monitoring,
3. monitor areas within the watershed where data are lacking or absent to determine if the waterbody meets the use criteria,
4. monitor areas where BMPs and other control strategies have been implemented or discharges have been removed to assess the effectiveness of the modification or elimination,
5. assemble data collected by each monitoring entity to formulate a concise report where the basin is assessed as a whole and an evaluation of BMPs can be made, and
6. add/remove/modify BMPs as needed based on monitoring results.

The monitoring plan is an ever changing document that requires flexibility to add, change or delete sampling locations, sampling frequency, methods and analysis. At the minimum, all monitoring should be conducted with a focus on:

- capturing water quality conditions under varied weather conditions,
- establishing sampling locations in an effort to pin-point sources,
- researching new and proven technologies for separating human from animal bacteria sources, and
- assessing efficacy of BMPs.

9.0 Reasonable Assurances

Reasonable assurances that the TMDL will be implemented include both enforcement of current regulations, availability of financial incentives including low or no-interest loans to communities for wastewater treatment facilities through the State Revolving Fund (SRF), and the various local, state and federal programs for pollution control. Storm water NPDES permit coverage will address discharges from municipal owned storm water drainage systems. Enforcement of regulations controlling non-point discharges includes local enforcement of the states Wetlands Protection Act and Rivers Protection Act; Title 5 regulations for septic systems and various local regulations including zoning regulations. Financial incentives include Federal monies available under the CWA Section 319 NPS program and the CWA Section 604 and 104b programs, which are provided as part of the Performance Partnership Agreement between MADEP and the EPA. Additional financial incentives include state income tax credits for Title 5 upgrades, and low interest loans for Title 5 septic system upgrades through municipalities participating in this portion of the state revolving fund program.

10.0 Public Participation

To be added later....
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