ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124

[FRL-3834-7]

RIN 2040-AA79

National Pollutant Discharge **Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for Storm Water** Discharges

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Today's final rule begins to implement section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (added by section 405 of the Water Ouality Act of 1987 (WQA)), which requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish regulations setting forth National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit application requirements for: storm water discharges associated with industrial activity; discharges from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 250,000 or more; and discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250,000.

Today's rule also clarifies the requirements of section 401 of the WOA. which amended CWA section 402(1)(2)to provide that NPDES permits shall not be required for discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations or oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations or transmission facilities, composed entirely of flows which are from conveyances (including but not limited to pipes, conduits, ditches, and channels) used for collecting and conveying precipitation runoff and which are not contaminated by contact with, or do not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product located on the site of such operations. This rule sets forth NPDES permit application requirements addressing storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and storm water discharges from large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems.

DATES: This final rule becomes effective December 17, 1990. In accordance with 40 CFR 23.2, this rule shall be considered final for purposes of judicial review on November 30, 1990, at 1 p.m. eastern daylight time. The public record is located at EPA Headquarters, EPA Public Information Reference Unit, room

2402, 401 M Street SW., Washington DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For further information on the rule contact: Thomas J. Seaton, Kevin Weiss, or Michael Mitchell Office of Water Enforcement and Permits (EN-336), **United States Environmental Protection** Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 475-9518.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background and Water Quality Concerns
- II. Water Quality Act of 1987
- III. Remand of 1984 Regulations
- **Codification Rule and Case-by-Case** Designations
- V. Consent Decree of October 20, 1989 VI. Today's Final Rule and Response to
- Comments
- A. Overview
- **B. Definition of Storm Water**
- C. Responsibility for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity into Municipal Separate Storm Sewers
- D. Preliminary Permitting Strategy for Storm Water Discharges Associated with **Industrial Activity**
- 1. Tier 1-Baseline Permitting
- 2. Tier 2—Watershed Permitting 3. Tier 3—Industry Specific Permitting
- 4. Tier 4—Facility Specific Permitting
- 5. Relationship of Strategy to Permit
- **Application Requirements** a. Individual Permit Application
- Requirements
- b. Croup Application
- c. Case-by-Case Requirements
- E. Storm Water Discharge Sampling
- F. Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity
- 1. Permit Applicability
- a. Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity to Waters of the United States
- b. Storm Water Discharges Through **Municipal Separate Storm Sewers**
- c. Storm Water Discharges Through Non-**Municipal Storm Sewers**
- 2. Scope of "Associated with Industrial Activity"
- 3. Individual Application Requirements
- 4. Group Applications
- a. Facilities Covered
- b. Scope of Group Application
- c. Group Application Requirements
- 5. Group Application: Applicability in NPDES States
- 6. Group Application: Procedural Concerns
- 7. Permit Applicability and Applications for Oil, Gas and Mining Operations
- a. Gas and Oil Operations
- b. Use of Reportable Quantities to Determine if a Storm Water Discharge from an Oil or Gas Operation is Contaminated
- c. Mining Operations
- 8. Application Requirements for **Construction Activities**
- a. Permit application requirements
- b. Administrative burdens
- **G.** Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

- 1. Municipal Separate Storm Sewers 2. Effective Prohibition on Non-Storm
- Water Discharges 3. Site-Specific Storm Water Quality
- Management Programs for Municipal Systems
- 4. Large and Medium Municipal Storm Sewer Systems
- a. Overview of proposed options and comments
- b. Definition of large and medium
- municipal separate storm sewer system c. Response to comments
- H. Permit Application Requirements for
- Large and Medium Municipal Systems
- 1. Implementing the Permit Program 2. Structure of Permit Application
- a. Part 1 Application
- b. Part 2 Application
- 3. Major Outfalls
- 4. Field Screening Program
- 5. Source Identification
- 6. Characterization of Discharges
- a. Screening Analysis for Illicit Discharges
- b. Representative Data
- c. Loading and Concentration Estimates
- 7. Storm Water Quality Management Plans a. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Runoff
- from Commercial and Residential Areas b. Measures for Illicit Discharges and **Improper Disposal**
- c. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity Through Municipal Systems
- d. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Runoff from Construction Sites Through Municipal Systems
- 8. Assessment of Controls
- I. Annual Reports
- J. Application Deadlines
- VII. Economic Impact
- VIII. Paperwork Reduction Act
- IX. Regulatory Flexibility Act

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Water Quality Concerns

The 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (referred to as the Clean Water Act or CWA), prohibit the discharge of any pollutant to navigable waters from a point source unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. Efforts to improve water quality under the NPDES program traditionally and primarily focused on reducing pollutants in discharges of industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. This program emphasis developed for a number of reasons. At the onset of the program in 1972, many sources of industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage were not adequately controlled and represented pressing environmental problems. In addition, sewage outfalls and industrial process discharges were easily identified as responsible for poor, often drastically degraded, water quality conditions. However, as pollution control measures were initially

developed for these discharges, it became evident that more diffuse sources (occurring over a wide area) of water pollution, such as agricultural and urban runoff were also major causes of water quality problems. Some diffuse sources of water pollution, such as agricultural storm water discharges and irrigation return flows, are statutorily exempted from the NPDES program.

Since enactment of the 1972 amendments to the CWA, considering the rise of economic activity and population, significant progress in controlling water pollution has been made, particularly with regard to industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. Expenditures by EPA, the States, and local governments to construct and upgrade sewage treatment facilities have substantially increased the population served by higher levels of treatment. Backlogs of expired permits for industrial process wastewater discharges have been reduced. Continued improvements are expected for these discharges as the NPDES program continues to place increasing emphasis on water qualitybased pollution controls, especially for toxic pollutants.

Although assessments of water quality are difficult to perform and verify, several national assessments of water quality are available. For the purpose of these assessments, urban runoff was considered to be a diffuse source or nonpoint source pollution. From a legal standpoint, however, most urban runoff is discharged through conveyances such as separate storm sewers or other conveyances which are point sources under the CWA. These discharges are subject to the NPDES program. The "National Water Quality Inventory, 1988 Report to Congress" provides a general assessment of water quality based on biennial reports submitted by the States under section 305(b) of the CWA. In preparing the section 305(b) Reports, the States were asked to indicate the fraction of the States' waters that were assessed, as well as the fraction of the States' waters that were fully supporting, partly supporting, or not supporting designated uses. The Report indicates that of the rivers, lakes, and estuaries that were assessed by States (approximately onefifth of stream miles, one-third of lake acres and one-half of estuarine waters), roughly 70% to 75% are supporting the uses for which they are designated. For waters with use impairments, States were asked to determine impacts due to diffuse sources (agricultural and urban runoff and other sources), municipal sewage, industrial process wastewaters, combined sewer overflows, and natural and other sources, then combine impacts to arrive at estimates of the relative percentage of State waters affected by each source. In this manner, the relative importance of the various sources of pollution that are causing use impairments was assessed and weighted national averages were calculated. Based on 37 States that provided information on sources of pollution, industrial process wastewaters were cited as the cause of nonsupport for 7.5% of rivers and streams, 10% of lakes, and 6% of estuaries. Municipal sewage was the cause of nonsupport for 13% of rivers and streams, 5% lakes, 48% estuaries, 41% of the Great Lake shoreline, and 11% of coastal waters. The Assessment concluded that pollution from diffuse sources, such as runoff from agricultural, urban areas. construction sites. land disposal and resource extraction, is cited by the States as the leading cause of water quality impairment. These sources appear to be increasingly important contributors of use impairment as discharges of industrial process wastewaters and municipal sewage plants come under increased control and as intensified data collection efforts provide additional information. Some examples of diffuse sources cited as causing use impairment are: for rivers and streams, 9% from separate storm sewers, 6% from construction and 13% from resource extraction; for lakes, 28% from separate storm sewers and 26% from land disposal; for the Great Lakes shoreline, 10% from separate storm sewers, 34% from resource extraction. and 82% from land disposal; for estuaries, 28% from separate storm sewers and 27% from land disposal; and for coastal areas, 20% from separate storm sewers and 29% from land disposal.

The States conducted a more comprehensive study of diffuse pollution sources under the sponsorship of the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators (ASIWPCA) and EPA. The study resulted in the report "America's Clean Water—The States' Nonpoint Source Assessment, 1985" which indicated that 38 States reported urban runoff as a major cause of beneficial use impairment. In addition, 2l States reported construction site runoff as a major cause of use impairment.

To provide a better understanding of the nature of urban runoff from commercial and residential areas, from 1978 through 1983, EPA provided funding and guidance to the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program (NURP). The NURP included 28 projects across the Nation, conducted separately at the local level but centrally reviewed, coordinated, and guided.

One focus of the NURP was to characterize the water quality of discharges from separate storm sewers which drain residential, commercial, and light industrial (industrial parks) sites. The majority of samples collected in the study were analyzed for eight conventional pollutants and three metals. Data collected under the NURP indicated that on an annual loading basis, suspended solids in discharges from separate storm sewers draining runoff from residential, commercial and light industrial areas are around an order of magnitude greater than solids in discharges from municipal secondary sewage treatment plants. In addition, the study indicated that annual loadings of chemical oxygen demand (COD) are comparable in magnitude to effluent from secondary sewage treatment plants. When analyzing annual loadings associated with urban runoff, it is important to recognize that discharges of urban runoff are highly intermittent, and that the short-term loadings associated with individual events will be high and may have shockloading effects on receiving water, such as low dissolved oxygen levels. NURP data also showed that fecal coliform counts in urban runoff are typically in the tens to hundreds of thousands per 100 ml of runoff during warm weather conditions, although the study suggested that fecal coliform may not be the most appropriate indicator organism for identifying potential health risks in storm water runoff. Although NURP did not evaluate oil and grease, other studies have demonstrated that urban runoff is an extremely important source of oil pollution to receiving waters, with hydrocarbon levels in urban runoff typically being reported at a range of 2 to 15 mg/l. These hydrocarbons tend to accumulate in bottom sediments where they may persist for long periods of time and exert adverse impacts on benthic organisms.

A portion of the NURP study involved monitoring 120 priority pollutants in storm water discharges from lands used for residential, commercial and light industrial activities. Seventy-seven priority pollutants were detected in samples of storm water discharges from residential, commercial and light industrial lands taken during the NURP study, including 14 inorganic and 63 organic pollutants. Table A-1 shows the priority pollutants which were detected in at least ten percent of the discharge samples which were sampled for priority pollutants. TABLE A-1.— PRIORITY POLLUTANTS; DE-TECTED IN AT LEAST 10% OF NURP SAMPLES

[In percent]

	Frequency of detection
Metals and inorganics:	
Antimony	13
Arsenic	52
Bervllium	12
Cadmium	48
Chromium	58
Copper	. 91
Cyanides	23
Lead	94
Nickel	43
Selenium	11
Zinc	94
Pesticides:	
Alpha-hexachlorocyclohexane	20
Alpha-endosulfan	19
Chlordane	17
Lindane	15
Halogenated aliphatics:	
Methane, dichloro	11
Phenois and cresols:	
Phenol	14
Phenol, pentachloro	19
Phenol, 4-nitro	10
Phthalate esters:	
Phthalate, bis(2-ethylhexyl)	22
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons:	
Chrysene	10
Fluoranthene	16
Phenanthrene	· 12
Pyrene	15

The NURP data also showed a significant number of these samples exceeded various EPA freshwater water quality criteria.

The NURP study provides insight on what can be considered background levels of pollutants for urban runoff, as the study focused primarily on monitoring runoff from residential, commercial and light industrial areas. However, NURP concluded that the quality of urban runoff can be adversely impacted by several sources of pollutants that were not directly evaluated in the study and are generally not reflected in the NURP data, including illicit connections, construction site runoff, industrial site runoff and illegal dumping.

Other studies have shown that many storm sewers contain illicit discharges of non-storm water and that large amounts of wastes, particularly used oils, are improperly disposed in storm sewers. Removal of these discharges present opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of storm. water discharges. Storm water discharges from industrial facilities may contain toxics and conventional pollutants when material management practices allow exposure to storm water, in addition to wastes from illicit connections and improperly disposed wastes.

In some municipalities, illicit connections of sanitary, commercial and industrial discharges to storm sewer systems have had a significant impact on the water quality of receiving waters. Although the NURP study did not emphasize the identification of illicit connections to storm sewers (other than to assure that monitoring sites used in the study were free from sanitary sewage contamination), the study concluded that illicit connections can result in high bacterial counts and dangers to public health. The study also noted that removing such discharges presented opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of urban storm water discharges.

Studies have shown that illicit connections to storm sewers can create severe, wide-spread contamination problems. For example, the Huron River Pollution Abatement Program inspected 660 businesses, homes and other buildings located in Washtenaw County, Michigan and identified 14% of the buildings as having improper storm drain connections. Illicit discharges were detected at a higher rate of 60% for automobile related businesses, including service stations, automobile dealerships, car washes, body shops and light industrial facilities. While some of the problems discovered in this study were the result of improper plumbing or illegal connections, a majority were approved connections at the time they were built.

Intensive construction activities may result in severe localized impacts on water quality because of high unit loads of pollutants, primarily sediments. Construction sites can also generate other pollutants such as phosphorus and nitrogen from fertilizer, pesticides, petroleum products, construction chemicals and solid wastes. These materials can be toxic to aquatic organisms and degrade water for drinking and water-contact recreation. Sediment loadings rates from construction sites are typically 10 to 20 times that of agricultural lands, with runoff rates as high as 100 times that of agricultural lands, and typically 1,000 to 2,000 times that of forest lands. Even a small amount of construction may have a significant negative impact on water quality in localized areas. Over a short period of time, construction sites can contribute more sediment to streams than was previously deposited over. several decades.

II. Water Quality Act of 1987

The WQA contains three provisions which specifically address storm water discharges. The central WQA provision governing storm water discharges is section 405, which adds section 402(p) to the CWA. Section 402(p)(1) provides that EPA or NPDES States cannot require a permit for certain storm water discharges until October 1, 1992, except: for storm water discharges listed under section 402(p)(2). Section 402(p)(2) lists five types of storm water discharges which are required to obtain a permit prior to October 1, 1992:

(A) A discharge with respect to which a permit has been issued prior to February 4, 1987;

(B) A discharge associated with industrial activity;

(C) A discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 250,000 or more;

(D) A discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250,000; or

(E) A discharge for which the Administrator or the State, as the case may be, determines that the storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to the waters of the United States.

Section 402(p)(4)(A) requires EPA to promulgate final regulations governing storm water permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and discharges from large municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of 250,000 or more), "no later than two years" after the date . of enactment (i.e., no later than February 4, 1989). Section 402(p)(4)(B) also requires EPA to promulgate final regulations governing storm water permit application requirements for discharges from medium municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of 100,000 or more but less than 250,000) "no later than four years" after enactment (i.e., no later than February 4, 1991).

In addition, section 402(p)(4) provides that permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and discharges from large municipal separate storm sewer systems "shall be filed no later than three years" after the date of enactment of the WQA (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1990). Permit applications for discharges from medium municipal systems must be filed "no later than five years" after enactment (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1992).

The WQA clarified and amended the requirements for permits for storm water discharges in the new CWA section 402(p)(3). The Act clarified that permits for discharges associated with industrial activity must meet all of the applicable provisions of section 402 and section 301 including technology and water quality based standards. However, the new Act makes significant changes to the permit standards for discharges from municipal storm sewers. Section 402(p)(3)(B) provides that permits for such discharges:

(i) May be issued on a system- or jurisdiction-wide basis;

(ii) Shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers; and

(iii) Shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.

These changes are discussed in more detail later in today's rule.

The EPA. in consultation with the States, is required to conduct two studies on storm water discharges that are in the class of discharges for which **EPA and NPDES States cannot require** permits prior to October 1, 1992. The first study will identify those storm water discharges or classes of storm water discharges for which permits are not required prior to October 1, 1992, and determine, to the maximum extent practicable, the nature and extent of pollutants in such discharges. The second study is for the purpose of establishing procedures and methods to control storm water discharges to the extent necessary to mitigate impacts on water quality. Based on the two studies the EPA, in consultation with State and local officials, is required to issue regulations no later than October 1, 1992, which designate additional storm water discharges to be regulated to protect water quality and establish a comprehensive program to regulate such designated sources. This program must, at a minimum, (A) Establish priorities, (B) establish requirements for State storm water management programs, and (C) establish expeditious deadlines. The program may include performance standards, guidelines, guidance, and management practices and treatment requirements, as appropriate.

Section 401 of the WQA amends section 402(1)(2) of the CWA to provide that the EPA shall not require a permit for discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations or oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations or transmission facilities if the storm water discharge is not contaminated by contact with, or does not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product located on the site of such operations.

Section 503 of the WQA amends section 502(14) of the CWA to exclude agricultural storm water discharges from the definition of point source.

III. Remand of 1984 Regulations

On December 4, 1987, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated 40 CFR 122.26, (as promulgated on September 26, 1984, 49 FR 37998, September 26, 1984), and remanded the regulations to EPA for further rulemaking (*NRDC* v. *EPA*, No. 80–1607). EPA had requested the remand because of significant changes made by the storm water provisions of the WQA. The effect of the decision was to invalidate the storm water discharge regulations then found at § 122.26.

Storm water discharges which had been issued an NPDES permit prior to February 4, 1987, were not affected by the Court remand or the February 12, 1988, rule implementing the court order (53 FR 4157). (See section 402(p)(2)(A) of the CWA.) Similarly, the remand did not affect the authority of EPA or an NPDES State to require a permit for any storm water discharge (except an agricultural storm water discharge) designated under section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA. The notice of the remand clarified that such designated discharges meet the regulatory definition of point source found at 40 CFR 122.2 and that EPA or an NPDES State can rely on the statutory authority and require the filing of an application (Form 1 and Form 2C) for an NPDES permit with respect to such discharges on a case-by-case basis.

IV. Codification Rule and Case-by-Case Designations

Codification Rule

On January 4, 1989, (54 FR 255), EPA published a final rule which codified numerous provisions of the WQA into EPA regulations. The codification rule included several provisions dealing with storm water discharges. The codification rule promulgated the language found at section 402(p) (1) and (2) of the amended Clean Water Act at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1). In addition, the codification rule promulgated the language of Section 503 of the WQA which exempted agricultural storm water discharges from the definition of point source at 40 CFR 122.2, and section 401 of the WQA addressing uncontaminated storm water discharges from mining or oil and gas operations at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(2).

EPA also codified the statutory authority of section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA for the Administrator or the State Director, as the case may be, to designate storm water discharges for a permit on a case-by-case basis at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1)(v).

Case by Case Designations

Section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA authorizes case-by-case designations of storm water discharges for immediate permitting if the Administrator or the State Director determines that the storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

In determining that a storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States for the purpose of a designation under section 402(p)(2)(E). the legislative history for the provision provides that "EPA or the State should use any available water quality or sampling data to determine whether the latter two criteria (contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States) are met, and should require additional sampling as necessary to determine whether or not these criteria are met." Conference Report, Cong. Rec. S16443 (daily ed. October 16, 1986]. In accordance with this legislative history, today's rule promulgates permit application requirements for certain storm water discharges, including discharges designated on a case-by-case basis. EPA will consider a number of factors when determining whether a storm water discharge is a significant contributor of pollution to the waters of the United States. These factors include: the location of the discharge with respect to waters of the United States; the size of the discharge; the quantity and nature of the pollutants reaching waters of the United States; and any other relevant factors. Today's rule incorporates these factors at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1)(v).

Under today's rule, case-by-case designations are made under regulatory procedures found at 40 CFR 124.52. The procedures at 40 CFR 124.52 require that whenever the Director decides that an individual permit is required, the Director shall notify the discharger in writing that the discharge requires a permit and the reasons for the decision. In addition, an application form is sent with the notice. Section 124.52 provides a 60 day period from the date of notice for submitting a permit application. Although this 60 day period may be appropriate for many designated storm water discharges, site specific factors may dictate that the Director provide

additional time for submitting a permit application. For example, due to the complexities associated with designation of a municipal separate storm sewer system for a system- or jurisdiction-wide permit, the Director may provide the applicant with additional time to submit relevant information or may require that information be submitted in several phases.

V. Consent Decree of October 20, 1989

On April 20, 1989, EPA was served notice of intent to sue by Kathy Williams et al, because of the Agency's failure to promulgate final storm regulations on February 4, 1989. pursuant to Section 402(p)(4) of the CWA. A suit was filed by the same party on July 20, 1989, alleging the same cause of action, to wit: the Agency's failure to promulgate regulations under section 402(p)(4) of the CWA. On October 20, 1989, EPA entered into a consent decree with Kathy Williams et al, wherein the Federal District Court, District of Oregon, Southern Division. decreed that the Agency promulgate final regulations for storm water discharges identified in sections 402(p)(2) (B) and (C) of the CWA no later than July 20, 1990. Kathy Williams et al., v. William K. Reilly, Administrator, et al., No. 89-6265-E (D-Ore.) In July 1990, the consent degree was amended to provide for a promulgation date of October 31. Today's rule is promulgated in compliance with the terms of the consent decree as amended.

VI. Today's Final Rule and Response to Comments

A. Overview

Section 405 of the WQA alters the regulatory approach to control. pollutants in storm water discharges by adopting a phased and tiered approach. The new provision phases in permit application requirements, permit issuance deadlines and compliance with permit conditions for different categories of storm water discharges. The approach is tiered in that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity must comply with sections 301 and 402 of the CWA (requiring control of the discharge of pollutants that utilize the Best Available Technology (BAT) and the Best **Conventional Pollutant Control** Technology (BCT) and where necessary, water quality-based controls), but permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems must require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent

practicable, and where necessary water quality-based controls, and must include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers. Furthermore, EPA in consultation with State and local officials must develop a comprehensive program to designate and regulate other storm water discharges to protect water quality.

This final regulation establishes requirements for the storm water permit application process. It also sets forth the required components of municipal storm water quality management plans, as well as a preliminary permitting strategy for industrial activities. In implementing these regulations, EPA and the States will strive to achieve environmental results in a cost effective manner by placing high priority on pollution prevention activities, and by targeting activities based on reducing risk from particularly harmful pollutants and/or from discharges to high value waters. EPA and the States will also work with applicants to avoid cross media transfers of storm water contaminants, especially through injection to shallow wells in the Class V Underground Injection Control Program.

In addition, EPA recognizes that problems associated with storm water, combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and infiltration and inflow (1&1) are all interrelated even though they are treated somewhat differently under the law. EPA believes that it is important to begin linking these programs and activities and, because of the potential cost to local governments, to investigate the use of innovative, non-traditional approaches to reducing or preventing contamination of storm water.

The application process for developing municipal storm water management plans provides an ideal opportunity between steps 1 and 2 for considering the full range of nontraditional, preventive approaches, including municipalities, public awareness/education programs, use of vegetation and/or land conservancy practices, alternative paving materials, creative ways to eliminate I&I and illegal hook-ups, and potentials for water reuse. EPA has already announced its plans to present an award for the best creative, cost effective approaches to storm water and CSOs beginning in 1991.

This rulemaking establishes permit application requirements for classes of storm water discharges that were specifically identified in section 402(p)(2). These priority storm water discharges include storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and discharges from a municipal separate storm sewer serving a population of 100,000 or more.

This rulemaking was developed after careful consideration of 450 sets of comments, comprising over 3200 pages, that were received from a variety of industries, trade associations, municipalities, State and Federal Agencies, environmental groups, and private citizens. These comments were received during a 90-day comment period which extended from December 7, 1988, to March 7, 1989. EPA received several requests for an extension of the comment period from 30-days up to 90days. Many arguments were advanced for an extension including: the extent and complexity of the proposal, the existence of other concurrent EPA proposals, and the need for technical evaluations of the proposal. EPA considered these comments as they were received, but declined to extend. the comment period beyond 90 days. The standard comment period on proposals normally range from 30 to 60 days. In light of the statutory deadline of February 4, 1989; additional time for the comment period beyond what was already a substantially lengthened comment period would have been inappropriate. The number and extent of the comments received on this proposal indicated that interested parties had substantially adequate time to review and comment on the regulation. Furthermore, the public was invited to attend six public meetings in Washington DC, Chicago, Dallas, Oakland, Jacksonville, and Boston to present questions and comments. EPA is convinced that substantial and adequate public participation was sought and received by the Agency.

Numerous commenters have also requested that the rule be reproposed due to the extent of the proposal and the number of options and issues upon which the Agency requested comments. EPA has decided against a reproposal. The December 7, 1988, notice of proposed rulemaking was extremely detailed and thoroughly identified major issues in such a manner as to allow the public clear opportunities to comment. The comments that were received were extensive, and many provided valuable information and ideas that have been incorporated into the regulation. Accordingly, the Agency is confident it has produced a workable and rational approach to the initial regulation of storm water discharges and a regulation that reflects the experience and knowledge of the public as provided in the comments, and which was developed in accordance with the

procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). EPA believes that while the number of issues raised by the proposal was extensive, the number of detailed comments indicates that the public was able to understand the issues in order to comment adequately. Thus, a reproposal is unnecessary.

B. Definition of Storm Water

The December 7, 1988, notice requested comment on defining storm water as storm water runoff, surface runoff, street wash waters related to street cleaning or maintenance, infiltration (other than infiltration contaminated by seepage from sanitary sewers or by other discharges) and drainage related to storm events or snow melt. This definition is consistent with the regulatory definition of "storm sewer" at 40 CFR 35.2005(b)(47) which is used in the context of grants for construction of treatment works. This definition aids in distinguishing separate storm water sewers from sanitary sewers, combined sewers, process discharge outfalls and non-storm water. non-process discharge outfalls.

The definition of "storm water" has an important bearing on the NPDES permitting scheme under the CWA. The following discusses the interrelationship of NPDES permitting requirements for storm water discharges addressed by this rule and NPDES permitting requirements for other non-storm water discharges which may be discharged via the storm sewer as a storm water discharge. Today's rule addresses permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more. Storm water discharges associated with industrial activity are to be covered by permits which contain technology-based controls based on BAT/BCT considerations or water quality-based controls, if necessary. A permit for storm water discharges from an industrial facility may also cover other non-storm water discharges from the facility. Today's rule establishes individual (Form 1 and Form 2F) and group application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. In addition, EPA or authorized NPDES States with authorized general permit programs may issue general permits which establish alternative application or notification requirements for storm water discharges covered by the general permit(s). Where a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity is mixed with a nonstorm water discharge, both discharges

must be covered by an NPDES permit (this can be in the same permit or with multiple permits). Permit application requirements for these "combination" discharges are discussed later in today's notice.

Today's rule also addresses permit application requirements for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more. Under today's rule, appropriate municipal owners or operators of these systems must obtain NPDES permits for discharges from these systems. These permits are to establish controls to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system and, where necessary, contain applicable water quality-based controls. Where nonstorm water discharges or storm water discharges associated with industrial activity discharge through a municipal separate storm sewer system (including systems serving a population of 100,000 or more as well as other systems), which ultimately discharges to a waters of the United States, such discharges through a municipal storm sewer need to be covered by an NPDES permit that is independent of the permit issued for discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer system. Today's rule defines the term "illicit discharge" to describe any discharge through a municipal separate storm sewer that is not composed entirely of storm water and that is not covered by an NPDES permit. Such illicit discharges are not authorized under the CWA. Section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA requires that permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewers require the municipality to "effectively prohibit". non-storm water discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer. As discussed in more detail below, today's rule begins to implement the "effective prohibition" by requiring municipal operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more to submit a description of a program to detect and control certain non-storm water discharges to their municipal system. Ultimately, such non-storm water discharges through a municipal separate storm sewer must either be removed from the system or become subject to an NPDES permit (other than the permit for the discharge from the municipal separate storm sewer). For reasons discussed in more detail below, in general, municipalities will not be held responsible for prohibiting some specific components of discharges or flows listed below through their municipal separate storm sewer

system, even though such components may be considered non-storm water discharges, unless such discharges are specifically identified on a case-by-case basis as needing to be addressed. However, operators of such non-storm water discharges need to obtain NPDES permits for these discharges under the present framework of the CWA (rather than the municipal operator of the municipal separate storm sewer system). (Note that section 516 of the Water Quality Act of 1987 requires EPA to conduct a study of de minimis discharges of pollutants to waters of the United States and to determine the most effective and appropriate methods of regulating any such discharges.)

EPA received numerous comments on the proposed regulatory definition of storm water, many of which proposed exclusions or additions to the definition. Several commenters suggested that the definition should include or not include detention and retention reservoir releases, water line flushing, fire hydrant flushing, runoff from fire fighting, swimming pool drainage and discharge, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, uncontaminated pumped ground water, rising ground waters, discharges from potable water sources, uncontaminated waters from cooling towers, foundation drains, non-contact cooling water (such as HVAC or heating, ventilation and air conditioning condensation water that POTWs require to be discharged to separate storm sewers rather than sanitary sewers). irrigation water, springs, roof drains, water from crawl space pumps, footing drains, lawn watering, individual car washing, flows from riparian habitats and wetlands. Most of these comments were made with regard to the concern that these were commonly occurring discharges which did not pose significant environmental problems. It was also noted that, unless these flows are classified as storm water, permits would be required for these discharges.

In response to the comments which requested EPA to define the term "storm water" broadly to include a number of classes of discharges which are not in any way related to precipitation events, EPA believes that this rulemaking is not an appropriate forum for addressing the appropriate regulation under the NPDES program of such non-storm water discharges, even though some classes of non-storm water discharges may typically contain only minimal amounts of pollutants. Congress did not intend that the term storm water be used to describe any discharge that has a de minimis amount of pollutants, nor did it intend for section 402(p) to be used to

provide a moratorium from permitting other non-storm water discharges. Consequently, the final definition of storm water has not been expanded from what was proposed. However, as discussed in more detail later in today's notice, municipal operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems will generally not be held responsible for "effectively prohibiting" limited classes of these discharges through their municipal separate storm sewer systems.

The proposed rule included infiltration in the definition of storm water. In this context one commenter suggested that the term infiltration be defined. Infiltration is defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(b)(20) as water other than wastewater that enters a sewer system (including sewer service connections and foundation drains) from the ground through such means as defective pipes, pipe joints, connections or manholes. Infiltration does not include, and is distinguished from, inflow. Another commenter urged that ground water infiltration not be classified as storm water because the chemical characteristics and contaminants of ground water will differ from surface storm water because of a longer contact period with materials in the soil and because ground water quality will not reflect current practices at the site. In today's rule, the definition of storm water excludes infiltration since pollutants in these flows will depend on a large number of factors, including interactions with soil and past land use practices at a given site. Further infiltration flows can be contaminated by sources that are not related to precipitation events, such as seepage from sanitary sewers. Accordingly the final regulatory language does not include infiltration in the definition of storm water. Such flows may be subject to appropriate permit conditions in industrial permits. As discussed in more detail below, municipal management programs must address infiltration where identified as a source of pollutants to waters of the United States.

One commenter questioned the status of discharges from detention and retention basins used to collect storm water. This regulation covers discharges of storm water associated with industrial activity and discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more into waters of the United States. Therefore, discharges from basins that are part of a conveyance system for a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity or part of a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 100,000 or more are covered by this regulation. Flows which are channeled into basins and which do not discharge into waters of the United States are not addressed by today's rule.

Several commenters requested that the term illicit connection be replaced with a term that does not connote illegal discharges or activity, because many discharges of non-storm water to municipal separate storm sewer systems occurred prior to the establishment of the NPDES program and in accordance with local or State requirements at the time of the connection. EPA disagrees that there should be a change in this terminology. The fact that these connections were at one time legal does not confer such status now. The CWA prohibits the point source discharge of non-storm water not subject to an NPDES permit through municipal separate storm sewers to waters of the United States. Thus, classifying such discharges as illicit properly identifies such discharges as being illegal.

A commenter wanted clarification of the terms "other discharges" and "drainage" that are used in the definition of "storm water." As noted above, today's rule clarifies that infiltration is not considered storm water. Thus the portion of the definition of storm water that refers to "other discharges" has also been removed. However, the term drainage has been retained. "Drainage" does not take on any meaning other than the flow of runoff into a conveyance, as the word is commonly understood.

One commenter stated that irrigation flows combined with storm water discharges should be excluded from consideration in the storm water program. The Agency would note that irrigation return flows are excluded from regulation under the NPDES program. Section 402(1)(1) states that the Administrator or the State shall not require permits for discharges composed entirely of return flows from irrigated agriculture. The legislative history of the 1977 Clean Water Act, which enacted this language, states that the word "entirely" was intended to limit the exception to only those flows which do not contain additional discharges from activities unrelated to crop production. Congressional Record Vol. 123 (1977), pg. 4360, Senate Report No. 95-370. Accordingly, a storm water discharge component, from an industrial facility for example, included in such "joint" discharges may be regulated pursuant to an NPDES permit either at the point at which the storm water flow enters or joins the irrigation flow, or where the

combined flow enters waters of the United States or a municipal separate storm sewer.

Some commenters expressed concern about including street wash waters as storm water. One commenter argued including street wash waters in the definition of storm water should not be construed to eliminate the need for management practices relating to construction activities where sediment may simply wash into storm drains. EPA agrees with these points and the concerns that storm sewers may receive material that pose environmental problems if street wash waters are included in the definition. Accordingly, such discharges are no longer in the definition as proposed, and must be addressed by municipal management programs as part of the prohibition on non-storm water discharges through municipal separate storm sewer systems.

Several commenters requested that the terms discharge and point source, in the context of permits for storm water discharge, be clarified. Several commenters stated that the EPA should clarify that storm water discharge does not include "sheet flow" off of an industrial facility. EPA interprets this as request for clarification on the status of the terms "point source" and "discharge" under these regulations. In response, this rulemaking only covers storm water discharges from point sources. A point source is defined at 40 CFR 122.2 as "any discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to, any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, landfill leachate collection system, vessel or other floating craft from which pollutants are or may be discharged. This term does not include return flows from irrigated agriculture or agricultural storm water runoff." EPA agrees with one commenter that this definition is adequate for defining what discharges of storm water are covered by this rulemaking. EPA notes that this definition would encompass municipal separate storm sewers. In view of this comprehensive definition of point source, EPA need clarify in this rulemaking only that a storm water discharge subject to NPDES regulation does not include storm water that enters the waters of the United States via means other than a "point source." As further discussed below, storm water from an industrial facility which enters and is subsequently discharged through a municipal separate storm sewer is a "discharge associated with industrial

activity" which must be covered by an individual or general permit pursuant to today's rule.

EPA would also note that individual facilities have the burden of determining whether a permit application should be submitted to address a point source discharge. Those unsure of the classification of storm water flow from a facility, should file permit applications addressing the flow, or prior to submitting the application consult permitting authorities for clarification.

One commenter stated that "point source" for this rulemaking should be defined, for the purposes of achieving better water quality, as those areas where "discharges leave the municipal [separate storm sewer] system." EPA notes in response that "point source" as currently defined will address such discharges, while keeping the definition of discharge and point source within the framework of the NPDES program, and without adding potentially confusing and ambiguous additional definitions to the regulation. If this comment is asserting that the term point source should not include discharges from sources through the municipal system. EPA disagrees. As discussed in detail below, discharges through municipal separate storm sewer systems which are not connected to an operable treatment works are discharges subject to NPDES permit requirements at (40 CFR 122.3(c)), and may properly be deemed point sources.

One industry argued that the definition of "point source" should be modified for storm water discharges so as to exclude discharges from land that is not artificially graded and which has a propensity to form channels where precipitation runs off. EPA intends to embrace the broadest possible definition of point source consistent with the legislative intent of the CWA and court interpretations to include any identifiable conveyance from which pollutants might enter the waters of the United States. In most court cases interpreting the term "point source", the term has been interpreted broadly. For example, the holding in Sierra Club v. Abston Construction Co., Inc., 620 F.2d 41 (5th Cir. 1980) indicates that changing the surface of land or establishing grading patterns on land will result in a point source where the runoff from the site is ultimately discharged to waters of the United States:

Simple erosion over the material surface, resulting in the discharge of water and other materials into navigable waters, does not constitute a point source discharge, absent some effort to *change the surface*, to *direct* the water flow or otherwise impede its progress * * * Gravity flow, resulting in a discharge into a navigable body of water. may be part of a point source discharge if the (discharger) at least initially collected or channeled the water and other materials. A point source of pollution may also be present where (dischargers) design spoil piles from discarded overburden such that, during periods of precipitation, erosion of spoil pile walls results in discharges into a navigable body of water by means of ditches, gullies and similar conveyances, even if the (dischargers) have done nothing beyond the mere collection of rock and other materials

* * * Nothing in the Act relieves (dischargers) from liability simply because the operators did not actually construct those conveyances, so long as they are reasonably likely to be the means by which pollutants are ultimately deposited into a navigable body of water. Conveyances of pollution formed either as a result of natural erosion or by material means, and which constitute a component of a * * * drainage system, may fit the statutory definition and thereby subject the operators to liability under the Act." 620 F.2d at 45 (emphasis added).

Under this approach, point source discharges of storm water result from structures which increase the imperviousness of the ground which acts to collect runoff, with runoff being conveyed along the resulting drainage or grading patterns.

The entire thrust of today's regulation is to control pollutants that enter receiving water from storm water conveyances. It is these conveyances that will carry the largest volume of water and higher levels of pollutants. The storm water permit application process and permit conditions will address circumstances and discharges peculiar to individual facilities.

One industry commented that the definition of waters of the State under some State NPDES programs included municipal storm sewer systems. The commenter was concerned that certain industrial facilities discharging through municipal storm sewers in these states would be required to obtain an NPDES permit, despite EPA's proposal not to require permits from such facilities generally. In response, EPA notes that section 510 of the CWA, approved States are able to have stricter requirements in their NPDES program. In approved NPDES States, the definition of waters of the State controls with regard to what constitutes a discharge to a water body. However, EPA believes that this will have little impact, since, as discussed below, all industrial dischargers, including those discharging through municipal separate storm sewer systems, will be subject to general or individual NPDES permits, regardless of any additional State requirements.

One municipality commented that neither the term "point source" nor "discharge" should be used in conjunction with industrial releases into urban storm water systems because that gives the impression that such systems are navigable waters. EPA disagrees that any confusion should result from the use of these terms in this context. In this rulemaking, EPA always addresses such discharges as "discharges through municipal separate storm sewer systems" as opposed to "discharges to waters of the United States." Nonetheless, such industrial discharges through municipal storm sewer systems are subject to the requirements of today's rule, as discussed elsewhere.

One commenter desired clarification with regard to what constituted an outfall, and if an outfall could be a pipe that connected two storm water conveyances. This rulemaking defines outfall as a point of discharge into the waters of the United States, and not a conveyance which connects to Sections of municipal separate storm sewer. In response to another comment, this rulemaking only addresses discharges to waters of United States, consequently discharges to ground waters are not covered by this rulemaking (unless there is a hydrological connection between the ground water and a nearby surface water body. See, e.q., Exxon Coro. v. Train, 554 F.2d 1310, 1312 n.1 (5th Cir. 1977); McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Weinberger, 707 F.Supp. 1182, 1195-96 (E.D. Cal. 1988)).

In the WQA and other places, the term "storm water" is presented as a single word. Numerous comments were received by EPA as to the appropriate spelling. Many of these comments recommended that two words for storm water is appropriate. EPA has decided to use an approach consistent with the Government Printing Office's approved form where storm water appears as two words.

C. Responsibility for Storm Water Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity Through Municipal Separate Storm Sewers

The December 7, 1988, notice of proposed rulemaking requested comments on the appropriate permitting scheme for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through municipal separate storm sewers. EPA proposed a permitting scheme that would define the requirement to obtain coverage under an NPDES permit for a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity through a municipal separate storm sewer in terms of the classification of the municipal separate storm sewer. EPA proposed holding municipal operators of large or medium

municipal separate storm sewer systems primarily responsible for applying for and obtaining an NPDES permit covering system discharges as well as storm water discharges fincluding storm water discharges associated with industrial activity) through the system. Under the proposed approach, operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge through a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system would generally not be required to obtain permit coverage for their discharge (unless designated as a significant contributor of pollution pursuant to section 402(p)(2)(E)) provided the municipality was notified of: The name, location and type of facility and a certification that the discharge has been tested (if feasible) for non-storm water (including the results of any testing). The notification procedure also required the operator of the storm water discharge associated with industrial activity to determine that: The discharge is composed entirely of storm water: the discharge does not contain hazardous substances in excess of reporting quantities; and the facility is in compliance with applicable provisions of the NPDES permit issued to the municipality for storm water.

In the proposal, EPA also requested comments on whether a decision on regulatory requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through other municipal separate storm sewer systems (generally those serving a population of less than 100,000) should be postponed until completion of two studies of storm water discharges required under section 402(p)(5) of the CWA.

EPA favored these approaches because they appeared to reduce the potential administrative burden associated with preparing and processing the thousands of permit applications associated with the rulemaking and provide EPA additional flexibility in developing permitting requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. EPA also expressed its belief, based upon an analysis of ordinances controlling construction site runoff in place in certain cities, that municipalities generally possessed legal authority sufficient to control contributions of industrial storm water pollutants to their separate storm sewers to the degree necessary to implement the proposed rule. EPA commented that municipal controls on industrial sources implemented to comply with an NPDES permit issued to the municipality would likely result in a level of storm water

pollution control very similar to that put directly on the industrial source through its own NPDES permit. This was to be accomplished by requiring municipal permitees, to the maximum extent practicable, to require industrial facilities in the municipality to develop and implement storm water controls based on a consideration of the same or similar factors as those used to make BAT/BCT determinations. (See 40 CFR 125.3 (d)(2) and (d)(3)).

The great majority of commenters on the December 7, 1988, notice addressed this aspect of the proposal. Based on consideration of the comments received on the notice. EPA has decided that it is appropriate to revise the approach in its proposed rule to require direct permit coverage for all storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, including those that discharge through municipal separate storm sewers. In response to this decision, EPA has continued to analyze the appropriate manner to respond to the large number of storm water discharges subject to this rulemaking. The development of EPA's policy regarding permitting these discharges is discussed in more detail in the section VI.D of today's preamble.

EPA notes that the status of discharges associated with industrial activity which pass through a municipal separate storm sewer system under section 402(p) raises difficult legal and policy questions. EPA believes that treating these discharges under permits separate from those issued to the municipality will most fully address both the legal and policy concerns raised in public comment.

Certain commenters supported EPA's proposal. Some commenters claimed that EPA lacked any authority to permit industrial discharges which were not discharged immediately to waters of the U.S. Other commenters agreed with EPA's statements in the proposal that its approach would result in a more manageable administrative burden for EPA and the NPDES states. However, numerous comments also were received which provided various arguments in support of revising the proposed approach. These comments addressed several areas including the definition of discharge under the CWA, the requirements and associated statutory time frames of section 402(p), as well as the resource and enforcement constraints of municipalities. EPA is persuaded by these comments and has modified its approach accordingly. The key comments on this issue are discussed below.

EPA disagrees with commenters who suggested that EPA lacks authority to

permit separately industrial discharges through municipal sewers. The CWA prohibits the discharge of a pollutant except pursuant to an NPDES permit. Section 502(12)(A) of the CWA defines the "discharge of a pollutant" as "any addition of any pollutant to navigable waters from any point source." ¹ There is no qualification in the statutory language regarding the source of the pollutants being discharged. Thus, pollutants from a remote location which are discharged through a point source conveyance controlled by a different entity (such as a municipal storm sewer) are nonetheless discharges for which a permit is required.

EPA's regulatory definition of the term "discharge" reflects this broad construction. EPA defines the term to include

additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channelled by man; discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances owned by a State, municipality, or other person which does not lead to a treatment works; and discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances, leading into privately owned treatment works.

40 CFR § 122.2 (1989) (emphasis added). The only exception to this general rule is the one contemplated by section 307(b) of the CWA, *i.e.*, the introduction of pollutants into publicly-owned treatment works. EPA treats these as "indirect discharges," subject not to NPDES requirements, but to pretreatment standards under section 307(b).

In light of its construction of the term discharge, EPA has consistently maintained that a person who sends pollutants from a remote location through a point source into a water of the U.S. may be held liable for the unpermitted discharge of that pollutant. Thus, EPA asserts the authority to require a permit either from the operator of the point source conveyance, (such as a municipal storm sewer or a privatelyowned treatment works), or from any person causing pollutants to be present in that conveyance and discharged through the point source, or both. See Decision of the General Counsel (of EPA) No. 43 ("In re Friendswood Development Co.") (June 11, 1976) (operator of privately owned treatment work and dischargers to it are both subject to NPDES permit requirements). See also, 40 CFR 122.3(g), 122.44(m)

¹ Indeed, the DC Circuit has held, in the storm water context, that EPA may not exempt any point source discharges of pollutants from the requirement to obtain an NPDES permit. *NRDC* v. *Costle*, 569 F.2d 1369, 1377 (DC Cir. 1977).

(NPDES permit writer has discretion to permit contributors to a privately owned treatment works as direct dischargers). In other words, where pollutants are added by one person to a conveyance owned/operated by another person, and that conveyance discharges those pollutants through a point source, EPA may permit either person or both to ensure that the discharge is properly controlled. Pollutants from industrial sites discharged through a storm sewer to a point source are appropriately treated in this fashion.

Furthermore. EPA believes that storm water from an industrial plant which is discharged through a municipal storm sewer is a "discharge associated with industrial activity." Today's rule, as in the proposal, defines discharges associated with industrial activity solely in terms of the origin of the storm water runoff. There is no distinction for how the storm water reaches the waters of the U.S. In other words, pollutants in storm water from an industrial plant which are discharged are "associated with industrial activity," regardless of whether the industrial facility operates the conveyance discharging the storm water (or whether the storm water is ultimately discharged through a municipal storm sewer). Indeed, there is no distinction in the "industrial" nature of these two types of discharges. The pollutants of concern in an industrial storm water discharge are present when the storm water leaves the facility. either through an industrial or municipal storm water conveyance. EPA has no data to suggest that the pollutants in industrial storm water entering a municipal storm sewer are any different than those in storm water discharged immediately to a water of the U.S. Thus, industrial storm water in a municipal sewer is properly classified as "associated with industrial activity." Although EPA proposed not to cover these discharges by separate permit, the Agency believes that it is clearly not precluded from doing so.

Many comments also supported the proposed approach, noting that holding municipalities primarily responsible for obtaining a permit which covers industrial storm water discharges through municipal systems would reduce the administrative burden associated with preparing and processing thousands of permit applications—permit applications that would be submitted if each industrial discharger through a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system had to apply individually (or as part of a group application). EPA appreciates these concerns. Yet EPA also recognizes that there are also significant problems with putting the burden of controlling these sources on the municipalities (except for designated discharges) which must be balanced with the concerns about the permit application burden on industries. The industrial permitting strategy discussed in section VI.D below attempts to achieve this balance.

EPA also does not believe that the administrative burden will be nearly as significant as originally thought, for several reasons. First, as discussed in section VI.F.2 below and in response to significant public comment, EPA has significantly narrowed the scope of the definition of "associated with industrial activity" to focus in on those facilities which are most commonly considered "industrial" and thought to have the potential for the highest levels of pollutants in their storm water discharges. EPA believes this is a more appropriate way to ensure a manageable scope for the industrial storm water program in light of the statutory language of section 402(p), since it does not attempt to arbitrarily distinguish industrial facilities on the basis of the ownership of the conveyance through which a facility discharges its storm water. Second. EPA's industrial permitting strategy discussed in section VI.D is designed around aggressive use of general permits to cover the vast majority of industrial sources. These general permits will require industrial facilities to develop storm water control plans and practices similar to those that would have been required by the municipality. Yet, general permits will eliminate the need for thousands of individual or group permit applications, greatly reducing the burden on both industry EPA/States. Finally, even under the proposal, EPA believes that a large number of industrial dischargers would have been appropriate for designation for individual permitting under section 402(p)(2)(E), with the attendant individual application requirements. Today's approach will actually decrease the overall burden on these facilities; rather than filing an individual permit application upon designation, these facilities will generally be covered by a general permit.

By contrast, several commenters asserted that not only does EPA have the authority to cover these discharges by separate permit, it is required to by the language of section 402(p). As discussed above, storm water from an industrial plant which passes through a municipal storm sewer to a point source and is discharged to waters of the U.S. is a "discharge associated with industrial activity." Therefore, it is subject to the appropriate requirements of section 402(p). The operator of the discharge (or the industrial facility where the storm water originates) must apply for a permit within three years of the 1987 amendments (i.e., Feb. 4, 1990); 2 EPA must issue a permit by one year later (Feb. 4, 1991); and the permit must require compliance within three years of permit issuance. That permit must ensure that the discharge is in compliance with all appropriate provisions of sections 301 and 402. Commenters asserted that EPA's proposal would violate these two requirements of the law. First, the statute requires all industrial storm water discharges to obtain a permit in the first round of permitting (i.e., February 4, 1990). However, Congress established a different framework to address discharges from small municipal separate storm sewer systems. Section 402(p) requires EPA to complete two studies of storm water discharges, and based on those studies, promulgate additional regulations, including requirements for state storm water management programs by October 1, 1992. EPA is prohibited from issuing permits for storm water discharges from small municipal systems until October 1, 1992 unless the discharge is designated under section 402(p)(2)(E). Thus, industrial storm water discharges from these systems would not be covered by a permit until later than contemplated by statute. Second, permits for municipal storm sewer systems require controls on storm water discharges "to the maximum extent practicable," as opposed to the BAT/BCT requirements of section 301(b)(2). Yet, all industrial storm water discharges must comply with section 301(b)(2). Thus, covering industrial storm water under a municipal storm water permit will not ensure the legally-required level of control of industrial storm water discharges.

In addition to comments on the requirements of section 402(p), EPA received several comments questioning whether EPA's proposal to cover industrial pollutants in municipal separate storm sewers solely in the permit issued to the municipality would ensure adequate control of these pollutants due to both inadequate

² It should be noted that EPA did not promulgate the required storm water regulations by February. 1989, as contemplated by section 402(p)(4)(A). As discussed below, today's rule generally requires industrial storm water discharges to file a permit application in one year.

resources and enforcement. Some municipalities stated that the burdens of this responsibility would be too great with regard to source identification and general administration of the program. These commenters claimed they lacked the necessary technical and regulatory expertise to regulate such sources. Commenters also noted that additional resources to control these sources would be difficult to obtain given the restrictions on local taxation in many states and the fact that EPA will not be providing funding to local governments to implement their storm water programs.

Municipalities also expressed concerns regarding enforcement of EPA's proposed approach. Some municipalities remarked that they did not have appropriate legal authority to address these discharges. Several commenters also stated that requiring municipalities to be responsible for addressing storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through their municipal system would result in unequal treatment of industries nationwide because of different municipal requirements and enforcement procedures. Several municipal entities expressed concern with regard to their responsibility and liability for pollutants discharged to their municipal storm sewer system, and further asserted that it was unfair to require municipalities to bear the full cost of controlling such pollutants. Other municipalities suggested that overall municipal storm water control would be impaired, since municipalities would spend a disproportionate amount of resources trying to control industrial discharges through their sewers, rather than addressing other storm water problems. In a related vein, certain commenters suggested that, where industrial storm water was a significant problem in a municipal sewer, EPA's proposed approach would hamper enforcement at the federal/state level, since all enforcement measures could be directed only at the municipality, rather than at the most direct source of that problem.

In response to all of these concerns, EPA has decided to require storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge through municipal separate storm sewers to obtain separate individual or general NPDES permits. EPA believes that this change will adequately address all of the key concerns raised by commenters.

The Agency was particularly influenced by concerns that many municipalities lacked the authority under state law to address industrial storm water practices. EPA had assumed that since several cities regulate construction site activities, that they could regulate other industrial operations in a similar manner. Several commenters suggested otherwise. In light of these concerns. EPA agrees with certain commenters that municipal controls on industrial facilities, in lieu of federal control, might not comply with section 402(p)(3)(A) for those facilities.³ This calls into question whether EPA's proposed approach would have reasonably implemented Congressional intent to address industrial storm water early and stringently in the permitting process.

EPA also agrees with those commenters who argued that municipal controls on industrial storm water sources were not directly analogous to. the pretreatment program under section 307(b), as EPA suggested in the preamble to the proposal. The authority of cities to control the type and volume of industrial pollutants into a POTW is generally unquestioned under the laws of most states, since sewage and industrial waste treatment is a service provided by the municipality. Thus, EPA has greater confidence that cities can and will adopt effective pretreatment programs. By contrast, many cities are limited in the types of controls they can impose on flows into storm sewers; cities are more often limited to regulations on quantity of industrial flows to prevent flooding the system. So too, the pretreatment program allows for federal enforcement of local pretreatment requirements. Enforcement against direct dischargers (including dischargers through municipal storm sewers) is possible only when the municipal requirements are contained in an NPDES permit.

Although today's rule will require industrial discharges through municipal storm sewers to be covered by separate permit, EPA still believes that municipal operators of large and medium municipal systems have an important role in source identification and the development of pollutant controls for industries that discharge storm water through municipal separate storm sewer systems is appropriate. Under the CWA,

large and medium municipalities are responsible for reducing pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers to the maximum extent practicable. Because storm water from industrial facilities may be a major contributor of pollutants to municipal separate storm sewer systems. municipalities are obligated to develop controls for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through their system in their storm water management program. (See section VI.H.7. of today's preamble.) The CWA provides that permits for municipal separate storm sewers shall require municipalities to reduce pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Permits issued to municipalities for discharges from municipal separate storm sewers will reflect terms, specified controls, and programs that achieve that goal. As with all NPDES permits, responsibility and liability is determined by the discharger's compliance with the terms of the permit. A municipality's responsibility for industrial storm water discharged through their system is governed by the terms of the permit issued. If an industrial source discharges storm water through a municipal separate storm sewer in violation of requirements incorporated into a permit for the industrial facility's discharge, that industrial operator of the discharge may be subject to an enforcement action instituted by the Director of the NPDES program.

Today's rule also requires operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through large and medium municipal systems to provide municipal entities of the name, location, and type of facility that is discharging to the municipal system. This information will provide municipalities with a base of information from which management plans can be devised and implemented. This requirement is in addition to any requirements contained in the industrial facility's permit. As in the proposal, the notification process will assist cities in development of their industrial control programs.

EPA intends for the NPDES program, through requirements in permits for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, to work in concert with municipalities in the industrial component of their storm water management program efforts. EPA believes that permitting of municipal storm sewer systems and the industrial discharges through them will act in a complementary manner to fully control the pollutants in those sewer systems. This will fully implement the intent of

³ EPA notes that the legal issue raised by commenters regarding whether industrial storm water would be controlled to BAT if covered by a municipal permit at the MEP level is primarily a theoretical issue. As explained above, the proposal assumed that cities would establish controls on industry very similar to those established in an NPDES permit using best professional judgment. EPA's key concero, rather, is whether cities can, in fact, establish such controls. Thus, today's final rule should not appreciably change the requirements to be imposed on industrial sources, only how those requirements are enforced.

Congress to control industrial as well as large and medium municipal storm water discharges as expeditiously and effectively as possible. This approach will also address the concerns of municipalities that they lack sufficient authority and resources to control all industrial contributions to their storm sewers and will be liable for discharges outside of their control.

The permit application requirements for large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems, discussed in more detail later in today's preamble, address the responsibilities of the municipal operators of these systems to identify and control pollutants in storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. Permit applications for large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems are to identify the location of facilities which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity to the municipal system (see section VI.H.7. of the preamble). In addition, municipal applicants will provide a description of a proposed management program to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants from storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge to the municipal system (see section VI.H.7.c of this preamble). EPA notes that each municipal program will be tailored to the conditions in that city. Differences in regional weather patterns, hydrology, water quality standards, and storm sewer systems themselves dictate that storm water management practices will vary to some degree in each municipality. Accordingly, similar industrial storm water discharges may be treated differently in terms of the requirements imposed by the municipality, depending on the municipal program. Nonetheless, any individual or general permit issued to the industrial facility must comply with section 402(p)(3)(A) of the CWA.

EPA intends to provide assistance and guidance to municipalities and permitting authorities for developing storm water management programs that achieve permit requirements. EPA intends to issue a guidance document addressing municipal permit applications in the near term.

Controls developed in management plans for municipal system permits may take a variety of forms. Where necessary, municipal permittees can pursue local remedies to develop measures to reduce pollutants or halt storm water discharges with high levels of pollutants through municipal storm sewer systems. Some local entities have already implemented ordinances or laws

that are designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants to municipal separate storm sewers, while other municipalities have developed a variety of techniques to control pollutants in storm water. Alternatively, where appropriate, municipal permittees may develop end-of-pipe controls to control pollutants in these discharges such as regional wet detention ponds or diverting flow to publicly owned treatment works. Finally, municipal applicants may bring individual storm water discharges, which cannot be adequately controlled by the municipal permittees or general permit coverage, to the attention of the permitting authority. Then, at the Director's discretion, appropriate additional controls can be required in the permit for the facility generating the targeted storm water discharge.

One commenter suggested that municipal operators of municipal separate storm sewers should have control over all storm water discharges from a facility that discharges both through the municipal system and to waters of the United States. In response, under this regulatory and statutory scheme, industries that discharge storm water directly into the waters of the United States, through municipal separate storm sewer systems, or both are required to obtain permit coverage for their discharges. However, municipalities are not precluded from exercising control over such facilities through their own-municipal authorities.

It is important to note that EPA has established effluent guideline limitations for storm water discharges for nine subcategories of industrial dischargers (Cement Manufacturing (40 CFR part 411), Feedlots (40 CFR part 412), Fertilizer Manufacturing (40 CFR part 418), Petroleum Refining (40 CFR part 419), Phosphate Manufacturing (40 CFR part 422), Steam Electric (40 CFR part 423), Coal Mining (40 CFR part 434), Ore Mining and Dressing (40 CFR part 440) and Asphalt (40 CFR part 441)). Most of the existing facilities in these subcategories already have individual permits for their storm water discharges. Under today's rule, facilities with existing NPDES permits for storm water discharges through a municipal storm sewer will be required to maintain these permits and apply for an individual permit, under § 122:26(c), when existing permits expire. EPA received numerous comments supporting this decision because requiring facilities that have existing permits to comply with today's requirements immediately would be inefficient and not serve improved water quality.

Sections 402(p) (1) and (2) of the CWA provide that discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of less than 100,000 are not required to obtain a permit prior to October 1, 1992, unless designated on a case-by-case basis under section . 402(p)(2)(E). However, as discussed above, storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through such municipal systems are not excluded. Thus, under today's rule, all storm water discharges associated with industrial activity that discharge through municipal separate storm sewer systems are required to obtain NPDES permit coverage, including those which discharge through systems serving populations less than 100,000. EPA believes requiring permits will address the legal concerns raised by commenters regarding these sources. In addition, it will allow for control of these significant sources of pollution while EPA continues to study under section 402(p)(6) whether to require the development of municipal storm water management plans in these municipalities. If these municipalities do ultimately obtain NPDES permits for their municipal separate storm sewer systems, early permitting of the industrial contributions may aid those cities in their storm water management efforts.

In the December 7, 1988, proposal. EPA recognized that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from Federal facilities through municipal separate storm sewer systems may pose unique legal and administrative situations. EPA received numerous comments on this issue, with most of these comments coming from cities and counties. The comments reflected a general concern with respect to a municipality's ability to control Federal storm water discharges through municipal separate storm sewer systems. Most municipalities stated that they do not have the legal authority to adequately enforce against problem storm water discharges from Federal facilities and that these facilities should be required to obtain separate storm water permits. Some commenters stated that they have no Constitutional authority to regulate Federal facilities or establish regulation for such facilities. Some commenters indicated that Federal facilities could not be inspected. monitored, or subjected to enforcement for national security and other jurisdictional reasons. Some commenters argued that without clearly stated legal authority for the municipality, such dischargers should be required to obtain permits. One

municipality pointed out that Federal facilities within city limits are exempted from their Erosion and Sediment Control Act and that permits for these facilities should be required.

Under today's rule, Federal facilities which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity through municipal separate storm sewer systems will be required to obtain NPDES permit coverage under Federal or State law. EPA believes this will cure the legal authority problems at the local level raised by the commenters. EPA notes that this requirement is consistent with section 313(a) of the CWA.

D. Preliminary Permitting Strategy for Storm Water Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity

Many of the comments received on the December 7, 1988, proposal focused on the difficulties that EPA Regions and authorized NPDES States, with their finite resources, will have in implementing an effective permitting program for the large number of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. Many commenters noted that problems with implementing permit programs are caused not only by the large number of industrial facilities subject to the program, but by the difficulties associated with identifying appropriate technologies for controlling storm water at various sites and the differences in the nature and extent of storm water discharges from different types of industrial facilities.

EPA recognizes these concerns; and based on a consideration of comments from authorized NPDES States, municipalities, industrial facilities and environmental groups on the permitting framework and permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, EPA is in the process of developing a preliminary strategy for permitting storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. In developing this strategy, EPA recognizes that the CWA provides flexibility in the manner in which NPDES permits are issued.⁴ EPA intends to use this flexibility in designing a workable and reasonable permitting system. In accordance with these considerations, EPA intends to publish in the near future a discussion of its preliminary permitting strategy for implementing the NPDES storm water program.

The preliminary strategy is intended to establish a framework for developing permitting priorities, and includes a four tier set of priorities for issuing permits to be implemented over time:

• *Tier I—baseline permitting:* One or more general permits will be developed to initially cover the majority of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity;

• *Tier II—watershed permitting:* Facilities within watersheds shown to be adversely impacted by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity will be targeted for permitting.

• Tier III—industry specific permitting: Specific industry categories. will be targeted for individual or industry-specific permits; and

• Tier IV—facility specific permitting: A variety of factors will be used to target specific facilities for individual permits.

Tier I—Baseline Permitting

EPA intends to issue general permits that initially cover the majority of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity in States without authorized NPDES programs. These permits will also serve as models for States with authorized NPDES programs.

The consolidation of many sources under one permit will greatly reduce the otherwise overwhelming administrative burden associated with permitting storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. This approach has a number of additional advantages, including:

• Requirements will be established for discharges covered by the permit;

• Facilities whose discharges are covered by the permit will have an opportunity for substantial compliance with the CWA;

• The public, including municipal operators of municipal separate storm sewers which may receive storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, will have access under section 308(b) of the CWA to monitoring data and certain other information developed by the permittee;

• EPA will have the opportunity to begin to collect and review data on storm water discharges from priority industries, thereby supporting the development of subsequent permitting activities;

• Applicable requirements of municipal storm water management programs established in permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems will be enforceable directly against non-complying industrial facilities that generate the discharges;

• The public will be given an opportunity to comment on permitting activities;

• The baseline permits will provide a basis for bringing selected enforcement actions by eliminating many issues which might otherwise arise in an enforcement proceeding; and

• Finally, the baseline permits will provide a focus for public comment on the development of subsequent phases of the permitting strategy for storm water discharges, including the development of priorities for State storm water management programs developed under section 402(p)(6) of the CWA.

Initially, the coverage of the baseline permits will be broad, but the coverage is intended to shrink as other permits are issued for storm water discharges associated with industrial activities pursuant to Tier II through IV activities.

2. Tier II-Watershed Permitting

Facilities within watersheds shown to be adversely impacted by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity will be targeted for individual and general permitting. This process can be initiated by identifying receiving waters (or segments of receiving waters) where storm water discharges associated with industrial activity have been identified as a source of use impairment or are suspected to be contributing to use impairment.

3. Tier III—Industry Specific Permitting

Specific industry categories will be targeted for individual or industryspecific general permits. These permits will allow permitting authorities to focus attention and resources on industry categories of particular concern and/or industry categories where tailored requirements are appropriate. EPA will work with the States to coordinate the development of model permits for selected classes of industrial storm water discharges. EPA is also working to identify priority industrial categories in the two reports to Congress required under section 402(p)(5) of the CWA. In addition, group applications that are received can be used to develop model permits for the appropriate industries.

⁴ The courts in *NRDC* v. *Train*. 396 F.Supp. 1393 (D.D.C. 1975) *aff'd*. *NRDC* v. *Costle*, 568 F.2d 1369 (DC Cir. 1977), have acknowledged the administrative burden placed on the Agency by requiring individual permits for a large number of storm water discharges. These courts have recognized EPA's discretion to use certain administrative devices, such as area permits or general permits to help manage its workload. In addition, the courts have recognized flexibility in the type of permit conditions that are established, including requirements for best management practices.

4. Tier IV—Facility Specific Permitting

Individual permits will be appropriate for some storm water discharges in addition to those identified under Tier II and III activities. Individual permits should be issued where warranted by: the pollution potential of the discharge; the need for individual control mechanisms; and in cases where reduced administrative burdens exist. For example, individual NPDES permits for facilities with process discharges should be expanded during the normal process of permit reissuance to cover storm water discharges from the facility.

5. Relationship of Strategy to Permit Applications Requirements

The preliminary long-term permitting strategy described above identifies several permit schemes that EPA anticipates will be used in addressing storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. One issue that arises with this strategy is determining the appropriate information needed to develop and issue permits for these discharges. The NPDES regulatory scheme provides three major options for obtaining permit coverage for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity: (1) Individual permit applications; (2) group applications; and (3) case-by-case requirements developed for general permit coverage.

a. Individual permit application requirements. Today's notice establishes requirements for individual permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. These application requirements are applicable for all storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, except where the operator of the discharge is participating in a group application or a general permit is issued to cover the discharge and the general permit provides alternative means to obtain permit coverage. Information in individual applications is intended to be used in developing the site-specific conditions generally associated with individual permits.

Individual permit applications are expected to play an important role in all tiers of the Strategy, even where general permits are used. Although general permits may provide for notification requirements that operate in lieu of the requirement to submit individual permit applications, the individual permit applications may be needed under several circumstances. Examples include: where a general permit requires the submission of a permit application as the notice of intent to be covered by the permit; where the owner or operator authorized by a general permit requests to be excluded from the coverage of the general permit by applying for a permit (see 40 CFR 122.28(b)(2)(iii) for EPA issued general permits); and where the Director requires an owner or operator authorized by a general permit to apply for an individual permit (see 40 CFR 122.28(b)(2)(ii) for EPA issued general permits).

b. *Group applications.* Today's rule also promulgates requirements for group, applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. These applications provide participants of groups with sufficiently similar storm water discharges an alternative mechanism for applying for permit coverage.

The group application requirements are primarily intended to provide information for developing industry specific general permits. (Group applications can also be used to issue individual permits in authorized NPDES States without general permit authority or where otherwise appropriate). As such, group application requirements correlate well with the Tier III permitting activities identified in the long-term permitting Strategy.

c. Case-by-case requirements. 40 CFR 122.21(a) excludes persons covered by general permits from requirements to submit individual permit applications. Further, the general permit regulations at 40 CFR 122.28 do not address the issue of how a potential permittee is to apply to be covered under a general permit. Rather, conditions for notification of intent (NOI) to be covered by the general permit are established in the permits on a case-bycase basis, and operate in lieu of permit application requirements. Requirements for submitting NOIs to be covered by a general permit can range from full applications (this would be Form 1 and Form 2F for most discharges composed entirely of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity), to no notice. EPA recommends that the NOI requirements established in a general permit for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity be commensurate with the needs of the permit writer in establishing the permit and the permit program. The baseline general permit described in Tier I is intended to support the development of controls for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity that can be supported by the limited resources of the permitting Agency. In this regard, the burdens of receiving and reviewing NOI's from the large number of facilities covered by the permit should also be considered when developing NOI

requirements. In addition, NOI requirements should be developed in conjunction with permit conditions establishing reporting requirements during the term of the permit.

NOI requirements in general permits can establish a mechanism which can be used to establish a clear accounting of the number of permittees covered by the general permit, the nature of operations at the facility generating the discharge, their identity and location. The NOI can be used as an initial screening tool to determine discharges where individual permits are appropriate. Also, the NOI can be used to identify classes of discharges appropriate for more specific general permits, as well as provide information needed to notify such dischargers of the issuance of a more specific general permit. In addition, the NOI can provide for the identification of the permittee to provide a basis for enforcement and compliance monitoring strategies. EPA will further address this issue in the context of specific general permits it plans to issue in the near future.

Today's rule requires that individual permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity be submitted within one year from the date of publication of this notice. EPA is considering issuing general permits for the majority of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity in those States and territories that do not have authorized State NPDES programs (MA, ME, NH, FL, LA, TX, OK, NM, SD, AZ, AK, ID, District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam. American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) before that date to enable industrial dischargers of storm water to ascertain whether they are eligible for coverage under a general permit (and subject to any alternative notification requirements established by the general permit in lieu of the individual permit application requirements of today's rule) or whether they must submit an individual permit application (or participate in a group application) before the regulatory deadlines for submitting these applications passes. Storm water application deadlines are discussed in further detail below.

E. Storm Water Discharge Sampling

Storm water discharges are intermittent by their nature, and pollutant concentrations in storm water discharges will be highly variable. Not only will variability arise between given events, but the flow and pollutant concentrations of such discharges will vary with time during an event. This variability raises two technical problems: how best to characterize the discharge associated with a single storm event; and how best to characterize the variability between discharges of different events that may be caused by seasonal changes and changes in material management practices, for example.

Prior to today's rulemaking, 40 CFR 122.21(g)[7) required that applicants for NPDES permits submit quantitative data based on one grab sample taken every hour of the discharge for the first four hours of discharge. EPA has modified this requirement such that, instead of collecting and analyzing four grab samples individually, applicants for permits addressing storm water discharges associated with industrial activity will provide data as indicators of two sets of conditions: data collected during the first 30 minutes of discharge and flow-weighted average storm event concentrations. Large and medium municipalities will provide data on flowweighted average storm event concentrations only.

Data describing pollutants in a grab sample taken during the first few minutes of the discharge can often be used as a screen for non-storm water discharges to separate storm sewers because such pollutants may be flushed out of the system during the initial portion of the discharge. In addition, data from the first few minutes of a discharge are useful because much of the traditional structural technology used to control storm water discharges, including detention and retention devices, may only provide controls for the first portion of the discharge, with relatively little or no control for the remainder of the discharge. Data from the first portion of the discharge will give an indication of the potential usefulness of these techniques to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges. Also, such discharges may be primarily responsible for pollutant shocks to the ecosystem in receiving waters.

Studies such as NURP have shown that flow-weighted average concentrations of storm water discharges are useful for estimating pollutant loads and for evaluating certain concentration-based water quality impacts. The use of flowweighted composite samples are also consistent with comments raised by various industry representatives during previous Agency rulemakings that continuous monitoring of discharges from storm events is necessary to adequately characterize such discharges.

EPA requested comment on the feasibility of the proposed modification of sampling procedures at § 122.21(g)(7) and the ability to characterize pollutants in storm water discharges with an average concentration from the first portion of the discharge compared to collecting and separately analyzing four grab samples. It was proposed that an event composite sample be collected, as well as a grab sample collected during the first 20 minutes of runoff. Comments were solicited as to whether or not this sampling method would provide better definition of the storm load for runoff characterization than would the requirement to collect and separately analyze four grab samples.

Many commenters questioned the ability to obtain a 20 minute sample in the absence of automatic samplers. Some believed that pollutants measured by such a sample can be accounted for in the event composite sample. Others argued that this is an unwarranted sampling effort if municipal storm water management plans are to be geared to achieving annual pollutant load reductions. Many commenters advised that problems accessing sampling stations and mobilizing sampling crews, particularly after working hours, made sampling during the first 20 minutes impractical. These comments were made particularly with respect to municipalities, where the geographical areas could encompass several hundred square miles. Several alternatives were suggested including: the collection of a sample in the first hour, and representative grab sampling in the next three hours, one per hour; or perform time proportioned sampling for up to four hours.

Because of the logistical problems associated with collecting samples during the first few minutes of discharge from municipal systems, EPA will only require such sampling from industrial facilities. Municipal systems will be spread out over many square miles with sampling locations potentially several miles from public works departments or other responsible government agencies. Reaching such locations in order to obtain samples during the first few minutes of a storm event may prove impossible. For essentially the same reasons, the requirement has been modified to encompass the first 30 minutes of the discharge, instead of 20 minutes, for industrial discharges. The rule also clarifies that the sample should be taken during the first 30 minutes or as soon thereafter as practicable. Where appropriate, characterization of this

۰.

portion of the discharge from selected outfalls or sampling points may be a condition to permits issued to municipalities. With regard to protocols for the collection of sample aliquots for flow-weighted composite samples, § 122.21(g)(7) provides that municipal applicants may collect flow-weighted composite samples using different protocols with respect to the time duration between the collection of sample aliquots, subject to the approval of the Director or Regional Administrator. In other words, the period may be extended from 15 minutes to 20 or 25 minutes between sample aliquots, or decreased from 15 to 10 or 5 minutes.

Other comments raised issues that apply both to the impact of runoff characterization and the first discharge representation. These primarily pertained to regions that have well defined wet and dry seasons. Comments questioned whether or not it is fair to assume that the initial storm or two of a wet season, which will have very high pollutant concentrations, are actually representative of the runoff concentrations for the area.

In response, EPA believes that it is important to represent the first part of the discharge either separately or as a part of the event composite samples. This loading is made up primarily of the mass of unattached fine particulates and readily soluble surface load that accumulates between storms. This load washes off of the basin's directly connected paved surfaces when the runoff velocities reach the level required for entrainment of the particulate load into the surface flow. It should be noted that for very fine particulates and solubles, this can occur very soon after the storm begins and much sooner than the peak flow. The first few minutes of discharge represents a shock load to the receiving water, in terms of concentration of pollutants, because for many constituents the highest concentrations of the event will occur during this initial period. Due to the need to properly quantify this load, it is not necessary to represent the first discharge from the upper reaches of the outfall's tributary area. In runoff characterization basins, the assumption is that the land use in the basin is homogeneous, or nearly so, and that the first discharge from the lower reaches for all intents and purposes is representative of the entire basin. If a sample is taken during the first 30 minutes of the runoff, it will be composed primarily of first discharge. If the sample is taken at the outfall an hour into the event, it may contain

discharge from the remote portions of the basin. It will not be representative of the discharge because it will also contain later washoff from the lower reaches of the basin, resulting in a low estimation of the first discharge load of most constituents. Conversely, larger suspended particulates that normally are not present in first discharge due to inadequate velocities will appear in this later sampling scenario because of the influence of higher runoff rates in the lower basin. Many commonly used management practices are designed based on their ability to treat a volume of water defined by the first discharge phenomenon. It is important to characterize the first discharge load because most management practices effectively treat only, or primarily, this load.

It should be noted that first discharge runoff is sometimes contaminated by non-storm water related pollutants. In many urban catchments, contaminants that result from illicit connections and illegal dumping may be stored in the system until "flushed" during the initial storm period. This does not negate the need for information on the characteristic first discharge load, but does indicate that the first phase field screen results for illicit connections should be used to help define those outfalls where this problem might exist.

Several methods can be used to develop an event average concentration. Either automatic or manual sampling techniques can be used that sample the entire hydrograph, or at least the first four hours of it, that will result in several discrete samples and associated flow rates that represent the various flow regimes of an event. These procedures have the potential for providing either an event average concentration, an event mean concentration, or discrete definition of the washoff process. Automatic sampling procedures are also available that collect a single composite sample, either on a time-proportioned or flow proportioned basis.

When discrete samples are collected, an event average composite sample can be produced by the manual composite of the discrete samples in equal volumes. Laboratory analysis of time proportioned composite samples will directly yield the event average concentration. Mathematical averaging of discrete sample analysis results will yield an event average concentration.

When discrete samples are collected, a flow-weighted composite sample can be produced based on the discharge record. This is done by manually flow proportioning the volumes of the individual samples. Laboratory analysis of flow weighted composite samples will directly yield an event mean concentration. Mathematical integration of the change in concentrations and mass flux of the discharge for discrete sample data can produce an event mean concentration. This procedure was used during the NURP program.

EPA wishes to emphasize that the reason for sampling the type of storm event identified in § 122.21(g)(7) is to provide information that represents local conditions that will be used to create sound storm water management plans. Based on the method to be used to generate system-wide estimates of pollutant loads, either method, discrete or event average concentrations, may be preferable to the other. If simulation models will be used to generate loading estimates, analysis of discrete samples will be more valuable so that calibration of water quality and hydrology may be performed. On the other hand, simple estimation methods based on event average or event mean concentrations may not justify the additional cost of discrete sample analysis.

EPA believes that the first discharge loading should be represented in the permit application from industrial facilities and, if appropriate, permitting authorities may require the same in the discharge characterization component of permits issued to municipalities. The first discharge load should also be represented as part of an event composite sample. This requirement will assist industries in the development of effective storm water management plans.

EPA requested comments on the appropriateness of the proposed rules and of proposed amendments to the rules regarding discharge sampling. Comments were received which addressed the appropriateness of imposing uniform national guidelines. Several commenters are concerned that uniform national guidelines may not be appropriate due to the geographic variations in meteorology, topography, and pollutant sources. While some assert that a uniform guideline will provide consistency of the sample results, others prefer a program based on regional or State guidelines that more specifically address their situation.

Several commenters, addressing industrial permit application requirements, preferred that the owner/ operator be allowed to set an individual sampling protocol with approval of the permit writer. Some commenters were concerned that one event may not be sufficient to characterize runoff from a basin as this may result in gross overestimation or underestimation of the pollutant loads. Others indicated confusion with regard to sampling procedures, lab analysis procedures, and the purpose of the program.

In response, today's regulations establish certain minimum requirements. Municipalities and industries may vary from these requirements to the extent that their implementation is at least as stringent as outlined in today's rule. EPA views today's rule as a means to provide assurance as to the quality of the data collected; and to this end, it is important that the minimum level of sampling required be well defined.

In response to EPA's proposal that the first discharge be included in "representative" storm sampling, several commenters made their concerns known about the possible equipment necessary to meet this requirement. Several commenters are concerned that in order to get a first discharge sample, automatic sampling equipment will be required. Concerns related to the need for this equipment surfaced in the comments frequently; most advised that the equipment is expensive and that the demand on sampling equipment will be too large for suppliers and manufacturers to meet. Although equipment can be leased, some commenters maintained that not enough rental equipment is available to make this a viable option in many instances.

EPA is not promoting or requiring the use of automated equipment to satisfy the sampling requirements. A community may find that in the long run it would be more convenient to have such equipment since sampling is required not only during preparation of the application, but also may be required during the term of the permit to assure that the program goals are being met. Discharge measurement is necessary in order for the sample data to have any meaning. If unattended automatic sampling is to be performed, then unattended flow measurement will be required too.

EPA realizes that equipment availability is a legitimate concern. However, there is no practical recommendation that can be made relative to the availability of equipment. If automatic sampling equipment is not available, manual sampling is an appropriate alternative.

F. Storm Water Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity

1. Permit Applicability

a. Storm water discharges associated with industrial activity to waters of the United States. Under today's rule dischargers of storm water associated with industrial activity are required to apply for an NPDES permit. Permits are to be applied for in one of three ways depending on the type of facility: Through the individual permit application process; through the group application process; or through a notice of intent to be covered by general permit.

Storm water discharges associated with the industrial activities identified under § 122.26(b)(14) of today's rule may avail themselves of general permits that EPA intends to propose and promulgate in the near future. The general permit will be available to be promulgated in each non-NPDES State, following State certification, and as a model for use by NPDES States with general permit authority. It is envisioned that these general permits will provide baseline storm water management practices. For certain categories of industries, specific management practices will be prescribed in addition to the baseline management practices. As information on specific types of industrial activities is developed, other, more industryspecific general permits will be developed.

Today's rule requires facilities with existing NPDES permits for storm water discharges to apply for individual permits under the individual permit application requirements found at 122.26(c) 180 days before their current permit expires. Facilities not eligible for coverage under a general permit are required to file an individual or group permit application in accordance with today's rule. The general permits to be proposed and promulgated will indicate what facilities are eligible for coverage by the general permit.

b. Storm water discharges through municipal storm sewers. As discussed above, many operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity are not required to apply for an individual permit or participate in a group application under § 122.26(c) of today's rule if covered by a general permit. Under the December 7, 1988, proposal, dischargers through large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems were not required, as a general rule, to apply for an individual permit or as a group applicant. Today's rule is a departure from that proposal. Today's rule requires all dischargers through municipal separate storm sewer systems to apply for an individual permit, apply as part of a group application, or seek coverage under a promulgated general permit for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity.

Municipal operators of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems are responsible for obtaining system-wide or area permits for their system's discharges. These permits are expected to require that controls be placed on storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge through the municipal system. It is anticipated that general or individual permits covering industrial storm water dischargers to these municipal separate storm sewer systems will require industries to comply with the terms of the permit issued to the municipality, as well other terms specific to the permittee.

c. Storm water discharges through non-municipal storm sewers. Under today's rulemaking all operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity that discharge into a privately or Federally owned storm water conveyance (a storm water conveyance that is not a municipal separate storm sewer) will be required to be covered by an NPDES permit (e.g. an individual permit, general permit, or as a co-permittee to a permit issued to the operator of the portion of the system that directly discharges to waters of the United States). This is a departure from the "either/or" approach that EPA requested comments on in the December 7, 1988, notice. The "either/or" approach would have allowed either the system discharges to be covered by a permit issued to the owner/operator of the system segment that discharged to waters of the United States, or by an individual permit issued to each contributor to the non-municipal conveyance.

EPA requested comments on the advantages and disadvantages of retaining the "either/or" approach for non-municipal storm sewers. An abundance of comment was received by EPA on this particular part of the program. A number of industrial commenters and a smaller number of municipalities favored retaining the "either/or" approach as proposed, while most municipal entities, one industry, and one trade association favored requiring permits for each discharger.

Two commenters stated that private owners of conveyances may not have the legal authority to implement controls on discharges through their system and would not want to be held responsible for such controls. EPA agrees that this is a potential problem. Therefore, today's rule will require permit coverage for each storm water discharge associated with industrial activity.

One commenter supported the concept of requiring all the facilities that discharge to a non-municipal conveyance to be co-permittees. EPA agrees that this type of permitting scheme, along with other permit schemes such as area or general permits, is appropriate for discharges from non-municipal sewers, as long as each storm water discharge through the system is associated with industrial activity and thus currently subject to NPDES permit coverage.

One State agency commented that in the interest of uniformity, all industries that discharge to non-municipal conveyances should be required to conform to the application requirements. One industry stated that the rules must provide a way for the last discharger before the waters of the U.S. to require permits for facilities discharging into the upper portions of the system. EPA agrees with these comments. Today's rule provides that each discharger may be covered under individual permits, as co-permittees to a single permit, or by general permit rather than holding the last discharger to the waters of the United States solely responsible.

In response to one commenter, the term "non-municipal" has been clarified to explain that the term refers to nonpublicly owned or Federally-owned storm sewer systems.

Some commenters supporting the approach as proposed, noted that industrial storm water dischargers into such systems can take advantage of the group application process. EPA agrees that in appropriate circumstances, such as when industrial facilities discharging storm water to the same system are sufficiently similar, group applications can be used for discharges to nonmunicipal conveyances. However, EPA believes that it would be inappropriate to approve group applications for those facilities whose only similarity is that they discharge storm water into the same private conveyance system. The efficacy of the group application procedures is predicated on the similarity of operations and other factors. The fact that several industries discharge storm water to the same nonmunicipal sewer system alone may not make these discharges sufficiently similar for group application approval.

One commenter suggested that EPA has not established any deadlines for submission of permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through nonmunicipal separate storm sewer systems. EPA wants to clarify that industrial storm water dischargers into privately owned or Federally owned storm water conveyances are required to apply for permits in the same time frame as individual or group applicants (or as otherwise provided for in a general permit).

One commenter stated that the operator of the conveyance that accepts discharges into its system has control and police power over those that discharge into the system by virtue of the ability to restrict discharges into the system. This commenter stated that these facilities should be the entity required to obtain the permit in all cases. Assuming that this statement is true in all respects, the larger problem is that one's theoretical ability to restrict discharges is not necessarily tied to the reality of enforcing those restrictions or even detecting problem discharges when they exist. In a similar vein one commenter urged that a private operator will not be in any worse a position than a municipal entity to determine who is the source of pollution up-stream. EPA agrees that from a hydrological standpoint this may be true. However, from the standpoint of detection resources, police powers, enforcement remedies, and other facets of municipal power that may be brought to bear upon problem dischargers, private systems are in a far more precarious position with respect to controlling discharges from other private sources.

In light of the comments received, EPA has decided that the either/or approach as proposed is inappropriate. Operators of non-municipal systems will generally be in a poorer position to gain knowledge of pollutants in storm water discharges and to impose controls on storm water discharges from other facilities than will municipal system operators. In addition, best management practices and other site-specific controls are often most appropriate for reducing pollutants in storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and can often only be effectively addressed in a regulatory scheme that holds each industrial facility operator directly responsible. The either/or approach as proposed is not conducive to establishing these types of practices unless each discharger is discharging under a permit. Also, some nonmunicipal operators of storm water conveyances, which receive storm water runoff from industrial facilities, may not be generating storm water discharges associated with industrial activity themselves and, therefore, they would otherwise not need to obtain a permit prior to October 1, 1992, unless specifically designated under section 402(p)(2)(E). Accordingly, EPA disagrees with comments that dischargers to nonmunicipal conveyances should have the flexibility to be covered by their permit or covered by the permit issued to the operator of the outfall to waters to the United States.

2. Scope of "Associated with Industrial Activity"

The September 26, 1984, final regulation divided those discharges that met the regulatory definition of storm water point source into two groups. The term Group I storm water discharges was defined in an attempt to identify those storm water discharges which had a higher potential to contribute significantly to environmental impacts. Group I included those discharges that contained storm water drained from an industrial plant or plant associated areas. Other storm water discharges (such as those from parking lots and administrative buildings) located on lands used for industrial activity were classified as Group II discharges. The regulations defined the term "plant associated areas" by listing several examples of areas that would be associated with industrial activities However, the resulting definition led to confusion among the regulated community regarding the distinctions between the Group I and Group II classifications.

In amending the CWA in 1987, Congress did not explicitly adopt EPA's regulatory classification of Group I and Group II discharges. Rather, Congress required EPA to address "storm water discharges associated with industrial activity" in the first round of storm water permitting. In light of the adoption of the term "associated with industrial activity" in the CWA, and the ongoing confusion surrounding the previous regulatory definition. EPA has eliminated the regulatory terms "Group I storm water discharge" and "Group II storm water discharge" pursuant to the December 7, 1987, Court remand and has not revived it. In addition, today's notice promulgates a definition of the term "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity"at § 122.26(b)(14) and clarified the scope of the term.

In describing the scope of the term "associated with industrial activity", several members of Congress explained in the legislative history that the term applied if a discharge was "directly related to manufacturing, processing or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant." (Vol. 132 Cong. Rec. H10932, HI0938 (daily ed. October 15, 1986); Vol. 133 Cong. Rec. H176 (daily ed. January 8, 1987]]. Several commenters cited this language in arguing for a more expansive or less expansive definition of "associated with industrial activity." EPA believes that the legislative history supports the decision to exclude from the definition of industrial activity, at § 122.26(b)(14) of today's rule, those facilities that are

generally classified under the Office of Management and Budget Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) as wholesale, retail, service, or commercial activities.

Two commenters recommended that all commercial enterprises should be required to obtain a permit under this regulation. Another commenter recommended that all the facilities listed in the December 7, 1988, proposal, including those listed in paragraphs (xi) through (xvi) on page 49432 of the December 7, 1988, proposal, should be included. EPA disagrees since the intent of Congress was to establish a phased and tiered approach to storm water permits, and that only those facilities having discharges associated with industrial activity should be included initially. The studies to be conducted pursuant to section 402(p)(5) will examine sources of pollutants associated with commercial, retail, and other light business activity. If appropriate, additional regulations addressing these sources can be developed under section 402(p)(6) of the CWA. As further discussed below, EPA believes that the facilities identified in paragraphs (xi) through (xvi) are more properly characterized as commercial or retail facilities, rather than indutrial facilities.

Today's rule clarifies the regulatory definition of "associated with industrial activity" by adopting the language used in the legislative history and supplementing it with a description of various types of areas that are directly related to an industrial process (e.g., industrial plant yards, immediate access roads and rail lines, drainage ponds, material handling sites, sites used for the application or disposal of process waters, sites used for the storage and maintenance of material handling equipment, and known sites that are presently or have been used in the past for residual treatment, storage or disposal). The agency has also incorporated some of the suggestions offered by the public in comments.

Three commenters suggested that the permit application should focus only on storm water with the potential to come into contact with industrial-related pollutant sources, rather than focusing on how plant areas are utilized. These commenters suggested that facilities that are wholly enclosed or have their operations entirely protected from the elements should not be subject to permit requirements under today's rule. EPA agrees that these comments have merit with regard to certain types of facilities. Today's rule defines the term "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity" to include storm water discharges from facilities identified in today's rule at 40 CFR 122.21(b)(I4)(xi) (facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 20, 21, 22, 23, 2434, 25, 265, 267, 27, 283, 285, 30, 31 (except 311), 323, 34 (except 3441), 35, 36, 37 (except 373), 38, 39, 4221–25) only if:

areas where material handling equipment or activities, raw materials, intermediate products, final products, waste materials, byproducts, or industrial machinery at these facilities are exposed to storm water. Such areas include: material handling sites; refuse sites; sites used for the application or disposal of process waste waters (as defined at 40 CFR 401); sites used for the storage and maintenance of material handling equipment; sites used for residual treatment: storage or disposal; shipping and receiving areas; manufacturing buildings; material storage areas for raw materials, and intermediate and finished products; and areas where industrial activity has taken place in the past and significant materials remain and are exposed to storm water.

The critical distinction between the facilities identified at 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(xi) and the facilities identified at 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(i)-(x) is that the former are not classified as having "storm water discharges associated with industrial activity" unless certain materials or activities are exposed to storm water. Storm water discharges from the latter set of facilities are considered to be "associated with industrial activity" regardless of the actual exposure of these same materials or activities to storm water.

EPA believes this distinction is appropriate because, when considered as a class, most of the activity at the facilities in § 122.26(b)(14)(xi) is undertaken in buildings; emissions from stacks will be minimal or non-existent; the use of unhoused manufacturing and heavy industrial equipment will be minimal; outside material storage, disposal or handling generally will not be a part of the manufacturing process; and generating significant dust or particulates would be atypical. As such, these industries are more akin or comparable to businesses, such as retail. commercial, or service industries, which Congress did not contemplate regulating before October 1, 1992, and storm water discharges from these facilities are not "associated with industrial activity." Thus, these industries will be required to obtain a permit under today's rule only when the manufacturing processes undertaken at such facilities would result in storm water contact with industrial materials associated with the facility.

Industrial categories in § 122.26(b)(14)(xi) all tend to engage in production activities in the manner described in the paragraph above. Facilities under SIC 20 process foods including meats, dairy food, fruit, and flour. Facilities classified under SIC 21 make cigarettes, cigars, chewing tobacco and related products. Under SIC 22. facilities produce yarn, etc., and/or dye and finish fabrics. Facilities under SIC 23 are in the business of producing clothing by cutting and sewing purchased woven or knitted textile products. Facilities under SIC 2434 and 25 are establishments engaged in furniture making. SIC 265 and 267 address facilities that manufacture paper board products. Facilities under SIC 27 perform services such as bookbinding, plate making, and printing. Facilities under SIC 283 manufacture pharmaceuticals and facilities under 285 manufacture paints, varnishes, lacquers, enamels, and allied products. Under SIC 30 establishments manufacture products from plastics and rubber. Those facilities under SIC 31 (except 311), 323, 34 (except 3441), 35, 36, and 37 (except 373) manufacture industrial and commercial metal products, machinery, equipment, computers, electrical equipment, and transportation equipment, and glass products made of purchased glass. Facilities under SIC 38 manufacture scientific and electrical instruments and optical equipment. Those under SIC 39 manufacture a variety of items such as jewelry, silverware, musical instruments, dolls, toys, and athletic goods. SIC 4221-25 are warehousing and storage activities. In contrast, the facilities identified by

SIC 24 (except and 2434), 26 (except 265 and 267), 28 (except 283 and 285), 29, 311, 32 (except 323), 33, 3441, 373 when taken as a group, are expected to have one or many of the following activities, processes occurring on-site: storing raw materials, intermediate products, final products, by-products, waste products, or chemicals outside; smelting; refining; producing significant emissions from stacks or air exhaust systems; loading or unloading chemical or hazardous substances; the use of unhoused manufacturing and heavy industrial equipment; and generating significant dust or particulates. Accordingly, these are classes of facilities which can be viewed as generating storm water discharges associated with industrial activity requiring a permit. Establishments identified under SIC 24 (except 2434) are engaged in operating sawmills, planing mills and other mills engaged in producing lumber and wood basic materials. SIC 26 facilities are paper mills. Under SIC 28, facilities

produce basic chemical products by predominantly chemical processes. SIC 29 describes facilities that are engaged in the petroleum industry. Under SIC 311, facilities are engaged in tanning, currying, and finishing hides and skins. Such processes use chemicals such as sulfuric acid and sodium dichromate, and detergents, and a variety of raw and intermediate materials. SIC 32 manufacture glass, clay, stone and concrete products form raw materials in the form quarried and mined stone. clay. and sand. SIC 33 identifies facilities that smelt, refine ferrous and nonferrous metals from ore, pig or scrap, and manufacturing related products. SIC 3441 identifies facilities manufacturing fabricated structural metal. Facilities under SIC 373 engage in ship building and repairing. The permit application requirements for storm water discharges from facilities in these categories are unchanged from the proposal.

Today's rule clarifies that the requirement to apply for a permit applies to storm water discharges from plant areas that are no longer used for industrial activities (if significant materials remain and are exposed to storm water) as well as areas that are currently being used for industrial activities. EPA would also clarify that all discharges from these areas including those that discharge through municipal separate storm sewers are addressed by this rulemaking.

One commenter questioned the use of the word "or" instead of the word "and" to describe storm water "which is located at an industrial plant 'or' directly related to manufacturing, processing, or raw material storage areas at an industrial plant." The comment expressed the concern that discharges from areas not located at an industrial plant would be subject to permitting by this language and questioned whether this was EPA's intent. EPA agrees that this is a potential source of confusion and has modified this language to reflect the conjunctive instead of the alternative. This change has been made to provide consistency in the rule whereby some areas at industrial plants, such as administrative parking lots which do not have storm water discharges commingled with discharges from manufacturing areas, are not included under this rulemaking.

Two commenters wanted clarification of the term "or process water," in the definition of discharge associated with industrial activity at § 122.26(b)(14). This rulemaking replaces this term with the term "process waste water" which is defined at 40 CFR part 401.

One commenter took issue with the decision to include drainage ponds, refuse sites, sites for residual treatment, storage, or disposal, as areas associated with industrial activity, because it was the commenter's view that such areas are unconnected with industrial activity. EPA disagrees with this comment. If refuse and other sites are used in conjunction with manufacturing or the by-products of manufacturing they are clearly associated with industrial activity. As noted above, Congress intended to include discharges directly related to manufacturing and processing at industrial plants. EPA is convinced that wastes, refuse, and residuals are the direct result or consequence of manufacturing and processing and, when located or stored at the plant that produces them, are directly related to manufacturing and processing at that plant. Storm water drainage from such areas, especially those areas exposed to the elements (e.g. rainfall) has a high potential for containing pollutants from materials that were used in the manufacturing process at that facility. One commenter supported the inclusion of these areas since many toxins degrade very slowly and the mere passage of time will not eliminate their effects. EPA agrees and finalizes this part of the definition as proposed. One commenter requested clarification of the term "residual" as used in this context. Residual can generally be defined to include material that is remaining subsequent to completion of an industrial process. One commenter noted that the current owner of a facility may not know what areas or sites at a facility were used in this manner in the past. EPA has clarified the definition of discharge associated with industrial activity to include areas where industrial activity has taken place in the past and significant materials remain and are exposed to storm water. The Agency believes that the current owner will be in a position to establish these facts.

One commenter suggested including material shipping and receiving areas, waste storage and processing areas, manufacturing buildings, storage areas for raw materials, supplies, intermediates, and finished products, and material handling facilities as additional areas "associated with industrial activity." EPA agrees that this would add clarification to the definition, and has incorporated these areas into the definition at § 122.26(b)[14].

One commenter stated that the language "point source located at an industrial plant" would include outfalls located at the facility that are not owned or operated by the facility, but which are municipal storm sewers on easements granted to a municipality for the conveyance of storm water. EPA agrees that if the industry does not operate the point source then that facility is not required to obtain a permit for that discharge. A point source is a conveyance that discharges pollutants into the waters of the United States. If a facility does not operate that point source, then it would be the responsibility of the municipality to cover it under a permit issued to them. However, if contaminated storm water associated with industrial activity were introduced into that convevance by that facility, the facility would be subject to permit application requirements as is all industrial storm water discharged through municipal sewers.

EPA disagrees with several comments that road drainage or railroad drainage within a facility should not be covered by the definition. Access roads and rail lines feven those not used for loading and unloading) are areas that are likely to accumulate extraneous material from raw materials, intermediate products and finished products that are used or transported within, or to and from, the facility. These areas will also be repositories for pollutants such as oil and grease from machinery or vehicles using these areas. As such they are related to the industrial activity at facilities. However, the language describing these areas of industrial activity has been clarified to include those access roads and rail lines that are "used or traveled by carriers of raw materials, manufactured products, waste material, or by-products used or created by the facility." For the same reasons haul roads (roads dedicated to transportation of industrial products at facilities) and similar extensions are required to be addressed in permit applications. Two industries stated that haul roads and similar extensions should be covered by permits by rule. EPA is not considering the use of a permit by rule mechanism under this regulation, however this issue will be addressed in the section 402(p)(5) reports to Congress and in general permits to be proposed and promulgated in the near future. EPA would note however that facilities with similar operations and storm water concerns that desire to limit administrative burdens associated with permit applications and obtaining permits may want to avail themselves of the group application and/or general permits.

In response to comments, EPA would also like to clarify that it intends the language "immediate access roads" (including haul roads) to refer to roads which are exclusively or primarily dedicated for use by the industrial facility. EPA does not expect facilities to. submit permit applications for discharges from public access roads such as state, county, or federal roads such as highways or BLM roads which happen to be used by the facility. Also, some access roads are used to transport bulk samples of raw materials or products (such as prospecting samples from potential minest in small-scale prior to industrial production. EPA does not intend to require permit applications for access roads to operations which are not yet industrial activities.

EPA does agree with comments made by several industries that undeveloped areas, or areas that do not encompass those described above, should generally not be addressed in the permit application, or a storm water permit, as long as the storm water discharge from these areas is segregated from the storm water discharge associated with the industrial activity at the facility.

Numerous commenters stated that maintenance facilities, if covered, should not be included in the definition. EPA disagrees with this comment. Maintenance facilities will invariably have points of access and egress, and frequently will have outside areas where parts are stored or disposed of. Such areas are locations where oil, grease, solvents and other materials associated with maintenance activities will accumulate. In response to one commenter, such areas are only regulated in the context of those facilities enumerated in the definition at § 122.26(b)[14), and not similar areas of retail or commercial facilities.

Another commenter requested that "storage areas" be more clearly defined. EPA disagrees that this term needs further clarification in the context of this section of the rule. However, in response to one comment, tank farms at industrial facilities are included. Tank farms are in existence to store products and materials created or used by the facility. Accordingly they are directly related to manufacturing processes.

Regarding storage areas, one commenter stated that the regulations should emphasize that only facilities that are not totally enclosed are required to submit permit applications. EPA does not agree with this interpretation since use of the generic term storage area indicates no exceptions for certain physical characteristics. Thus discharges from enclosed storage areas are also covered by today's rule (except as discussed above). EPA also disagrees with one comment asserting that small outside storage areas of finished products at industrial facilities should be excluded under the definition of associated with industrial activity. EPA believes that such areas are areas associated with industrial activity which Congress intended to be regulated under the CWA. As noted above, the legislative history refers to storage areas, without reference to whether they are covered or uncovered, or of a certain size.

The same language, in the legislative history cited above, was careful to state that the term "associated with industrial activity" does not include storm water "discharges associated with parking lots and administrative and employee buildings." To accommodate legislative intent, segregated storm water discharges from these areas will not be required to obtain a permit prior to October 1, 1992. Many commenters stated that this was an appropriate method in which to limit the scope of "associated with industrial activity." However, if a storm water discharge from a parking lot at an industrial facility is mixed with a storm water discharge "associated with industrial activity," the combined discharge is subject to permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. EPA disagrees with some commenters who urged that office buildings and administrative parking lots should be covered if they are located at the plant site. EPA agrees with one commenter that inclusion of storm water discharge from these areas would be overstepping Congressional intent unless such are commingled with storm water discharges from the plant site. Several commenters requested that language be incorporated into the rule which establishes that storm water discharges from parking lots and administrative areas not be included in the definition of associated with industrial activity. EPA agrees and has retained language used in the proposal which addresses this distinction.

Storm water discharges from parking lots and administrative buildings along with other discharges from industrial lands that do not meet the regulatory definition of "associated with industrial activity" and that are segregated from such discharges may be required to obtain an NPDES permit prior to October 1, 1992, under certain conditions. For example, large parking facilities, due to their impervious nature may generate large amounts of runoff which may contain significant amounts of oil and grease and heavy metals which may have adverse impacts on

receiving waters. The Administrator or NPDES State has the authority under section 402(p)(2)(E) of the amended CWA to require a permit prior to October 1, 1992, by designating storm water discharges such as those from parking lots that are significant contributors of pollutants or contribute to a water quality standard violation. EPA will address storm water discharges from lands used for industrial activity which do not meet the regulatory definition of "associated with industrial activity" in the section 402(p)(5) study to determine the appropriate manner to regulate such discharges.

Several commenters requested clarification that the definition does not include sheet flow or discharged storm water from upstream adjacent facilities that enters the land or comingles with discharge from a facility submitting a permit application. EPA wishes to clarify that operators of facilities are generally responsible for its discharge in its entirety regardless of the initial source of discharge. However, where an upstream source can be identified and permitted, the liability of a downstream facility for other storm water entering that facility may be minimized. Facilities in such circumstances may be required to develop management practices or other run-on/run-off controls, which segregates or otherwise prevents outside runoff from comingling with its storm water discharge. Some commenters expressed concern about other pollutants which may arrive on a facility's premises from rainfall. This comment was made in reference to runoff with a high or low pH. If an applicant has reason to believe that pollutants in its storm water discharge are from such sources, then that needs to be addressed in the permit application and brought to the attention of the permitting authority, which can draft appropriate permit conditions to reflect these circumstances.

EPA requested comments on clarifying the types of facilities that involve industrial activities and generate storm water. EPA preferred basing the clarification, in part, on the use of Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, which have been suggested in comments to prior storm water rulemakings because they are commonly used and accepted and would provide definitions of facilities involved in industrial activity. Several commenters supported the use by EPA of Standard Industrial Classifications for the same , reasons identified by EPA as a generally used and understood form of classification. It was also noted that

using such a classification would allow targeting for special notification and educational mailings. Three municipalities and three State authorities commented that SICs were appropriate and endorsed their use as a sound basis for determining which industries are covered.

One municipality questioned how SIC classifications will be assigned to particular industries. SICs have descriptions of the type of industrial activity that is engaged in by facilities. Industries will need to assess for themselves whether they are covered by a listed SIC and submit an application accordingly. Another commenter questioned if Federal facilities that do not have an SIC code identification are required to file a permit application. Federal facilities will be required to submit a permit application if they are engaged in an industrial activity that is described under § 122.26(b)(14). The definition of industrial activity incorporates language that requires Federal facilities to submit permit applications in such circumstances. The language has been further clarified to include State and municipal facilities.

EPA requested comments on the scope of the definition (types of facilities addressed) as well as the clarity of regulation. EPA identified the following types of facilities in the proposed regulation as those facilities that would be required to obtain permits for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity:

(i) Facilities subject to storm water effluent limitations guidelines, new source performance standards, or toxic pollutant effluent standards under 40 CFR subchapter N (except facilities with toxic pollutant effluent standards which are also identified under category (xi) of this paragraph). One commenter (a municipality) agreed with EPA that these industries should be addressed in this rulemaking. No other comments were received on this category. EPA agrees with this comment since these facilities are those that Congress has required EPA to examine and regulate under the CWA with respect to process water discharges. The industries in these categories have generally been identified by EPA as the most significant dischargers of process wastewaters in the country. As such, these facilities are likely to have storm water discharges associated with industrial activity for which permit applications should be required.

One commenter stated that because oil and gas producers are subject to effluent guidelines, EPA is disregarding the intent of Congress to exclude facilities pursuant to section 402(1). EPA disagrees with this comment. EPA is not prohibited from requiring permit applications from industries with storm water discharge associated with industrial activity. EPA is prohibited only from requiring a permit for oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that discharge storm water that is not contaminated by contact with or has not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished products, byproducts or waste products located on the site of such operations such discharges. In keeping with this requirement, EPA is requiring permit applications from oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that fall into a class of dischargers as described in § 122.26(c)(iii).

(ii) Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 24 (except 2434), 26 (except 265 and 267), 28 (except 283 and 285), 29, 311, 32 (except 323), 33, 3411, 373 and (xi). Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 20, 21, 22, 23, 2434, 25, 265, 267, 27, 283, 285, 30, 31 (except 311), 323, 34 (except 3441), 35, 36, 37 (except 373), 38, 39, 4221-25. One large municipality and one industry agreed with EPA that facilities covered by these SICs should be covered by this rulemaking. Many commenters, however, took exception to including all or some of these industries. However as noted elsewhere these facilities are appropriate for permit applications.

One commenter stated that within certain SICs industries, such as textile manufacturers use few chemicals and that there is little chance of pollutants in their storm water discharge. EPA agrees that some industries in this category are less likely than others to have storm water discharges that pose significant risks to receiving water quality. However, there are many other activities that are undertaken at these facilities that may result in polluted storm water. Further, the CWA is clear in its mandate to require permit applications for discharges associated with industrial activity. Excluding any of the facilities under these categories, except where the facility manufacturing plant more closely resembles a commercial or retail outlet would be contrary to Congressional intent.

One State questioned the inclusion of facilities identified in SIC codes 20–39 because of their temporary and transient nature or ownership. Agency disagrees that simply because a facility may transfer ownership that storm water quality concerns should be ignored. If constant ownership was a condition precedent to applying for and obtaining a permit, few if any facilities would be subject to this rulemaking.

One State estimated that the proposed definition would lead to permits for 18,000 facilities in its State. Consequently this commenter recommended that the facilities under SIC 20-39 should be limited to those facilities that have to report under section 313 of title III, Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act. However, as noted by another commenter, limiting permit requirements to these facilities would be contrary to Congressional intent. While use of chemicals at a facility may be a source of pollution in storm water discharges. other every day activities at an industrial site and associated pollutants such as oil and grease, also contribute to the discharge of pollutants that are to be addressed by the CWA and these regulations. While the number of permit applications may number in the thousands, EPA intends for group applications and general permits to be employed to reduce the administrative burdens as greatly as possible.

Two commenters felt the permit applications should be limited to all entities under SIC 20–39. EPA disagrees that all the industrial activities that need to be addressed fall within these SICs. Discharges from facilities under paragraphs (i) through (xi) such as POTWs, transportation facilities, and hazardous waste facilities, are of an industrial nature and clearly were intended to be addressed before October 1, 1992.

Two commenters stated that SIC 241 should be excluded in that logging is a transitory operation which may occur on a site for only 2–3 weeks once in a 20–30 year period. It was perceived that delays in obtaining permits for such operations could create problems in harvest schedule and mill demand. This commenter stated that runoff from such operations should be controlled by BMPs in effect for such industries and that such a permit would not be practical and would be cost prohibitive.

EPA agrees with the commenter that this provision needs clarification. The existing regulations at 40 CFR 122.27 currently define the scope of the NPDES program with regard to silvicultural activities. 40 CFR 122.27(b)(1) defines the term "silvicultural point source" to mean any discrete conveyance related to rock crushing, gravel washing, log sorting, or log storage facilities which are operated in connection with silvicultural activities and from which

pollutants are discharged into waters of the United States. Section 122.27(b)(1) also excludes certain sources. The definition of discharge associated with industrial activity does not include activities or facilities that are currently exempt from permitting under NPDES. EPA does not intend to change the scope of 40 CFR 122.27 in this rulemaking. Accordingly, the definition of "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity" does not include sources that may be included under SIC 24, but which are excluded under 40 CFR 122.27. Further, EPA intends to examine the scope of the NPDES silvicultural regulations at 40 CFR 122.27 as it relates to storm water discharges in the course of two studies of storm water discharges required under section 402(p)(5) of the CWA.

In response to one comment, EPA intends that the list of applicable SICs will define and identify what industrial facilities are required to apply. Facilities that warehouse finished products under the same code at a different facility from the site of manufacturing are not required to file a permit application, unless otherwise covered by this rulemaking.

(iii) Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 10 through 14 (mineral industry) including active or inactive mining operations (except for areas of coal mining operations no longer meeting the definition of a reclamation area under 40 CFR 434.11(l) because the performance bond issued to the facility by the appropriate SMCRA authority has been released, or except for areas of non-coal mining operations which have been released from applicable State or Federal reclamation requirements after December 17, 1990 and oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that discharge storm water contaminated by contact with or that has come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished products, byproducts or waste products located on the site of such operations. Several commenters urged that Congress intended to require permits or permit applications only for the manufacturing sector of the oil and gas industry (or those activities that designated in SIC 20 through 39). EPA disagrees with this argument. The fact that Congress used the language cited above and not the appropriate the SIC definition explicitly does not indicate that a broader definition or less exclusive definition was contemplated. According to these comments, all storm water discharges from oil and gas

exploration and production facilities would be exempt from regulation. However, EPA is convinced that a facility that is engaged in finding and extracting crude oil and natural gas from subsurface formations, separating the oil and gas from formation water, and preparing that crude oil for transportation to a refinery for manufacturing and processing into refined products, will have discharges directly relating to the processing or raw material storage at an industrial plant and are therefore discharges associated with industrial activity.

For further clarification EPA is intending to focus only on those facilities that are in SIC 10-14. Furthermore, in response to several comments, this rulemaking will require permit applications for storm water discharges from currently inactive petroleum related facilities within SIC codes 10-14, if discharges from such facilities meet the requirements as described in section VI.F.7.a. and § 122.26(c)(1)(iii). Inactive facilities will have storm water associated with industrial activity irrespective of whether the activity is ongoing. Congress drew no distinction between active and inactive facilities in the statute or in the legislative history.

(iv) Hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities that are operating under interim status or a permit under Subtitle C of the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act. One commenter believed that all RCRA and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) facilities should be specifically identified using SIC codes for further clarification. EPA considers this to be unnecessarily redundant, since the RCRA/CERCLA identification is sufficient.

Several industries asserted that storm water discharge from landfills, dumps, and land application sites, properly closed or otherwise subject to corrective or remedial actions under RCRA, should not be included in the definition. One commenter noted that the runoff from these areas is like runoff from undeveloped areas. One commenter also concluded that landfills, dumps, and land application sites should also be excluded if they are properly maintained under RCRA.

One commenter also rejected the idea of requiring permits from all active and inactive landfills and open dumps that have received any industrial wastes, and subtitle C facilities. This commenter felt that these facilities were already adequately covered under RCRA.

Two industry commenters felt that it would be redundant to have hazardous

waste facilities regulated by RCRA and the NPDES storm water program. One felt this was especially so if there are current pretreatment standards.

The Agency disagrees that all activities that may contribute to storm water discharges at RCRA subtitle C facilities are being fully controlled and that requiring NPDES permits for storm water discharges at RCRA subtitle C facilities is redundant. First, the vast majority of permitted hazardous waste management facilities are industrial facilities involved in the manufacture or processing of products for distribution in commerce. Their hazardous waste management activities are incidental to the production-related activities. While **RCRA** subtitle C regulations impose controls in storm water runoff from hazardous waste management units and require cleanup of releases of hazardous wastes, they generally do not control non-systematic spills or process. These releases, from the process itself or the storage of raw materials or finished products are a potential source of storm water contamination. In addition, RCRA subtitle C (except via corrective action authority) does not address management of "non hazardous" industrial wastes, which nevertheless could also potentially contaminate storm water runoff.

Second, at commercial hazardous waste management facilities, the RCRA subtitle C permitting requirements and management standards do not control all releases of potentially toxic materials. For example, some permitted commercial treatment facilities may store and use chemicals in the treatment of RCRA hazardous wastes. Releases of these treatment chemicals from storage areas are a potential source of storm water contamination.

Finally, many RCRA subtitle C facilities have inactive Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU's) on the facility property. These SWMU's may contain areas on the land surface that are contaminated with hazardous constituents. RCRA requires that hazardous waste management facilities must investigate these areas of potential contamination, and then perform corrective action to remediate any SWMU's that are of concern. However, the corrective action process at these facilities will not be completed for a number of years due to the complexity of the cleanup decisions, and due to the fact that many hazardous waste management facilities do not yet have **RCRA** permits. Until corrective action has been completed at all such subtitle C facilities, SWMU's are a potential source of storm water contamination that should be addressed under the

NPDES program. Finally, under section 1004(27) of RCRA, all point source discharges, including those at RCRA regulated facilities, are to be regulated by the NPDES program. Thus, there is no concern of regulatory overlap, and to the extent that the storm water regulations are effectively implemented, it will help address these units in a way that alleviates the need for expensive corrective action in the future.

(v) Landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that receive or have received industrial wastes and that are subject to regulation under subtitle D of RCRA. EPA received numerous comments supporting the regulation of municipal landfills which receive industrial waste and are subject to regulation under subtitle D of RCRA. EPA agrees with these comments. These industries have significant potential for storm water discharges that can adversely affect receiving water.

Two States argued that landfills should be addressed under the nonpoint source program. EPA disagrees that the non-point source program is sufficient for addressing these facilities. Further, addressing a class of facilities under the non-point source program does not exempt storm water discharges from these facilities from regulation under NPDES. The CWA requires EPA to promulgate regulations for controlling point source discharges of storm water from industrial facilities. Point sources from landfills consisting of storm water are such discharges requiring an NPDES permit. Several commenters argued that these discharges are adequately addressed by RCRA and that regulating them under this storm water rule would be redundant. However, as discussed above, RCRA expressly does not regulate point source discharges subject to NPDES permits. Given the nature of these facilities and of the material stored or disposed, EPA believes storm water permits are necessary. Similarly EPA rejects the comment that storm water discharges from these facilities are already adequately regulated by State authority. Congress has mandated that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity have an NPDES permit.

One commenter wanted EPA to define by size what landfills are covered. In response, it is the intent of these regulations to require permit applications from all landfills that receive industrial waste. Storm water discharges from such facilities are addressed because of the nature of the material with which the storm water comes in contact. The size of facility will not dictate what type of waste is exposed to the elements.

One commenter requested that the definition of industrial wastes be clarified. For the purpose of this rule, industrial waste consists of materials delivered to the landfill for disposal and whose origin is any of the facilities described under § 122.26(b)(14) of this regulation.

(vi) Facilities involved in the recycling of materials, including metal scrapyards, battery reclaimers, salvage vards, and automobile junkyards, including but limited to those classified as Standard Industrial Classification 5015 and 5093. One commenter suggested that the recycling of materials such as paper, glass, plastics, etc., should not be classified as an industrial activity. EPA disagrees that such facilities should be excluded on that basis. These facilities may be considered industrial, as are facilities that manufacture such products absent recycling.

Other facilities exhibit traits that indicate industrial activity. In junkyards, the condition of materials and junked vehicles and the activities occurring on the yard frequently result in significant losses of fluids, which are sources of toxic metals, oil and grease and polychlorinated aromatic hydrocarbons. Weathering of plated and non-plated metal surfaces may result in contributions of toxic metals to storm water. Clearly such facilities cannot be classified as commercial or retail.

One municipality felt that "significant recycling" should be defined or clarified. EPA agrees that the proposed language is ambiguous. It has been clarified to require permit applications from facilities involved in the recycling of materials, including metal scrapyards, battery reclaimers, salvage yards, and automobile junkyards, including but limited to those classified as Standard Industrial Classification 5015 and 5093. These SIC codes describe facilities engaged in dismantling, breaking up, sorting, and wholesale distribution of motor vehicles and parts and a variety of other materials. The Agency believes these SIC codes clarify the term significant recycling.

One municipality stated that regulation of these facilities under NPDES would be duplicative if they are publicly owned facilities. One State expressed the view that automobile junkyards, salvage yards could not legitimately be considered industrial activity. As noted above, EPA disagrees with these comments. Facilities that are actively engaged in the storage and recycling of products including metals, oil, rubber, and synthetics are in the business of storing and recycling materials associated with or once used in industrial activity. These activities are not commercial or retail because they are engaged in the dismantling of motors for distribution in wholesale or retail, and the assembling, breaking up, sorting, and wholesale distribution of scrap and waste materials, which EPA views as industrial activity. Further, being a publicly owned facility does not confer non-industrial status.

(vii) Steam electric power generating facilities, including coal handling sites, and onsite and offsite ancillary transformer storage areas. Most of the comments were against requiring permit applications for onsite and offsite ancillary transformer facilities. One commenter stated that these transformers did not leak in storage and if there were leakage problems in handling transformers, such leaks were subject to Federal and State spill cleanup procedures. The same commenter suggested that if EPA required applications from such facilities that it exclude those that have regular inspections, management practices in place, or those that store 50 transformers at any one time.

EPA agrees that such facilities should not be covered by today's rule. As one commenter noted, the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) addresses pollutants associated with transformers that may enter receiving water through storm water discharges. EPA has examined regulations under TSCA and agrees that regulation of storm water discharges from these facilities should be the subject of the studies being performed under section 402(p)(5). rather than regulations established by today's rule. Under TSCA, transformers are required to be stored in a manner that prevents rain water from reaching the stored PCBs or PCB items. 40 CFR 761.65(b)(1)(i). EPA considers transformer storage to be more akin to retail or other light commercial activities, where items are inventoried in buildings for prolonged periods for use or sale at some point in the future, and where there is no ongoing manufacturing or other industrial activity within the structure.

One commenter stated that this category of industries should be loosened so that all steam electric facilities are addressed—oil fired and nuclear. EPA believes that the language as proposed broadly defines the type of industrial activity addressed without specifying each mode of steam electric production. One commenter noted that the EPA has no authority under the CWA (*Train v. CPIR, Inc.,* 426 U.S. 1 (1976) to regulate the discharge of source, special nuclear and by-product materials which are regulated under the Atomic Energy Act. EPA agrees permit applications may not address those aspects of such facilities, however the facility in its entirety may not necessarily be exempt. A permit application will be appropriate for discharges from non-exempt categories.

(viii) Transportation facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 40, 41, 42 (except 4221-25), 43, 44, 45, and 5171 which have vehicle maintenance shops, material handling facilities, equipment cleaning operations or airport deicing operations. Only those portions of the facility that are either involved in vehicle maintenance (including vehicle rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling, and lubrication), equipment cleaning operations, or which are identified in another subcategory of facilities under EPA's definition of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. One commenter requested clarification of the terms "vehicle maintenance." Vehicle maintenance refers to the rehabilitation, mechanical repairing, painting, fueling, and lubricating of instrumentalities of transportation located at the described facilities. EPA is declining to write this definition into the regulation however since "vehicle maintenance" should not cause confusion as a descriptive term. One commenter wanted railroad tracks where rail cars are set aside for minor repairs excluded from regulation. In response, if the activity involves any of the above activities then a permit application is required. Train yards where repairs are undertaken are associated with industrial activity. Train yards generally have trains which, in and of themselves, can be classified as heavy industrial equipment. Trains, concentrated in train yards, are diesel fueled, lubricated, and repaired in volumes that connote industrial activity, rather than retail or commercial activity.

One commenter argued that if gasoline stations are not considered for permitting, then all transportation facilities should be exempt. EPA disagrees with the thrust of this comment. Transportation facilities suchas bus depots, train yards, taxi stations, and airports are generally larger than individual repair shops, and generally engage in heavier more expansive forms of industrial activity. In keeping with Congressional intent to cover all industrial facilities, permit applications from such facilities are appropriate. In contrast, EPA views gas stations as retail commercial facilities not covered

by this regulation. It should be noted that SIC classifies gas stations as retail.

(ix) POTW lands used for land application treatment technology/ sludge disposal, handling or processing areas, and chemical handling and storage areas. One commenter wanted more clarification of the term POTW lands. Another commenter requested clarification of the terms sludge disposal, sludge handling areas, and sludge processing areas. One State recommended that a broader term than POTW should be used. EPA notes that on May 2, 1989, it promulgated NPDES Sewage Sludge Permit Regulations; State Sludge Management Program Requirements at 40 CFR part 501. This regulation identified those facilities that are subject to section 405(f) of the CWA as "treatment works treating domestic sewage.'

In response to the above comments, EPA has decided to use this language to define what facilities are required to apply for a storm water permit. Under this rulemaking "treatment works treating domestic sewage." or any other sewage sludge or wastewater treatment device or system used in the storage treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal or domestic sewage, including land dedicated to the disposal of sewage sludge, with a design flow of 1.0 mgd or more, or facilities required to have an approved pretreatment program under 40 CFR part 403, will be required to apply for a storm water permit. However, permit applications will not be required to address land where sludge is beneficially reused such as farm lands and home gardens or lands used for sludge management that are not physically located within the confines (offsite facility) of the facility or where sludge is beneficially reused in compliance with section 405 of the Clean Water Act (proposed rules were published on February 6, 1989, at 54 FR 5746). EPA believes that such activity is not "industrial" since it is agricultural or domestic application (non-industrial) unconnected to the facility generating the material.

EPA received many comments on the necessity and appropriateness of requiring permit applications for storm water discharges from POTW lands. It was anticipated by numerous commenters that the above cited sludge regulations would adequately address storm water discharges from lands where sludge is applied. However, the sewage sludge regulations do not directly address NPDES permit requirements for storm water discharges from POTW lands and related areas to the extent required by today's rulemaking; the regulations cover only permits for use or disposal of sludge. Also, the regulations proposed on February 4, 1989, cover primarily the technical standards for the composition of sewage sludge which is to be used or disposed. They do not include detailed permitting requirements for discharges of storm water from lands where sludge has been applied to the land. To that extent, EPA is not persuaded by these commenters that POTWs and POTW lands should be excluded from these storm water permit application requirements.

Two commenters noted that some States already regulate sludge use or disposal activities substantially and that-EPA should refrain from further regulation. EPA disagrees that this is a basis for excluding facilities from Federal requirements. Notwithstanding regulations in existence under State law, EPA is required by the CWA to promulgate regulations for permit application for storm water associated with industrial activity. Under the NPDES program, States are able to promulgate more rigorous requirements. However a minimum level of control is required under Federal law. One commenter also indicated that a State's sludge land application sites must follow a well defined plan to ensure there is no sludge related runoff. Notwithstanding that a State may require storm water controls for sludge land applications, as noted above, EPA is required to promulgate regulations requiring permit applications from appropriate facilities. EPA views facilities such as waste treatment plants that engage in on-site sludge composting, storage of chemicals such as ferric chloride, alum, polymers, and chlorine, and which may experience spills and bubbleovers are suitable candidates for storm water permits. Facilities using such materials are not characteristic of commercial or retail activities. Use and storage of chemicals and the production of material such as sludge, with attendant heavy metals and organics, is activity that is industrial in nature. The size and scope of activities at the facility will determine the extent to which such activities are undertaken and such materials used and produced at the facility. Accordingly, EPA believes limiting the facilities covered under this category to those of 1.0 mgd and those covered under the industrial pretreatment program is appropriate.

To the extent that permit applicants are already required to employ certain management practices regarding storm water, these may be incorporated into permits and permit conditions issued by Federal and State permitting authorities. EPA has selected facilities identified under 40 CFR part 501 (*i.e.* those with a design flow of 1.0 mgd or more or those required to have an approved pretreatment program) since these facilities will have largest contribution of industrial process discharges. Sludge from such facilities will contain higher concentrations of heavy metal and organic pollutants.

One commenter stated that sludge disposal is a public activity that should be addressed in a public facility's storm water management program under a municipal storm water management program. EPA disagrees. Industrial facilities, whether publicly owned or not, are required to apply for and obtain permits when they are designated as industrial activity.

Another comment stated that a permit should not be required for facilities that collect all runoff on site and treat it at the same POTW. EPA believes that a permit application should be required from such facilities. However, the above practice can be incorporated as a permit condition for such a facility. One commenter stated storm water from sludge and chemical handling areas can be routed through the headworks of the POTW. The agency agrees that this may be an appropriate management practice for POTWs as long as other NPDES regulatory requirements are fulfilled with regard to POTWs.

(x) Construction activities, including clearing, grading and excavation activities except operations that result in the disturbance of less than five acre total land area which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale. EPA addresses whether these facilities should be covered by today's rule in section VI.F.8.

The December 7, 1988, proposal also requested comments on including the following other categories of discharges in the definition of industrial activities: (xii) Automotive repair shops classified as Standard Industrial Classification 751 or 753: (xiii) Gasoline service stations classified as Standard Industrial Code 5541; (xiv) Lands other than POTW lands (offsite facilities) used for sludge management; (xv) Lumber and building materials retail facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classification 5211; (xvi) Landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that do not receive industrial wastes and that are subject to regulation under subtitle D of RCRA: (xvii) Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classification 46 (pipelines, except natural gas), and 492 (gas production and distribution); (xviii) Major electrical powerline corridors.

EPA received numerous comments on whether to require permit applications for these particular facilities. The December 7, 1988, proposal reflected EPA's intent not to require permits for these facilities, but rather to address these facilities in the two studies required by CWA sections 402(p)(5) and (6). After reviewing the comments on this issue. EPA believes that these facilities should be addressed under these sections of the CWA. Most of these facilities are classified as light commercial and retail business establishments, agricultural, facilities where residential or domestic waste is received, or land use activities where there is no manufacturing. It should be noted that although EPA is not requiring the facilities identified as categories (xii) to (xviii), in the December 7, 1988, proposal to apply for a permit application under this rulemaking, such facilities may be designated under section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA.

Three commenters recommended that EPA clarify that non-exempt Department of Energy and Department of Defense facilities should be covered by the storm water regulation. The regulation clearly states that Federal Facilities that are engaged in industrial activity (*i.e.* those activities in § 122.26(b)(14)(i)-(xi)) are required to submit permit applications. Those applying for permits covering Federal facilities should consult the Standard Industrial Classifications for further clarification.

One commenter questioned how EPA intended to regulate municipal facilities engaged in industrial activities. Municipal facilities that are engaged in the type of industrial activity described above and which discharge into waters of the United States or municipal separate storm sewer systems are required to apply for permits. These facilities will be covered in the same manner as other industrial facilities. The fact that they are municipally owned does not in any way exclude them from needing permit applications under this rulemaking.

One commenter suggested exempting those facilities that have total annual sales less than five million dollars or occupy less than five acres of land. Another commenter thought that all minor permittees should be exempt. EPA believes that the quality of storm water and the extent to which discharges impact receiving water is not necessarily related to the size of the facility or the dollar value of its business. What is important in this regard, is the extent to which steps are taken at facilities to curb the quantity and type of material that may pollute storm water discharges from these facilities. Therefore EPA has not excluded facilities from permitting on such a basis. This same commenter stated that the proposed rules should not address facilities with multiple functions (industrial and retail). EPA disagrees. If a facility engages in activity that is defined in paragraphs (i) through (xi) above, it is required to apply for a permit regardless of the fact that it also has a retail element. Such facilities need only submit a permit application for the industrial portion of the facility (as long as storm water from the non-industrial portion is segregated, as discussed above). This commenter also felt that more studies needed to be undertaken to determine the best way to regulate industries. EPA agrees that storm water problems need further study and for that reason EPA has devoted substantial manpower and resources to complete compréhensive studies under section 402(p)(5), while also addressing industrial sources that need immediate attention under this rulemaking.

One commenter requested that EPA give examples of storm water discharges from each of the facilities that have been designated for submitting permit applications. Agency believes that this is unnecessary and impractical since every facility, regardless of the type of industry, will have different terrain, hydrology, weather patterns, management practices and control techniques. However, EPA intends to issue guidance on filing permit applications for storm water discharges from industrial facilities which details how an industry goes about filing an industrial permit and dealing with storm water discharges.

Today's rulemaking for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity at § 122.26(c)(1)(i) includes special conditions for storm water discharges originating from mining operations, oil or gas operations (§ 122.26(c)(1)(iii)), and from the construction operations listed above (§ 122.26(c)(1)(ii)). These requirements are discussed in more detail in section VI.F.7 and section VI.F.9 of today's notice.

3. Individual Application Requirements

Today's rule establishes individual and group permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. These requirements will address facilities precluded from coverage under the general permits to be proposed and promulgated by EPA in the near future. EPA considers it necessary to obtain the information required in individual permit applications from certain facilities because of the nature of their industrial activity and because of existing institutional mechanisms for issuing and tracking NPDES permits. Furthermore, some States will not have general permitting authority. Facilities located in such States will be required to submit individual applications or participate in a group application. The following response to comments received on these requirements pertains to these facilities.

Under the September 26, 1984, regulation operators of Group I storm water discharges were required to submit NPDES Form 1 and Form 2C permit applications. In response to postregulation comments received on that rule, EPA proposed new permit application requirements (March 7, 1985, (50 FR 9362) and August 12, 1985, (50 FR 32548)) which would have decreased the analytical sampling requirements of the Form 2C and provided procedures for group applications. Passage of the WQA in 1987 gave the EPA additional time to consider the appropriate permit application requirements for storm water discharges. On December 7, 1988, application requirements were proposed and numerous comments were received. Based upon these comments, modifications and refinements have been made to the industrial storm water permit application.

Some commenters expressed the view that the permit application requirements are too burdensome, require too much paperwork, are of dubious utility, and focus too greatly on the collection of quantitative data. EPA disagrees. In comparison to prior approaches for permitting storm water discharges and other existing permitting programs, EPA has streamlined the permit application process, limited the quantitative data requirements, and required narrative information that will be used to determine permit conditions that relate to the quality of storm water discharge. To the extent that EPA needs nonquantitative information to develop appropriate permit conditions, EPA disagrees with the view of some commenters that the information required is excessive. In response to comments on earlier rulemakings and a comment received on the December 7, 1988, proposal (stressing that the emphasis should be on site management, rather than monitoring, sampling, and reporting) EPA has shifted the emphasis of the permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from the existing requirements for collection of

quantitative data (sampling data) in Form 2C towards collection of less quantitative data supplemented by additional information needed for evaluation of the nature of the storm water discharges.

The permit application requirements proposed for storm water discharges reduce the amount of quantitative data required in the permit application and exempt discharges which contain entirely storm water (i.e. contain no other discharge that, without the storm water component, would require an NPDES permit), from certain reporting requirements of Form 2C. The proposed modifications also would exempt applicants for discharges which contain entirely storm water from several nonquantitative information collection provisions currently required in the Form 2C. The proposed modifications would rely more on descriptive information for assessing impacts of the storm water discharge. One commenter proposed that information that the applicant has submitted for other permits be incorporated by reference into the storm water permit application. EPA disagrees that incorporation by reference is appropriate. The permitting authority will need to have this information readily available for evaluating permit application and permit conditions. Furthermore, EPA feels that the applicant is in the best position to provide the information and verify its accuracy. However, if the applicant has such information and it accurately reflects current circumstances, then the applicant can rely on the information for meeting the information requirements of the application. Another commenter suggested that EPA should only require the information in § 122.26(c)(1) (A) and (B) (*i.e.*, the requirement for a topographic map indicating drainage areas and estimate of impervious areas and material management practices). As explained in greater detail below, EPA is convinced that some quantitative data and the other narrative requirements are necessary for developing appropriate permit conditions.

Form 2F addressing permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity is included in today's final rule. A complete permit application for discharges composed entirely of storm water, will be comprised of Form 2F and Form 1. Operators of discharges which are composed of both storm water and non-storm water will submit, where required, a Form 1, an entire Form 2C (or Form 2D) and Form 2F when applying. In this case, the applicant will provide quantitative data describing the discharge during a storm event in Form 2F and quantitative data describing the discharge during non-storm events in Form 2C. Non-quantitative information reported in the Form 2C will not have to be reported again in the Form 2F.

Under today's rule, Form 2F for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity would not require the submittal of all of the quantitative information required in Form 2C, but would require that quantitative data be submitted for:

• Any pollutant limited in an effluent guideline for an industrial applicant's subcategory;

 Any pollutant listed in the facility's NPDES permit for its process wastewater;

• Oil and grease, TSS, COD, pH, BOD5, total phosphorus, total Kjeldahl nitrogen; nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen; and

• Any information on the discharge required under 40 CFR 122.2l(g)(7) (iii) and (iv).

In order to characterize the discharge(s) sampled, applicants need to submit information regarding the storm event(s) that generated the sampled discharge, including the date(s) the sample was taken, flow measurements or estimates of the duration of the storm event(s) sampled, rainfall measurements or estimates from the storm event(s) which generated the sampled runoff, and the duration between the storm event sampled and the end of the previous storm event. Information regarding the storm event(s) sampled is necessary to evaluate whether the discharge(s) sampled was generally representative of other discharges expected to occur during storm events and to characterize the amount and nature of runoff discharges from the site.

One commenter stated that the quantitative information should be limited to those pollutants that are expected to be known to the applicant. EPA believes this would be inappropriate since there will be no way of determining initially whether these pollutants are present despite the expectations of the applicant. Once the data is provided, permits can be drafted which address specific pollutants. This. rulemaking requires that the applicant test for oil and grease, COD, pH, BOD5, TSS, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen and total phosphorus. Oil and grease and TSS are a common component of storm water and can have serious impacts on receiving waters. Oxygen demand (COD and BOD5) will help the permitting authority evaluate the oxygen depletion potential of the discharge. BOD5 is the most commonly

used indicator of potential oxygen demand. COD is considered a more inclusive indicator of oxygen demand, especially where metals interfere with the BOD5 test. The pH will provide the permitting authority with important information on the potential availability of metals to the receiving flora, fauna and sediment. Total Kieldahl nitrogen, nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen and total phosphorus are measures of nutrients which can impact water quality. Because this data is useful in developing appropriate permit conditions, EPA disagrees with the argument made by one commenter that quantitative data requirements should be a permit condition and not part of the application process.

In the proposed rule, the Agency used total nitrogen as a parameter. This has been changed to total Kjeldahl nitrogen and nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen for clarity.

Today's rule defines sampling at industrial sites in terms of sampling for those parameters that have effluent limits in existing NPDES permits, as well as for any other conventional or nonconventional parameter that might be expected to be found at the outfall. Comments on the appropriateness of the defined parameters were solicited by the proposal. Numerous commenters maintained that either the parameter list be made industry specific, or that pollutant categories not detected in the initial screen be exempted from further testing. Some suggested that only conventional pollutants, inorganics, and metals be sampled unless reason for others is found.

In terms of specific water quality parameters, it was recommended that surfactants not be tested for unless foam is visible. One commenter also suggested that fecal coliform sampling is inappropriate for industrial permits applications. One commenter favored testing for TOC instead of VOC. In response, VOC has been eliminated from the list of parameters because it will not yield specific usable data. VOC is not specifically required in any sampling in today's rule, except where priority pollutant scans are required.

Some recommended that procedures be modified to facilitate quicker, less expensive lab analyses. Concern was also raised that industry might be required to collect its own rainfall data if there is no nearby observation station. Some commenters stated that EPA should not allow automatic sampling for either biological or oil and grease sampling due to the potential for contamination in sampling equipment.

In response, EPA believes that the sampling requirements for industry in today's rule are reasonable and not burdensome. These requirements address parameters that have effluent limits in existing NPDES permits, as well as for any other conventional or nonconventional parameter that might be expected to be found at the applicants outfall. Under this procedure both industry-specific and site-specific contaminants are already identified in the existing permit. Whether all these parameters need to be made a part of any discharge characterization plans, under the terms of the permit, will be a case-by-case determination for the permitting authority. EPA maintains that the test for surfactants (if in effluent guidelines or in the facility's NPDES permit for process water) is justifiable even when a foam is not obvious at the outfall. The presence of detergents in storm water may be indicated by foam, but the absence of foam does not indicate that detergents are not present.

EPA requested comments on fecal coliform as a parameter. Fecal coliform was included on the list as an indicator of the presence of sanitary sewage. In large concentrations, fecal coliform may be an effective indicator of sanitary sewage as opposed to other animal wastes. EPA believes that sanitary cross connections will also be found at industrial facilities. Furthermore, the test for fecal coliform is an inexpensive test and its inclusion or exclusion should make little impact financially on the individual application costs. Sampling for volatile organic carbon shall be accomplished when required, as it is an appropriate indicator of industrial solvents and organic wastes.

In response to comments, EPA acknowledges that there are certain pollutants that are capable of leaving residues in automatic sampling devices that will potentially contaminate subsequent samples. In these cases, such as for biological monitoring, if such a problem is perceived to exist and it is expected that the contaminant will render the subsequent samples unusable, manual grab samples may be needed. This would include grab samples for pH, temperature, cyanide, total phenols, residual chlorine, oil and grease, fecal coliform, and fecal streptococcus. EPA is not disallowing the use of automatic sampling because of possible contamination, as this type of sampling may be the best method for obtaining the necessary samples from a selected storm events.

In addition to the conventional pollutants listed above, this final rule requires applicants, when appropriate,

to sample other pollutants based on a consideration of site-specific factors. These parameters account for pollutants associated with materials used for production and maintenance, finished products, waste products and nonprocess materials such as fertilizers and pesticides that may be present at a facility. Applicants must sample for any pollutant limited in an effluent guideline applicable to the facility or limited in the facility's NPDES permit. These pollutants will generally be associated with the facility's manufacturing process or wastes. Other process and nonprocess related pollutants, will be addressed by complying with the requirements of 40 CFR 122.21(g)(7) (iii) and (iv).

Section 122.21(g)(7)(iii) requires applicants to indicate whether they know or have reason to believe that any pollutant listed in Table IV (conventional and nonconventional pollutants) of appendix D to 40 CFR part 122 is discharged. If such a pollutant is either directly limited or indirectly limited by the terms of the applicant's existing NPDES permit through limitations on an indicator parameter, the applicant must report quantitative data. For pollutants that are not contained in an effluent limitations guideline, the applicant must either report quantitative data or describe the reasons the pollutant is expected to be discharged. With regard to pollutants listed in Table II (organic pollutants) or Table III, (metals, cyanide and total phenol) of appendix D, the applicant must indicate whether they know or have reason to believe such pollutants are discharged from each outfall and, if they are discharged in amounts greater than 10 parts per billion (ppb), the applicant must report quantitative data. An applicant qualifying as a small business under 40 CFR 122.21(g)(8), (e.g., coal mines with a probable total annual production of less than 100,000 tons peryear or, for all other applicants, gross total annual sales averaging less than \$100,000 per year (in second quarter 1980 dollars)), is not required to analyze for pollutants listed in Table II of appendix D (the organic toxic pollutants).

Section 122.21(g)(7)(iv) requires applicants to indicate whether they know or have reason to believe that any pollutant in Table V of appendix D to 40 CFR part 122 (certain hazardous substances) is discharged. For every pollutant expected to be discharged, the applicant must briefly describe the reasons the pollutant is expected to be discharged and report any existing quantitative data it has for the pollutant.

When collecting data for permit applications, applicants may make use of 40 CFR 122.2l(g)(7), which provides that "when an applicant has two or more outfalls with substantially identical effluents, the Director may allow the applicant to test only one outfall and report that the quantitative data also applies to the substantially identical outfalls." Where the facility has availed itself of this provision, an explanation of why the untested outfalls are "substantially identical" to tested outfalls must be provided in the application. Where the amount of flow associated with the outfalls with substantially identical effluent differs, measurements or estimates of the total flow of each of the outfalls must be provided. Several commenters stated that the time and expense associated with sampling and analysis would be saved if the applicant was able to pick substantially identical outfalls without prior approval of the permitting authority. EPA disagrees that this would be an appropriate devolution of authority to the permit applicant. The permitting authority needs to ensure that these outfalls have been grouped according to appropriate criteria (for example do the outfalls serve similar drainage areas at the facility). Furthermore, EPA is not requiring that the permit applicant engage in sampling to demonstrate that the outfalls are indeed substantially identical, because that would of course defeat the purpose of § 122.21(g)(7). The procedure for establishing identical outfalls is not that onerous and provides a means for industry to save substantially on time and resources for sampling.

EPA proposed and requested comment on a requirement that the facility must sample a storm event that is typical for the area in terms of duration and severity The storm event must be greater than 0.1 inches and must be at least 96 hours from the previously measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event. In general, variance of the parameters (such as the duration of the event and the total rainfall of the event) should not exceed 50 percent from the parameters of the average rainfall event in that area. EPA also requested comments on addressing snow melt events under this definition.

Commenters stated that: median or average rainfall is not an acceptable approach; the minimum depth and duration of rainfall must be specified; the allowable 50% variation is questionable; the total depth of the storm is irrelevant; and the storm should be viewed based on the average intensity of the storm. One commenter suggested that using the median rainfall event would be a better approach than . the average rainfall event.

Others insisted that "representative" or typical storms do not exist in semiarid climates and that representative rainfall must be site-specific (regional) and seasonal. Several commenters contended that the requirement for 96 dry hours between events is not acceptable, with 48 and 72 hours identified as possible alternatives.

One commenter believed that a typical standard design storm, such as the 1-year, 24-hour, or 10-year, 1-hour, would be preferable. Another commenter felt that the storm event should be based on the rainfall required to generate a minimum discharge level. One commenter questioned whether the storm is to be sampled at all sites simultaneously.

To clarify its decision on what storm event should be sampled, EPA notes that its selection of the storm event considers both regional and seasonal variation of precipitation. This is evidenced in the rule with regard to sites in the municipal application (three events sampled), and in the requirements for industrial group applications (a minimum of two applicants, or one applicant in groups of less than 10, to be represented in each precipitation zone (see section VI.F.4 below).

The definition of a 0.1 inch minimum was determined by NURP and other studies to be the minimum rainfall depth capable of producing the rainfall/runoff characteristics necessary to generate a sufficient volume of runoff for meaningful sample analysis. EPA believes by requiring the average storm to be used as the basis for sampling that depth, duration, and therefore average rainfall intensity are being regionally defined. The Agency has also added the option of using the median rainfall event instead of the average. The potential for monitoring events that may not meet this specification should be minimized by allowing the proposed 50 percent variation in rainfall depth and/or duration from event statistics. However, the 50 percent variation need only be. met when possible. Further, there is flexibility in the rule where the Director may allow or establish site specific requirements such as the minimum duration between the previous measurable storm event and the storm event sampled, the amount of precipitation from the storm event to be sampled, and the form of precipitation sampled (snowmelt or rainfall). If data is obtained from a rain event that does not meet the criteria above, the Director has

the discretion to accept the data as valid.

The December 7, 1988, proposal called for a 96-hour period between events of measurable rainfall, here defined as 0.1 inch, which provided a four day minimum for the accumulation of pollutants on the surface of the outfalls' tributary areas. The key word in the definition is "measurable", which means that the 96-hour period did not necessarily have to be dry, only that no cleansing rainfall (i.e. 0.1 inch rain event) has occurred. However, after reviewing comments on this issue EPA has decided to change the period to 72 hours. Many commenters indicated that 96 hours is too restrictive and that securing a sample under such circumstances would be unnecessarily difficult. EPA agrees that the quality or representativeness of the sample would not be adversely affected by this change.

EPA does not agree with comments that the requirement of a particular "design" storm would be appropriate. Many commenters have expressed concern that they might sample an event not meeting the requirements for industrial group applications as defined. Because there is no way to know with sufficient certainty beforehand that an upcoming event will approximate a oneyear, twenty-four hour storm, many events would be unnecessarily sampled before this event is realized.

EPA does not intend that a municipality or industry be required to sample all required outfalls for a single storm. This would represent a unmanageable investment in equipment and manpower In some areas, it may be necessary to sample multiple sites for a single event due to the irregularity of rainfall, but not all sites.

EPA described parameters for selecting storm events for sampling of municipal and industrial outfalls in the December 7, 1988, proposal. EPA has received several comments regarding the problems that rainfall measurement in general presents. A recurring comment relative to reporting rainfall, and in verifying that the storm itself is representative, deals with the spatial distribution of rainfall. The rainfall measured at an airport does not always represent rainfall at the site, particularly in summer months when thunderstorms are prevalent. One commenter stated that it would be easier to base the selected storm on either a minimum discharge, or on a discharge duration other than on the total precipitation. because these parameters are easily measured at the site and are not dependent on the airport gauges

receiving the same rainfall as the site. A few commenters questioned how to determine typical storm characteristics. One commenter advised that NOAA rainfall reporting stations provide data that represent only daily rainfall totals, not storm event data. One commenter pointed out that the time frame of the sampling requirement does not consider that a particular region may be in the midst of a multi-year drought cycle, and that what little rainfall occurs may have uncharacteristically high levels of pollutants.

The type of rain event sampled is an important parameter in any attempt to characterize system-wide loads based on the sampling results. Rainfall gauges that report only event total depth will provide the information necessary to characterize most events, provided that a reasonable estimate of the event duration can be made. If simulation models are to be used in estimating system-wide loads, rainfall measurement based on time and depth of rainfall will be needed. If the recording stations are not believed to accurately reflect this distribution, then the data will need to be collected by the applicant at a location central to the tributary area of the outfall.

The rainfall data collected by NOAA are in most cases available in the form of hourly rainfall depths. This information can be analyzed to develop characteristic storm depths and durations. In some cases, this information has already been analyzed for many long term reporting stations by various municipalities, states, and universities. The results of these investigations should be available to the applicants.

EPA realizes that prolonged rainless periods occur for both semi-arid areas and areas experiencing droughts and that the first storm after a prolonged dry period may well not be representative of "normal" runoff conditions. In order for the appropriate system-wide characterization of loads to be made. data must be collected. With regard to the municipal permit application, today's rule states that runoff characterization data will be collected during three events at from five to ten sites. The rule gives the Director the flexibility of modifying these requirements.

EPA has defined the parameters for selecting the storm event to be sampled such that at the discretion of the Director, seasonal, including winter, sampling might be required. EPA has received several comments regarding the problems that snowmelt sampling may present. Several commenters are

opposed to monitoring of snowmelt events. The reasons cited include equipment problems and the unreasonableness of expecting this sampling, because of temperatures and the time required for personnel to be waiting for events. A few comments addressed the issues of snow pack depth, ambient temperature, and solar radiation levels, and that the snow pack may filter suspended solids or refreeze such that final melting is uncharacteristically over-polluted relative to normal conditions. Another commenter contended that it is impossible to manage the melting process and therefore unreasonable to expect controls to be implemented relative to snowmelt. In essence, it is contended that there is no first discharge unless the snow pack depth is low and melts quickly.

A few commenters favor monitoring snowmelt, for precisely the same reason that most oppose it: that the runoff from snowmelt is the most polluted runoff generated in some areas on an annual basis. Where this is the case, sampling snowmelt should be undertaken in order to accurately assess impacts to receiving streams. EPA is confident that in areas where automated sampling cannot be relied upon, grab sampling can probably be performed because the nature of the snowmelt process tends to make the timing of samples less of a problem when compared to typical rainfall events. EPA disagrees that management practices, either at industrial facilities or with regard to municipalities, cannot address snowmelt. Some areas may need to reassess their salt application procedures. In addition retention and detention devices may address snowmelt, as well as erosion controls at construction sites. Thus, obtaining samples of snowmelt is appropriate to allow development of such permit conditions.

Today's rule also modifies the Form 2C requirements by exempting applicants from the requirements at § 122.21(g)(2) (line drawings), (g)(4) (intermittent flows), (g)(7) (i), (ii), and (v) (various sampling requirements to characterize discharges) if the discharge covered by the application is composed. entirely of storm water. Permit applications for discharges containing storm water associated with industrial activity would require applicants to provide other non-quantitative information which will aid permit writers to identify which storm water discharges are associated with industrial activity and to characterize the nature of the discharge.

Numerous comments were received regarding the requirement to submit a topographic map and site drainage map. Many of these comments offered alternatives to EPA's proposal. Two commenters suggested that a simple sketch of the site would be sufficient. Two commenters stated that one or the other should be adequate. One commenter believed that the drainage map was a good idea, but that the topographic map should be optional. Several commenters submitted that a topographic map was sufficient and that only SPCC plans or SARA submittals should supplement that. Another commenter argued that information relating to the location of the nearest surface water or drinking wells would be sufficient. Other commenters believed that a drainage map alone would indicate all relevant site specific information. Numerous commenters expressed concern that the drainage area map would be too detailed and that one which depicts the general direction of flow should be sufficient. Clarification was requested on whether the final rule would require the location of any drinking water wells. One commenter stated that a U.S.G.S. 7.5 quadrangle map will not illustrate drainage systems in all cases, and that therefore the requirement should be optional.

Several commenters agreed with EPA's proposal. One commenter maintained that drainage maps should be required from developments greater than three acres and from all individual applicants. Several commenters agreed with EPA's proposal that both maps should be provided, with arrows indicating site drainage and entering and leaving points. It was advised that drainage maps are useful in locating sources of storm water contamination, and it is useful to identify areas and activities which require source controls or remedial action. One commenter recommended that the map should extend far enough offsite to demonstrate how the privately owned system connects to the publicly owned system.

After considering the merits of all the comments and the reasons supporting EPA's proposal, EPA is convinced that a topographic map and a site drainage map are necessary components of the industrial application. Existing permit application regulations at 40 CFR 122.21(f)(7) require all permit applicants to submit as part of Form 1 a topographic map extending one mile beyond the property boundaries of the source depicting: the facility and each intake and discharge structure; each hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility; each well where fluids from the facility are injected underground; and those wells, springs, other surface water bodies, and drinking water wells listed in the map area in public records or otherwise known to the applicant within one-quarter mile of the facility property boundary. (See 47 FR 15304, April 8, 1982.) However, as indicated by the comments the information provided under § 122.21(f)(7) is generally not sufficient by itself for evaluating the nature of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity.

As stated in comments, a drainage map can provide more important site specific information for evaluating the nature of the storm water discharge in comparison to existing requirements, which require a larger map with only general information. The volume of storm water discharge and the pollutants associated with it will depend on the configuration and activities occurring at the industrial site. One commenter suggested that it would be appropriate to submit an aerial photograph of the site with all the topographic and drainage information superimposed on the photograph. EPA agrees that this may be an appropriate method of providing this information. EPA is not requiring a specific format for submitting this information.

EPA is also requiring that a narrative description be submitted to accompany the drainage map. The narrative will provide a description of on-site features including: existing structures (buildings which cover materials and other material covers; dikes; diversion ditches, etc.) and non-structural controls (employee training, visual inspections, preventive maintenance, and housekeeping measures) that are used to prevent or minimize the potential for release of toxic and hazardous pollutants; a description of significant materials that are currently or in the past have been treated, stored or disposed outside; and the method of treatment, storage or disposal used. The narrative will also include: a description of activities at materials loading and unloading areas; the location, manner and frequency in which pesticides, herbicides, soil conditioners and fertilizers are applied; a description of the soil; and a description of the areas which are predominately responsible for first flush runoff. This requirement is unchanged from the proposal.

Some commenters believed that information on pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers and similar products is irrelevant, incidental to the facility's production activities, and should not be addressed by this rulemaking. EPA disagrees. As these materials are applied outside and hence subject to storm events, they are significant sources of pollutants in storm water discharges whether applied in residential or industrial settings. By providing this information in the permit application the permit writer will be able to determine whether such activity is associated with industrial activity and the subject of appropriate permit conditions. Nominal or incidental application of these materials at industrial facilities and non-detects in sampling of storm water discharges for the permit application will result, in most cases, in these materials not being addressed specifically in storm water permits.

Today's rule also requires that permit applicants for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity certify that all of the outfalls covered in the permit application have been tested or evaluated for non-storm water discharges which are not covered by an NPDES permit. (The applicant need not test for nonstorm water if the certification of the plant storm water discharges can be evaluated through the use of schematics or other adequate method). Section 405 of the WQA added section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) to the CWA to require that permits for municipal separate storm sewers effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges to the storm sewer system. As discussed in part VI.F.7.b of today's preamble, untreated non-storm water discharges to storm sewers can create severe, widespread contamination problems and removing such discharges presents opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of such discharges. Although section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) specifically addresses municipal separate storm sewers, EPA believes that illicit non-storm water discharges are as likely to be mixed with storm water at a facility that discharges directly to the waters of the United States as it is at a facility that discharges to a municipal storm sewer. Accordingly, EPA feels that it is appropriate to consider potential nonstorm water discharges in permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. The certification requirement would not apply to outfalls where storm water is intentionally mixed with process waste water streams which are already identified in and covered by a permit.

This rulemaking requires applicants for individual permits to submit known information regarding the history of significant spills at the facility. Several

commenters indicated that the extent to which this information is required should be modified. One commenter stated that the requirement should be limited to those spills that resulted in a complaint or enforcement action. EPA disagrees. EPA believes that significant spills at a facility should generally include releases of oil or hazardous substances in excess of reportable quantities under section 311 of the Clean Water Act (see 40 CFR 110.10 and 40 CFR 117.21) or section 102 of CERCLA (see 40 CFR 302.4). Such a requirement is consistent with these regulations and the perception that such spills are significant enough to mandate the reporting of their occurrence. Some commenters stated that industries have already submitted this information in other contexts and should not be required to have to do it again. For the same reason another commenter felt that submittal of this information represents a waste of manpower and resources. EPA disagrees that requiring this information is unduly burdensome. If this information has already been provided for another purpose it follows that it is readily available to the industrial applicant. Thus, the burden of providing this information cannot be considered undue. Furthermore, the permit authority will need to have this available in order to determine which drainage areas are likely to generate storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, evaluate pollutants of concern, and develop appropriate permit conditions. However, to keep this information requirement within reasonable limits and limited to information already available to individual facilities, EPA has declined to expand the reporting requirements to spills of other materials, such as food as one commenter has suggested. However, EPA has decided to add raw materials used in food processing or production to the list of significant materials. Materials such as these may find their way into storm water discharges in such quantities that serious water quality impacts occur. These materials may find there way into storm water from transportation vehicles carrying materials into the facility, loading docks, processing areas, storage areas, and disposal sites.

One commenter urged that any information requested should be limited to a period of three years, which is the general NPDES records retention requirement under 40 CFR 122.21(p) and 40 CFR 112.7(d)(8). EPA agrees with this comment and has limited historical information requirements to the 3 years prior to the date the application is submitted. In this manner this regulation will be consistent with records keeping practices under the NPDES and Oil Spill Prevention programs, except sludge programs.

The December 7, 1988, proposal required the applicant to submit a description of each past or present area used for outdoor storage or disposal of significant materials. One commenter felt that the definition of significant material was too imprecise. EPA disagrees that the language should be made more precise by delineating every conceivable material that may add pollutants to storm water. Rather the definition is broad, to encourage permit applicants to list those materials that have the potential to cause water quality impacts. Stating what materials are addressed in meticulous detail may result in potentially harmful materials remaining unconsidered in permits. However, EPA has decided to add "fertilizers, pesticides, and raw materials used in the production or processing of food" to the definition in response to the comment of one State authority that such materials need to be accounted for due to their potential danger to storm water discharge quality. This same commenter recommended that "hazardous chemicals" should be added. EPA agrees, and will delineate those chemicals as "hazardous substances" which are designated under section 101(14) of CERCLA. Further clarification has been added by requiring the listing of any chemical the facility is required to report pursuant to section 313 of title III of SARA.

Another commenter felt that EPA should not require information of past storage of significant materials. EPA agrees that this proposed requirement is overbroad and has limited the time frame to those materials that were stored in areas 3 years or fewer from the date of the permit application. The 3year limit is consistent with other Agency reporting requirements as discussed above.

One commenter questioned EPA's proposal not to provide for a waiver from the requirement to submit quantitative data if the applicant can demonstrate that it is unnecessary for permit issuance. Another commenter said that a waiver is inappropriate. EPA believes relevant quantitative data are essential to the process, but in this rulemaking the number of pollutants that must be sampled and analyzed is reduced compared to previous regulations. The proposed requirements for quantitative data are limited to pollutants that are appropriate for given site-specific operations, thereby making a waiver unnecessary.

Although the concept of a waiver is attractive because of the perceived potential reduction in burdens for applicants, EPA believes that because the storm water discharge testing requirements have already been streamlined, a waiver would not in practice provide significant reductions in burden for either applicants or permit issuing authorities. Requirements to provide and verify data demonstrating that a waiver is appropriate for a storm water discharge may prove to be more of a burden to the applicant and the permitting authorities. Establishing such a waiver procedure would be administratively complex and timeconsuming for both EPA and the applicants, without any justifiable benefit. Therefore, this rulemaking does not include a waiver provision.

In response to one commenter, EPA wishes to emphasize that if a facility has zero storm water discharge because it is discharging to a detention pond only, a permit application is not required. Only those discharges to the waters of the United States or municipal systems need submit notifications, individual or group permit applications, or notices of intent where applicable. However, if the detention pond overflows or the discharger anticipates that it may overflow, then a permit application should be submitted.

Two commenters agreed with EPA's proposed requirement to have a description of past and present material management practices and controls. EPA believes that this is important information directly relating to the quality of storm water that can be expected at a particular facility and this requirement is retained in today's rule. However, as with other historical information requirements, EPA is limiting past practices to those that occurred within three years of the date that the application is submitted. One commenter argued that past practices should not be considered unless there is evidence that past practices cause current storm water quality problems. EPA anticipates that the information submitted by the applicant will be used to make this determination and that appropriate permit conditions can be developed accordingly.

One commenter requested clarification on the certification requirement that the data and information in the application is true and complete to the best of the certifying officer's knowledge. This is a fundamental and integral part of all NPDES permit applications. It essentially requires the signatory to assure the permit writer, based upon his or her personal knowledge, that the information has been submitted without a negligent, reckless, or purposeful misrepresentation. EPA intends to interpret this requirement in the same manner for storm water applications as other applications.

4. Group Applications

Today's final rule provides some industries with the option of participating in a group application, in lieu of submitting individual permits. There are several reasons for the group application. First, the group application procedure provides adequate information for issuing permits for certain classes of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. Second, numerous commenters supported the concept of the group application as a way to reduce the costs and administrative burdens associated with storm water permit applications. Third, group applications will reduce the burden on the regulated community by requiring the submission of quantitative data from only selected members of the group. Fourth, the group application process will reduce the burden on the permit issuing authority by consolidating information for reviewing permit applications and for developinggeneral permits suited to certain industrial groups. Where general permits are not appropriate or cannot be issued, a group application can be used to develop model individual permits, which can significantly reduce the burden of preparing individual permits.

As noted above in today's preamble, EPA intends to promulgate a general permit that will cover many types of industrial activity. Industrial dischargers eligible for such permits will generally be required to seek coverage by submittal of a notice of intent. Facilities that are ineligible for coverage under the general permit will be required to submit an individual permit application or submit a group application. The group application process promulgated today will serve as an important component to implement Tier III of EPA's industrial storm water permitting strategy discussed above. The general permit which EPA intends to promulgate in the near future shall set forth what types of facilities are eligible for coverage.

Some commenters criticized the group application procedure as an abdication of EPA's responsibility to effectively deal with pollutants in storm water discharges. One commenter stated that every facility subject to these regulations should be required to submit quantitative data. In response EPA believes, as do numerous commenters, that the group application procedure is a legitimate and effective way of dealing with a large volume of currently uncontrolled discharges. The only difference between the group application procedure and issuing individual permits based on individual applications is that the quantitative data requirements from individual facilities will be less if certain procedures are followed. EPA is convinced that marked improvements in the process of issuing permits will be achieved when these procedures are followed. Where the storm water discharge from a particular facility is identified as posing a special environmental risk, it can be required to submit individual applications and therefore separate quantitative data. It should also be noted that submittal of a group application does not exempt a facility from submitting quantitative data on its storm water discharge during the term of the permit.

The final rule refines and clarifies some of the requirements of the group application approach set forth in the December 7, 1988 proposal. Several commenters requested that EPA add a provision which would allow a facility that becomes subject to the regulations to "add on" to a group application after that group application has already been submitted. One commenter indicated that some trade associations are prohibited from engaging in an activity which would not apply to all its members, and that an "add on' provision was needed in the event such a prohibition was invoked. Another commenter noted that where a group is particularly large, for example one that consists of several thousand members, that it would be a logistical feat to ensure that all facilities eligible as members of the group are properly identified and listed on the application within the 120 day deadline for submitting part 1A of the application.

EPA believes that a group applicant should have a limited ability to add facilities to the group after part 1A has been submitted and that a provision which allows a group or group representative an unbridled ability to "add on" is impractical for a number of reasons. First, 10% of the facilities must submit quantitative data. Adding facilities after the group has been formed and approved would change the number of facilities that have to submit quantitative data on behalf of the group. This would result in an unwarranted administrative burden on the reviewing authority, which is in the position of having to examine the quantitative data and determine the appropriateness of group members (and those that are

required to submit quantitative data) within 2 months of receiving part 1 of the group application. Further, during the permit application process permitting authorities will be developing permit conditions for an identified and pre-determined group of facilities. Allowing potentially significant numbers of permit applicants to suddenly inject themselves into a group application could unnecessarily hamper or disrupt the timely development of general and model permits. In addition, if a facility were "added on" the number of facilities having to submit quantitative data may drop below 10%. Thus the facility desiring to "add on" may be put in the position of having to submit the quantitative data themselves, which would clearly defeat the purpose of being a part of the group application.

Nevertheless, EPA has added a provision to 122.26(e) which enables facilities to add on to a group application at the discretion of the EPA's Office of Water Enforcement and Permits, and upon a showing of good cause by the group applicant. For the reasons noted above, EPA anticipates this provision will be invoked only in limited cases where good cause is shown. Facilities not properly identified in the group application, and which cannot meet the good cause test will be required to submit individual permit applications. EPA will advise such facilities within 30 days of receiving the request as to whether the facility may add on.

However, the "add on" facility must meet the following requirements: The application for the additional facility is made within 15 months of the final rule; and the addition of the facility does not reduce the percentage of the facilities that are required to submit quantitative data to below 10% unless there are over 100 facilities that are submitting quantitative data. Approval to become part of a group application is obtained from the group or the trade association and is certified by a representative of the group; approval for adding on to a group is obtained from the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits.

Several commenters stated that the application requirements for groups are so burdensome that the advantages of the process are undermined. These concerns are addressed in greater detail below. Among the requirements which commenters objected are the requirements to list every group member's company by name and address. EPA is convinced that a condition precedent to approving a group application is at least identifying the members of the group. Without such information it would be impossible to determine if all the facilities are sufficiently similar. EPA disagrees that industries will be dissuaded from using the group application process because the advantages of the process are undermined. Although commenters perceived many burdens associated with individual permit applications, by far the most significant burden identified by the comments is the requirement for obtaining and submitting quantitative data. The group application significantly reduces this burden by requiring only10% of the facilities to submit quantitative data if the number in the group is over 100. If the number in the group is over 1000, then only 100 of the facilities need submit quantitative information. If group applicants develop cost sharing procedures to reduce the financial and administrative burdens of submitting quantitative data, it is evident that utilizing the group application could save industries as much as 90% on the most economically burdensome aspect of the application.

Several commenters perceived that the group application procedure did not offer them significant savings because under the proposal their particular industry would only be required to test for COD, BOD5, pH, TSS, oil and grease, nitrogen, and phosphorous. These commenters stated that sampling for these pollutants is not particularly expensive. EPA believes that even if a group is required only to submit minimal quantitative data on particular pollutants, substantial savings can accrue to a particular industry if the group has many members. This is particularly true when the number of outfalls to be sampled, the information on storm events, and flow measurements are factored into the cost analysis. An additional benefit for members of the group as well as for permit issuing agencies is that the process of developing a permit, including drafting and responding to public comments on the permit, is consolidated by the group application process. Accordingly, it is less resource intensive for the group to work with permit issuance authorities to develop well founded permit conditions.

One commenter raised a concern about the situation where one of the facilities that is designated for submitting quantitative data drops out of the group. If this happened, then another facility would have to submit quantitative data. In response, EPA notes that one approach would be for the group to have one or two more facilities submit quantitative data than needed to avoid problems from such a departure or to account for new additions to the group. Certainly this issue goes directly to the facility selection process which is a critical component of the group application; the facilities need to be carefully selected and reviewed by the group to prevent such difficulties.

Several comments indicated a confusion over what facilities are eligible to take advantage of the group application procedure. Any industry or facility that is required to submit a storm water permit application under these regulations is eligible to participate in a group application. However, whether a facility can obtain a storm water permit under a group application procedure will depend upon whether that facility is a member of the same effluent guideline subcategory, or is sufficiently similar to other members of the group to be appropriate for a general permit or individual permit issued pursuant to the group application. Accordingly, group applications are not limited to national trade associations. The agency believes that the language in § 122.26(c)(2) adequately addresses these concerns. The process does not prohibit a particular company with multiple facilities from filing a group application as long as those facilities are sufficiently similar.

One commenter expressed concern that a single company would not be able to take advantage of the group application benefits unless the company had more than ten facilities. Under such circumstances the company would have to become integrated with a larger group of facilities owned by other companies in order to take advantage of the benefits afforded by the group application procedure. In response, the Agency is providing for a group application of between four and ten members, however at least half the facilities must submit data. One commenter stated that the number of facilities required to submit quantitative data should be determined on a case by case basis. EPA believes that 10 percent for groups with over ten members will be easiest to implement for both industry and EPA, and will ensure that adequate representative quantitative data are obtained so that meaningful determinations of facility similarity can be made and appropriate permit conditions in general or model permits can be developed.

Another commenter suggested that one facility with a multitude of storm water discharge points should be able to use the group permit application to reduce the amount of quantitative data that it is required to submit. This is an accurate observation but only to the extent that the facility combines with several other facilities to form a group. in which case only 10% of the facilities need submit quantitative data. The group application procedure in today's rule is designed for use by multiple facilities only. However, if an individual facility has 10 outfalls with ten substantially identical effluents the discharger may petition the Director to sample only one of the outfalls, with that data applying to the remaining outfalls. See § 122.21(g)(7). Thus, existing authority already allows for a "group-like" process for sampling a subset of storm water outfalls at a single facility.

Concern was expressed that the spill reporting requirement from each facility in part 1B would preclude any group from demonstrating that the facilities sampled are "representative," because the incidence of past spills is very sitespecific. EPA notes that since it has dropped the part 1B requirements for other reasons discussed below, this comment is now moot.

Numerous commenters noted that if a facility is part of a group application and is subsequently rejected as a group applicant, such an entity would not have a full year to submit an individual permit application. EPA agrees that this is a significant concern. Accordingly, those facilities that apply as a member of a group application will be afforded a full year from the time they are notified of their rejection as a member of the group to file an individual application. EPA notes that it intends to act on group application requests within 60 days of receipt; thus this approach will only provide facilities that are rejected from a group application a short extension of the deadline for other individual applications.

One commenter complained that the cost of defending a group's choice of representative facilities may exceed the cost of submitting an individual permit application, thereby reducing the incentive to apply as group. The agency anticipates that the selection process will be one open to negotiation between the affected parties and one that will end in a mutually satisfactory group of facilities. It is the intent of EPA to reduce the costs of submitting a permit application as much as possible, while providing adequate information to support permitting activities.

Another commenter argued that the use of model permits will create a disincentive for participating in a group because model permits may be used by the permit issuing authority to issue individual permits for discharges from similar facilities that did not participate in the group application. EPA does not agree. The benefit of applying as a group applicant is to take advantage of reduced representative quantitative data requirements. This incentive will exist regardless of whether or how model permits are used. Further, technology transfer can occur during the development of permits based on individual applications as well as those based on group applications.

One commenter suggested moving some of the facility specific information requirements of part 1 of the group application to part 2 of the group application in order to provide more incentive to apply as a group. EPA has considered this and believes such a change would be inappropriate. Part 1 information will be used to make an informed decision about whether individual facilities are appropriate as group members and appropriate for submitting representative quantitative data. Furthermore, information burdens from providing site specific factors in part 1 is relatively minimal, and the information requirements in the proposed part 1B application have been eliminated.

One commenter suggested that trade associations develop model permits since they have the most knowledge about the characteristics of the industries they represent. As noted above, EPA expects that the industries and trade associations will have input, through the permit application process, as to how permit conditions for storm water discharges are developed. While the applicant can submit proposed permit conditions with any type of application, EPA however cannot delegate the drafting of model permits to the permittees. EPA is developing and publishing guidance in conjunction with this rulemaking for developing permit conditions.

One commenter suggested that new dischargers should be able to take advantage of general permits developed pursuant to group applications. As with other general permits, EPA anticipates that such discharges will be able to fall within the scope of a general permit based on a group application where appropriate.

One commenter stated that the group application does not benefit municipalities since there is no requirement for industrial discharges through municipal sewers to apply for a permit. As noted in a previous discussion, industrial discharges through municipal sewers must be covered by an NPDES permit. Such facilities may avail themselves of the group application procedure. Also, municipalities are not precluded from developing a group application procedure under their management plan for industries that discharge into their municipal system, in order to streamline developing controls for such industries.

One industry wanted clarification that facilities located within a municipality would be eligible to participate in a group application. All industrial activities required to submit an individual permit are entitled to submit as part of group application, except those with existing NPDES permits covering storm water. Those facilities that discharge through a municipal separate storm sewer systems required to submit an individual application (because they do not fall within a general permit) are not precluded from using the group application procedure if appropriate.

Other municipalities expressed confusion over the industrial group application concept. The following responds to these comments. First, municipalities are not eligible for participation in a group application because the group application process is designed for industrial activities. Sampling requirements for municipal permit applications are already limited to a small subset of the outfalls from the system, as discussed below. Furthermore, permits for municipal separate storm sewer systems will be issued on a system-wide or jurisdictionwide basis, rather than individually for each outfall. Thus, today's regulation already incorporates a "grouplike" permit application process for municipalities. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that various municipal storm sewer systems would be "substantially similar" enough to justify group treatment in the same way as industrial facilities. In response to another comment, this regulation does not directly give the municipality enforcement power over members of an industrial group who may be discharging through its system. Only the permitting authority and private citizens and organizations (including the municipality acting in such a capacity) will have enforcement power over members of the group once permits are issued to those members.

One commenter believed that the States with authorized NPDES programs rather than EPA should establish permit terms for permits based on group applications. In response to this comment, EPA wishes to clarify its role in the group application process. Group applications will be submitted to EPA headquarters where they will be reviewed and summarized. The

summaries of the group application will be distributed to authorized NPDES States. EPA wishes to emphasize that NPDES States are not bound by draft model permits developed by EPA. States may adopt model permits for use in their particular area, making adjustments for local water quality standards and other regional characteristics. Where general permit coverage is believed to be inappropriate, facilities may be required to apply for individual permits. One commenter objected to the group application procedure because it is not consistent with existing Federal permitting procedures, which will lead to confusion in the regulated community. The agency disagrees with this assessment. The group application is a departure from established NPDES program procedures. However, the comments, when viewed in their entirety, reflect widespread support from the regulated community for a group application procedure. Further, the comments reflect that those affected by this rulemaking understand the components of the group application and the procedures under which permits will be obtained pursuant to the group application.

One commenter expressed concern regarding how BAT limits for groups of similar industries will be developed. Technology based limits will be developed based on the information received from the group applicants. If the group applicants possess similar characteristics in terms of their discharge, BAT/BCT limitations and controls will be developed accordingly for those members of the group. If the discharge characteristics are not similar then applying industries are not appropriate for the group.

One commenter has suggested that the proposed group application is too complex with regard to the part 1A, part 1B, and part 2 group application requirements and that EPA should repropose these provisions. As discussed below, EPA has simplified the industrial group application requirements by eliminating the part 1B application. Thus, reproposal is unnecessary.

One commenter criticized the group application concept as not achieving any type of reduction in administrative burden for NPDES States. EPA disagrees with this assessment. If industries take advantage of the group application procedure, EPA will have an opportunity to review information describing a large number of dischargers in an organized manner. EPA will perform much of the initial review and analysis of the group application, and provide NPDES States with summaries of the applications thereby reducing the burden on the States. Furthermore, the procedure encourages a potentially large number of facilities to be covered by a general permit, which will clearly reduce the administrative burden of issuing individual permits.

The final rule establishes a regulatory procedure whereby a representative entity, such as a trade association, may submit a group application to the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits (OWEP) at EPA headquarters, in whichquantitative data from certain representative members of a group of industrial facilities is supplied. Information received in the group application will be used by EPA headquarters to develop models for individual permits or general permits. These model permits are not issued permits, but rather they will be used by EPA Regions and the NPDES States to issue individual or general permits for participating facilities in the State. In developing such permits, the Region or NPDES State will, where necessary, adapt the model permits to take into account the hydrological conditions and receiving water quality in their area. One commenter expressed the view that having this procedure managed by EPA headquarters would cause delays and it should be delegated to the States and Regions. EPA disagrees that delay will ensue using this procedure. Furthermore, consistency in development of model and general permits can be achieved if application review is coordinated at EPA headquarters.

a. Facilities Covered. Under this rule the group application is submitted for only the facilities specifically listed in the application and not necessarily for an entire industry. The facilities in the group application selected to do sampling must be representative of the group, not necessarily of the industry.

Facilities that are sufficiently similar to those covered in a general permit (issued pursuant to a group application) that commence discharging after the general permit has been issued, must refer to the provisions of that general permit to determine if they are eligible for coverage. Facilities that have already been issued an individual permit for storm water discharges will not be eligible for participation in a group application. Several commenters believed that this restriction is inequitable since they have experienced the administrative burden of submitting a permit application. EPA disagrees. Industries that have already obtained a permit for storm water discharges have developed a storm water management

program, engaged in the collection of quantitative data, and possess familiarity and experience with submitting storm water permit applications. The Agency sees no point to instituting an entirely new permit application process for facilities that have storm water permits issued individually. It makes little sense for these industries to be involved with submitting another permit application before their current permit expires.

As noted above, once a general permit has been issued to a group of dischargers, a new facility may request that they be covered by the general permit. The permitting authority can then examine the request in light of the general permit applicability requirements and determine whether the facility is suitable or not.

b. Scope of Group Applications. Numerous comments were received on how facilities should be evaluated as members of a group application. Several commenters stated that effluent limitation guideline subcategories are not relevant to pollutants found in storm water, but rather to the facility's everyday activities, and therefore similarity should be based on each facility's discharge or the similarity of pollutants expected to be found in a facility's discharge. Other commenters felt that similarity of operations at facilities should be the criteria. Others, believed that an examination of the facility's impact on storm water quality should be the applied criteria. Other commenters suggested that EPA provide more guidance as to how broadly groups can be defined and that a failure to do so would discourage facilities from going to the trouble and expense of entering into the group application process. Some commenters were concerned that facilities would be rejected as a group because of variations in processes and process wastewater characteristics.

EPA does not agree that effluent limitation guideline subcategories are inappropriate as a method for determining group applications. EPA guideline subcategories are functional classifications, breaking down facilities into groups, for purposes of setting effluent limitations guidelines. The use of EPA subcategories will save time for both applicants and permitting authorities in determining whether a particular group is appropriate for a group application. Furthermore, EPA believes that this method of grouping provides adequate guidance for determining what facilities are grouped together. Establishing groups on the extent to which a facility's discharge

affects storm water quality would not provide applicants with sufficient guidance as to the appropriateness of individual industries for group applications and would not provide information needed to draft appropriate model permit conditions for potentially different types of industries, industrial processes, and material management practices.

However, EPA recognizes that the subcategory designations may not always be available or an effective methodology for grouping applicants. Also, there are situations where processes that are subject to different subcategories are combined. EPA agrees that the group application option should be flexible enough to allow groups to be created where subcategories are too rigid or otherwise inappropriate for developing group applications or where facilities are integrated or overlap into other subcategories. For these reasons, this rulemaking does not limit the submission to EPA subcategories alone. but rather allows groups to be formed where facilities are similar enough to be appropriate for general permit coverage.

In determining whether a group is appropriate for general permit coverage, EPA intends that the group applicant use the factors set forth in 40 CFR 122.28(a)(2)(ii), the current regulations governing general permits, as a guide. If facilities all involve the same or similar types of operations, discharge the same types of wastes, have the same effluent limitation and same or similar monitoring requirements, where applicable, they would probably be appropriate for a group application. To that extent, facilities that attempt to form groups where the constituent makeup of its process wastewater is dissimilar may run the risk of not being accepted for purposes of a group application.

Some commenters expressed the view that categories formed using general permit factors are too broad or that the language is too vague. One commenter expressed the view that the standard is too subjective and that permit writers will be evaluating the similarity of discharge too subjectively, while other commenters felt that the criteria should be broad and flexible. Other commenters stated that the effluent guideline subcategory or general permit coverage factors are not related to storm water discharges, because much of the criteria are based upon what is occurring inside the plant, rather than activities outside of the plant. EPA believes that these criteria are reasonable for defining the scope of a group application. EPA disagrees that

the procedure, which is adequate for the issuance of general permits, is inadequate for the development of a group application. EPA believes that the activities inside a facility will generally correspond to activities outside of the plant that are exposed to storm events. including stack emissions, material storage, and waste products. Furthermore, if facilities are able to demonstrate their storm water discharge has similar characteristics, that is one element in the analysis needed for establishing that the group is appropriate. EPA disagrees that the criteria are too vague. If facilities are concerned that general permit criteria is insufficient guidance, then subcategories under 40 CFR subchapter N should be used. EPA believes that the program will function best if flexibility for creating groups is maintained.

If a NPDES approved State feels that a tighter grouping of applicants is appropriate individual permit applications can be requested from those permit applicants. One commenter indicated that it was not clear whether the group application procedure could be used for all NPDES requirements. EPA would clarify that the group application is designed only to cover storm water discharges from the industrial facilities identified in § 122.26(b)(14).

As noted above, EPA wishes to clarify that facilities with existing individual NPDES permits for storm water are not eligible to participate in the group application process. From an administrative standpoint EPA is not prepared to create an entirely different mechanism for permitting industries which already have such permits.

c. Group Application Requirements. The group application, as proposed, included the following requirements in three separate parts. Part 1A of a group application included: (A) Identification of the participants in the group application by name and location; (B) a narrative description summarizing the industrial activities of participants; (C) a list of significant materials stored outside by participants; and (D) identification of 10 percent of the dischargers participating in the group application for submitting quantitative data. A proposed part 1B of the group application included the following information from each participant in the group application: (A) A site map showing topography (or indicating the outline of drainage areas served by the outfall(s) and related information; (B) an estimate of the area of impervious surfaces (including paved areas and building roofs) and the total area

drained by each outfall and a narrative description of significant materials; (C) a certification that all outfalls that should contain storm water discharges associated with industrial activity have been tested for the presence of nonstorm water discharges: (D) existing information regarding significant leaks or spills of toxic or hazardous pollutants at the facility; (E) a narrative description of industrial activities at the facility that are different from or that are in addition to the activities described under part 1A; and (F) a list of all constituents that are addressed in a NPDES permit issued to the facility for any of non-storm water discharge. Part 2 of a group application required quantitative data from 10 percent of the facilities identified.

Some commenters felt that spill histories, drainage maps, material management practices, and information on significant materials stored outside are too burdensome or meaningless for evaluating similarity of discharges among group applicants. Several commenters stated that such requirements where the group may consist of several thousand facilities were impractical and would not assist EPA in developing model permits. Many commenters insisted that the requirements imposed in part 1B would effectively discourage use of the group application procedure. EPA agrees in large part with these comments. After reevaluating the components of part 1B. and the entire rationale for instituting the group application procedure, EPA has decided to excise part 1B from the requirements, and rely on part 1A and part 2 for developing appropriate permit condition. Where appropriate, EPA may require facilities to submit the information, formerly in part 1B, during the term of the permit. In other cases, EPA will establish which facilities must submit individual permit applications where more site specific permits are appropriate.

Under the revised part 1 and part 2, EPA will receive information pertaining to the types of industrial activity engaged in by the group, materials used by the facilities, and representative quantitative data. EPA can use such information to develop management practices that address pollutants in storm water discharges from such facilities. For most facilities, general good housekeeping or management practices will eliminate pollutants in storm water. Such requirements can be further refined by determining the nature of a group's industrial activity and by obtaining information on material used at the facility and representative quantitative data from a
percentage of the facilities. Thus, EPA is confident that model permits and general permits can be developed from the information to be submitted under part 1 and part 2.

One commenter felt that more guidance on what makes a facility representative for sampling as part of a group is needed. In response, the Agency believes the rule as currently drafted provides adequate notice.

Another commenter asked how much sampling needed to be done and how much monitoring will transpire over the life of the permit for members of a group. This will vary from permit to permit and will be determined in permit proceedings. This rulemaking only covers the quantitative data that is to be submitted in the context of the group permit application.

One commenter indicated that because of the amount of diversity in the operations of a particular industry, obtaining a sample that could be considered representative would be extremely difficult. EPA recognizes that obtaining representative quantitative data through the group application process will prove to be difficult; however, EPA has sought to minimize these perceived problems. Under the group application concept, industries must be sufficiently similar to qualify. Industries which have significantly different operations from the rest of the group that affects the quality of their storm water discharge may be required to obtain an individual permit. Use of the nine precipitation zones will enable the data in the permit application to be more easily analyzed and patterns observed on the basis of hydrology and other regional factors. How EPA will evaluate the representativeness of the sample is discussed below.

Several commenters asked why the precipitation zone of group members is relevant to the application. The need to identify precipitation zones arises because the amount of rainfall is likely to have a significant impact on the quality of the receiving water. According to an EPA study (Methodology for Analysis of Detention **Basins for Control of Urban Runoff** Quality: Office of Water, Nonpoint Source Branch, Sept. 1986) the United States can be divided into nine general precipitation zones. These zones are characterized by differences in precipitation volume, precipitation intensity, precipitation duration, and precipitation intervals. Industrial facilities that seek general permits via the group application option may show significantly different loading rates as a result of these regional precipitation differences. As an example,

precipitation in Seattle, Washington, located in Zone 7, approaches the mean annual storm intensity of .024 inches/ hour with a mean annual storm duration of 20 hours for that Zone. In contrast, precipitation in Atlanta, Georgia, located in Zone 3 approaches the mean annual storm intensity of .102 inches/ hour and a mean storm duration of 6.2 hours for that Zone. Atlanta, receives on the average four times more precipitation per hour with storms lasting one-third as long. As a result of these differences, if identical facilities within a group application were situated in each of these areas, their storm water discharges would likely exhibit different pollutant characteristics. Accordingly, data should be submitted from facilities in each zone.

One commenter felt that the EPA should abandon or modify its rainfall zone concept, because storm water quality will depend more on what materials are used at the facility than rainfall. EPA disagrees. Because storm water loading rates may differ significantly as a result of regional precipitation differences, it is necessary that for each precipitation zone containing representatives of a group application, the group must provide samples from some of those representatives. In comments to previous rulemakings it was argued that the amount of rainfall will affect the degree of impact a storm water discharge may have on the receiving stream.

One commenter stated that the precipitation zones illustrated in appendix E of the proposed rulemaking do not adequately reflect regional differences in precipitation and that in some cases the zones cut through cities where there are concentrations of industries without differences in their precipitation patterns. The rainfall zone map is a general guide to determining what areas of the country need to be addressed when determining representative rainfall events and quantitative data. When dealing with rainfall on a national scale, it is near impossible to make generalized statements with a great deal of accuracy. In the case of rainfall zones, rainfall patterns may be similar for facilities in close proximity to each other but none the less in different rainfall zones. In response, EPA has created these zones to reflect regional rainfall patterns as accurately as possible. Because of the variable nature of rainfall such circumstances are sure to arise. However, in order to obtain a degree of representativeness EPA is convinced that the use of these rainfall zones as described is appropriate for the submittal of group applications and the quantitative data therein.

The second and third requirements of part 1 of the group application instruct the applicant to describe the industrial activity (processes) and the significant materials used by the group. For the significant materials listed, the applicant is to discuss the materials management practices employed by members of the group. For example, the applicant should identify whether such materials are commonly covered, contained, or enclosed, and whether storm water runoff from materials storage areas is collected in settling ponds prior to discharge or diverted away from such areas to minimize the likelihood of contamination. Also, the approximate percentage of facilities in the group with no practices in place to minimize materials stored outside is to be identified.

EPA considers that the processes and materials used at a particular facility may have a bearing on the quality of the storm water. Thus, if there are different processes and materials used by members of the group, the application must identify those facilities utilizing the different processes and materials, with an explanation as to why these facilities should still be considered similar.

One commenter felt that a facility should be able to describe in its permit application the possibility of individual materials entering receiving waters. EPA supports the applicant adding site specific information which will assist the permit writer making an informed decision about the nature of the facility, the quality of its storm water discharge, and appropriate permit conditions.

The fourth element of part 1 of the group application is a commitment to submit quantitative data from ten percent of the facilities listed. EPA proposed that there must be a minimum of ten and a maximum of one hundred facilities within a group that submit data. Comments reflected some dissatisfaction with this requirement. Some commenters asserted that ten percent was too high a number and would discourage group applications, while one commenter suggested a lesser percentage would be appropriate where the group can certify that facilities are representative. One commenter suggested that EPA have the discretion to allow for a smaller percentage. Several commenters argued that EPA should be satisfied with fewer than ten percent because EPA often relies on data from less than ten percent of the plants in a subcategory when promulgating effuent guidelines and that EPA should rely on data collection goals with affected groups as was done in the 1985 storm water proposal. Other commenters pointed out that an anomalous situation could arise where the group was small and facilities were scattered throughout the precipitation zones. For example, if a group consisted of 20 members where a minimum of ten facilities had to submit samples, and two or more members were in each precipitation zone; a total of 18 facilities (90% of the group) would have to submit quantitative data. EPA believes that there must be a sufficient number of facilities submitting data for any patterns and trends to be detectable. However, in light of these comments EPA has decided to modify the language in § 122.26(c) to allow 1 discharger in each precipitation zone to submit quantitative data where 10 or fewer of the group members are located in a particular precipitation zone. EPA believes, however, that one hundred facilities would in most cases be sufficient to characterize the nature of the runoff and thus 100 should remain the maximum. If the data are insufficient, EPA has the authority to request more sampling under section 308 of the CWA.

One commenter suggested that the ten facility cutoff was unreasonable, and that instead of cutting off the group at ten, allow a smaller number in the group and allow the facilities to sample ten percent of their outfalls instead. EPA agrees, in part, and will allow groups of between four and ten to submit a group application. However, the ten percent rule would not be effective in such cases. Therefore, at least half the facilities in a group of four to ten will be required to provide quantitative data from at least one outfall, with each precipitation zone represented by at least one facility.

For any group application, in addition to selecting a sufficient number of facilities from each precipitation zone, facilities selected to do the sampling should be representative of the group as a whole in terms of those characteristics identifying the group which were described in the narrative, i.e., number and range of facilities, types of processes used, and any other relevant factors. If there is some variation in the processes used by the group (40 percent of the group of food processors are canners and 60 percent are canners and freezers, for example), the different processes are to be represented. Also, samples are to be provided from facilities utilizing the materials management practices identified, including those facilities which use no materials management practices. The

representation of these different factors, to the extent feasible, is to be roughly equivalent to their proportion in the group.

EPA wishes to emphasize that the provision that ten percent of the facilities need to submit quantitative data only applies to the permit application process. The general or individual permit itself may require quantitative data from each facility.

Submittal of Part 2 of the Group Application. As with part 1, part 2 of the Group Application would be submitted to the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits, in Washington, DC. If the information is incomplete, or simply is found to be an inadequate basis for establishing model permit limits, EPA has the authority under section 308 of the Clean Water Act to require that more information be submitted, which may include sampling from facilities that were part of the group application but did not provide data with the initial submission. If the group application is used by a Region or NPDES State to issue a general permit, the general permit should specify procedures for additional coverage under the permit.

If a part 2 is unacceptable or insufficient, EPA has the option to request additional information or to require that the facilities that participated in the group application submit complete individual applications (e.g. facilities that have submitted Form 1 with the group application may be required to submit Form 2F, or facilities which have submitted complete Form 1 and Form 2F information in the group application generally would not have to submit additional information).

Once the group applications are reviewed and accepted, EPA will use the information to establish draft permit terms and conditions for models for individual and general permits. NPDES approved States and EPA regional offices will continue to be the permitissuing authority for storm water discharges. The NPDES approved States accepting the group application approach and the EPA Regions may then take the model permits and adapt them for their particular area, making adjustments for local water quality standards and other localized characteristics, and making determinations as to the need for an individual storm water permit where general permit coverage is felt to be inappropriate. Permits would be proposed by the Region or NPDES approved State in accordance with current regulations for public comment before becoming final. In NPDES States without general permit authority, or

where an individual permit is deemed appropriate, the model permit can serve as the basis for issuing an individual permit.

The group application is an NPDES permit application just like any other and, as such, would be handled through normal permitting procedures, subject to the regulatory provisions applicable to permit issuance. Incomplete or otherwise inadequate submissions would be handled in the same manner as any other inadequate permit application. The permit issuing authority would retain the right to require submission of Form 1, Form 2C and Form 2F from any individual discharger it designates.

Some commenters offered other procedures for developing a group application procedure; however, these were frequently entirely different approaches or so novel that a reproposal would be required. One commenter suggested that those industries that are identified as being likely to pollute should be required to submit quantitative data. Numerous commenters contended that a generic approach for meeting the required information requirements for group applications would allow EPA to develop adequate general permits. EPA does not view these approaches as appropriate.

5. Group Application: Applicability in NPDES States

Many commenters expressed concern about how the group application procedure will work within the framework of an NPDES approved State. The relationship between EPA and the States that are authorized to administer the NPDES program, including implementation of the storm water program, is a complicated aspect of this rulemaking. Approved States (there are 38 States and one territory so approved) must have requirements that are at least as stringent as the Federal program; they may be more stringent if they choose. Authority to issue general permits is optional with NPDES States.

EPA has determined that ten percent of the facilities must provide quantitative data in the permit application as noted above. Furthermore, these applications are submitted to EPA headquarters. Consequently States, whether NPDES approved or not, are not in a position to reject or modify this requirement. Such States may determine the amount of sampling to be done pursuant to permit conditions. If they choose to issue general permits they may include such authority in their NPDES program and, upon approval of the program by EPA, may then issue general permits. Within the context of the NPDES provisions of the CWA, if States do not have general permitting authority, then general permits are not available in those States.

In response to one comment, EPA does not have authority to issue general or individual permits to facilities in NPDES approved states. Today's rule provides a means for affected industries to be covered by general permits developed via the group application procedure as well as from general permits developed independently of the group application process. Accordingly, today's rule anticipates that most NPDES States will seek general permit issuance authority to implement the storm water program in the most efficient and economical way. Without general permit issuance authority NPDES States will be required to issue individual permits covering storm water discharges to potentially thousands of industrial facilities.

One commenter recommended that States with approved NPDES programs should be involved in determining what industries are representative for submitting quantitative data. EPA recognizes that States will have an interest in this determination and may possess insight as to the appropriateness of using some facilities. However, EPA may be managing hundreds of group applications and approving or disapproving them as expeditiously as possible. EPA believes that involving the States in this already administratively complex and time consuming undertaking would be counterproductive. In any event, NPDES approved States are not bound by the determinations of EPA as to the appropriateness of groups or the issuance of permits based on model permits or individual permits. However, States will be encouraged to use model permits that are developed by EPA. EPA will endeavor to design general and model permits that are effective while also adaptable to the concerns of different States. Again, States are able to develop more stringent standards where they deem it to be appropriate. There are currently seventeen States that have authority to issue general permits: Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin. As suggested in the comments, EPA is encouraging more States to develop general permit issuing authority in order to facilitate the permitting process.

One commenter advised that the rules should state that a NPDES approved State may accept a group application or require additional information. EPA has decided not to explicitly state this in the rule. However, this comment does raise some points that need to be addressed. Because the group application option is a modification of existing NPDES permit application requirements, the State is free to adopt this option, but is not required to. If the State chooses to adopt the group application and it does not have general permit authority, the group application can be used to issue individual permits. If an approved NPDES State chooses to not issue permits based on the group application, facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity that are located in that State must submit individual applications to the State permitting authority. Before submitting a group application, facilities should ascertain from the State permitting authority whether that State intends to issue permits based upon a group application approved by EPA for the purpose of developing general permits. For facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity which are named in a group application, the Director may require an individual facility to submit an individual application where he or she determines that general permit coverage would be inappropriate for the particular facility.

One commenter stressed that EPA should streamline the procedure for States desiring to obtain general permit coverage. EPA has, over the last year, streamlined this procedure and encourages States to take advantage of this procedure. EPA recommends that States consider obtaining general permit authority as a means to efficiently issue permits for storm water discharges. These States should contact the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits at EPA Headquarters as soon as possible.

6. Group Application: Procedural Concerns

One commenter claimed that the proposed group application process and procedures violated federal law. This commenter claimed that EPA was abrogating its responsibility by allowing a trade association to design a data collection plan in lieu of completing an NPDES application form designed by EPA, thus violating the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The commenter stated that EPA would be improperly influenced by special interests if trade associations were able to design their own storm water data gathering plans. The commenter further asserted that any decisions by EPA on the content of specific group applications would be rulemakings and thus subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

EPA disagrees with the comment that the group application violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). FACA governs only those groups that are established or "utilized" by an agency for the purpose of obtaining "advice" or "recommendations." The group application option does not solicit or involve any "advice" or "recommendations." It simply allows submission of data by certain members of a group in accordance with specific regulatory criteria for determining which facilities are "representative" of a group. As such, the group application is merely a submission in accordance and in compliance with specific regulatory requirements and does not contain discretionary uncircumscribed "advice" or "recommendations" as to which facilities are representative of a group.

Thus, the determination of which facilities should submit testing data in accordance with regulatory criteria is little different from many other regulatory requirements where an applicant must submit information in accordance with certain criteria. For example, under 40 CFR 122.21 all outfalls must be tested except where two or more have "substantially identical" effluents. Similarly, quantitative data for certain pollutants are to be provided where the applicant knows or "has reason to believe" such pollutants are discharged. Both of these provisions allow the applicant to exercise discretion in making certain judgments but such action is circumscribed by regulatory standards. EPA further has authority to require these facilities to submit individual applications. In none of these instances. are "recommendations" or "advice' involved. EPA also notes that it is questionable whether, in providing for group applications, it is "soliciting" advice or recommendations from groups or that such groups are being "utilized" by EPA as a "preferred source" of advice. See 48 FR 19324 (April 28, 1983). Furthermore, this data collection effort may be supplemented by EPA if, after review of the data, EPA determines additional data is necessary for permit issuance. Other information gathering may act as a check on the group applications received.

EPA also does not agree with this commenter's claim that the group application scheme represents an

impermissible delegation of the Administrator's function in violation of the CWA regarding data gathering. The Administrator has the broadest discretion in determining what information is needed for permit development as well as the manner in which such information will be collected. The CWA does not require every discharger required to obtain a permit to file an application. Nor does the CWA require that the Administrator obtain data on which a permit is to be based through a formal application process (see 40 CFR 122.21). For years 'applications" have not been required from dischargers covered by general permits. EPA currently obtains much information beyond that provided in applications pursuant to section 308 of the CWA. This is especially true with respect to general permit and effluent limitations guidelines development. The group application option is simply another means of data gathering. The Administrator may always collect more data should he determine it necessary upon review of a groups' data submission. And, he may obtain such additional data by whatever means permissible under the Statute that he deems appropriate. Thus, it can hardly be said that by this initial data gathering effort the Administrator has delegated his data gathering responsibilities. In addition, since groups are required to select "representative" facilities, etc., in accordance with specific regulatory requirements established by the Administrator and because EPA will scrutinize part 1 of the group applications and either accept or reject the group as appropriate for a group application, no impermissible delegation has occurred. EPA will make an independent determination of the acceptability of a group application in view of the information required to be submitted by the group applicant, other information available to EPA (such as information on industrial subcategories obtained in developing effluent limitations guidelines as well as individual storm water applications received as a result of today's rule) and any further information EPA may request to supplement part 1 pursuant to section 308 of the CWA. Moreover, any concerns that a general permit may be based upon biased data can be dealt with in the public permit issuance process.

Finally, EPA also does not agree that the group application option violates the Administrative Procedures Act. Again, the group application scheme is simply a data gathering device. EPA could very well have determined to gather data informally via specific requests pursuant to section 308 of the CWA. In fact, general permit and effluent limitations guideline development proceed along these lines. It would make little sense if the latter informal data gathering process were somehow illegal simply because it is set forth in a rule that allows applicants some relief upon certain showings. In this respect, several of EPA's existing regulations similarly allow an applicant to be relieved from certain data submission requirements upon appropriate demonstrations. For example, testing for certain pollutants and or certain outfalls may be waived under certain circumstances. Most importantly, the operative action of concern that impacts on the public is individual or general permit issuance based upon data obtained. As previously stated, ample opportunity for public participation is provided in the permit issuance proceeding.

7. Permit Applicability and Applications for Oil and Gas and Mining Operations

Oil, gas and mining facilities are among those industrial sites that are likely to discharge storm water runoff that is contaminated by process wastes, toxic pollutants, hazardous substances. or oil and grease. Such contamination can include disturbed soils and process wastes containing heavy metals or suspended or dissolved solids, salts, surfactants, or solvents used or produced in oil and gas operations. Because they have the potential for serious water quality impacts, Congress recognized, throughout the development of the storm water provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1987, the need to control storm water discharges from oil, gas, and mining operations, as well as those associated with other industrial activities.

However, Congress also recognized that there are numerous situations in the mining and oil and gas industries where storm water is channeled around plants and operations through a series of ditches and other structural devices in order to prevent pollution of the storm water by harmful contaminants. From the standpoint of resource drain on both EPA as the permitting agency and potential permit applicants, the conclusion was that operators that use good management practices and make expenditures to prevent contamination must not be burdened with the requirement to obtain a permit. Hence, section 402(1)(2) creates a statutory exemption from storm water permitting requirements for uncontaminated runoff from these facilities.

To implement section 402(1)(2), EPA intends to require permits for

contaminated storm water discharges from oil, gas and mining operations. Storm water discharges that are not contaminated by contact with any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished product, byproduct or waste products located on the site of such operations will not be required to obtain a storm water discharge permit.

The regulated discharge associated with industrial activity is the discharge from any conveyance used for collecting and conveying storm water located at an industrial plant or directly related to manufacturing, processing or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant. Industrial plants include facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) 10 through 14 (the mining industry), including oil and gas exploration, production, processing, and treatment operations, as well as transmission facilities. See 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(iii). This also includes plant areas that are no longer used for such activities, as well as areas that are currently being used for industrial processes.

a. Oil and Gas Operations. In determining whether storm water discharges from oil and gas facilities are "contaminated", the legislative history reflects that the EPA should consider whether oil, grease, or hazardous materials are present in storm water runoff from the sites described above in excess of reportable quantities (RQs) under section 311 of the Clean Water Act or section 102 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response. Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). [Vol. 132 Cong. Rec. H10574 (daily ed. October 15, 1986) Conference Report].

Many of the comments received by EPA regarding this exemption focused on the concern that EPA's test for requiring a permit is and would subject an unnecessarily large number of oil and gas facilities to permit application requirements. Specific comments made in support of this concern are addressed below.

A primary issue raised by commenters centered on how to determine when a storm water discharge from an oil or gas facility is "contaminated", and therefore subject to the permitting program under section 402 of the CWA. Many of the comments received from industry representatives objected to the Agency's intent as expressed in the proposal to use past discharges as a trigger for submitting permit applications.

The proposed rule provided that the notification requirements for releases in excess of RQs established under the CWA and CERCLA would serve as a

48029

basis for triggering the submittal of permit applications for storm water discharges from oil and gas facilities. As described in the proposal, oil and gas operations that have been required to notify authorities of the release of either oil or a hazardous substance via a storm water route would be required to submit a permit application. In other words, any facility required to provide notification of the release of an RQ of oil or a hazardous substance in storm water in the past would be required to apply for a storm water permit under the current rule. In addition, any facility required to provide notification regarding a release occurring from the effective date of today's rule forward would be required to apply for a storm water permit.

Commenters maintained that the use of historical discharges to require permit applications is inconsistent with the language and intent of section 402(1)(2) of the CWA, and relevant legislative history, both of which focus on present contamination. Requiring storm water permits based solely on the occurrence of past contaminated discharges, even where no present contamination is evident, would go beyond the statutory requirement that EPA not issue a permit absent a finding present contamination. Commenters also noted that the proposal did not take into account the fact that past problems leading to such releases may have been corrected, and that requiring an NPDES permit may no longer be necessary. The result of such a requirement, commenters maintained, would be an excessive number of unnecessary permit applications being submitted, at significant cost and minimal benefit to both regulated facilities and regulating authorities.

Commenters also indicated that using the release of reportable quantities of oil, grease or hazardous substances as a permit trigger would identify discharges of an isolated nature, rather than the continuous discharges, which should be the focus of the NPDES permit program under section 402. Such an approach. commenters maintained, is inconsistent with existing regulations under section 311 of the CWA, and would result in permit applications from facilities that are more appropriately regulated under section 311.

Despite these criticisms, many commenters recognized that the Agency is left with the task of determining when discharges from oil and gas facilities are contaminated, in order to regulate them under section 402(1)(2). It was suggested by numerous commenters that the EPA adopt an approach similar to that used under section 311 of the CWA for Spill **Prevention Control and Countermeasure**

(SPCC) Plans. Under SPCC. facilities that are likely to discharge oil into waters of the United States are required to maintain a SPCC plan. In the event the facility has a spill of 1,000 gallons or 2 or more reportable quantities of oil in a 12 month period, the facility is required to submit its SPCC plan to the Agency. The triggering events proposed by the commenters for storm water permits for oil and gas operations are six reportable sheens or discharges of hazardous substances (other than oil) in excess of section 311 or section 102 reportable quantities via a storm water point source route over any thirty-six month period. It was suggested that if this threshold is reached, an operator would then file a permit application for join a group application) based upon the presumption that its current storm water discharges are contaminated.

In response to these comments, the Agency believes that past releases that are reportable quantities can be a valid indicator of the potential for present. contamination of discharges. The legislative history as cited above supports this conclusion. EPA would note that the existence of a RQ release would serve only as a triggering mechanism for a permit application. Under the proposed rule, evidence of past contamination would merely require submission of a permit application and would not be used as conclusive evidence of current contamination. The determination as to whether a permit would be actually required due to current contaminated discharge would be made by the permitting authority after reviewing the permit application. The fact of a past RQ release does not necessarily imply a conclusive finding of contamination, only that sufficient potential for contamination exists to warrant a permit application or the collection of other further information. Today's rule does not change the proposed approach in this respect. Thus, EPA does not believe that today's rule exceeds the authority of section 402(1)(2).

EPA believes that there is no legal impediment to using past RQ discharges as a trigger for requiring a storm water permit application. EPA notes that, as mentioned above, even those commenters who objected to the proposed test on legal authority grounds merely offered an alternate test that requires more releases to have occurred within a shorter period of time before a permit application is required.

Therefore, the only disagreement that remains is over what constitutes a reasonable test that will identify facilities with the potential for storm

water contamination. EPA notes that neither the statute nor the legislative history provides any guidance on this question. Furthermore, EPA disagrees with the commenters who suggested that 6 releases in the past 3 years or 2 releases in the past year are necessarily more valid measures of the potential for current contamination than EPA's proposed test. There is no statistical or other basis for preferring one test to the other. However, EPA does agree with those commenters that suggest that a single release in the distant past may not accurately reflect current conditions and the current potential for contamination.

EPA has therefore amended today's rule to provide that only oil and gas facilities which have had a release of an RQ of oil or hazardous substances in storm water in the past three years will be required to submit a permit application. EPA believes that limiting the permit trigger to events of the past three years will address commenters' concerns regarding the use of "stale history" in determining whether an application is required. EPA notes that the three year cutoff is consistent with the requirement for industrial facilities to report significant leaks or spills at the facility in their storm water permit applications. See 40 CFR 122.26(c)(1)(i)(D)

Commenters asserted that EPA and the States must have some reasonable basis for concluding that a storm water discharge is contaminated before requiring permit applications or permits. Commenters believed that § 122.26(c)(1)(iii)(B) as proposed implied that the Agency's authority in this respect is unrestricted. In response, EPA may collect such data by whatever appropriate means the statute allows, in order to obtain information that a permit is required. Usually, the most practical tool for doing so is the permit application itself. However, if necessary to supplement the information made available to the Agency, EPA has broad authority to obtain information necessary to determine whether or not a permit is required, under section 308 of the Clean Water Act. Given the plain language of the CWA and the Congressional intent as manifested in the legislative history, the Agency is convinced that the approach described above is appropriate. Yet, as further discussed below, EPA has also deleted as redundant § 122.26(c)(1)(iii)(B)

Regarding the types of facilities included in the storm water regulation, a number of commenters suggested that the Agency has misconstrued the meaning of facilities "associated with

۰.

industrial activity", and has proposed an overly broad definition of such facilities in the oil and gas industry. Specifically, commenters suggested that only the manufacturing sector of the oil and gas industry should be subject to storm water permit application requirements. and that exploration and production activities, gas stations, terminals, and bulk plants should all be exempted from storm water permitting requirements. Commenters maintain that this broad interpretation would subject many oil and gas facilities to the storm water permit requirements, when these were not intended by Congress to be so regulated. As a second point related to this issue, some commenters felt that transmission facilities were not intended to be regulated under the storm water provisions, and should be exempted from permit requirements. This would be consistent, it was argued, with legislative history which concluded that transmission facilities do not significantly contribute to the contamination of water.

The Agency disagrees that these facilities do not fall under the storm water permitting requirements as envisioned by Congress. SIC 13, which is relied upon by EPA to identify these oil and gas operations, describes oil and gas extraction industries as including facilities related to crude oil and natural gas, natural gas liquids, drilling oil and gas wells, oil and gas exploration and field services. Moreover, legislative history as it applies to industrial activities, and thus to oil and gas (mining) operations, expressly includes exploration, production, processing, transmission, and treatment operations within the purview of storm water permitting requirements and exemptions. EPA's intent is for storm water permit requirements (and the exemption at hand) to apply to the activities listed above (exploration, production, processing, treatment, and transmission) as they relate to the categories listed in SIC 13.

Commenters requested clarification from the Agency that storm water discharges from oil and gas facilities require a permit or the filing of a permit application only when they are contaminated at the point of discharge into waters of the United States. Commenters noted that large amounts of potentially contaminated stormwater may not enter waters of the United States, or may enter at a point once the discharge is no longer "contaminated". In these cases, it should be clear that no permit or permit application is required.

EPA agrees that oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations or transmission facilities must only obtain a storm water permit when a discharge to waters of the U.S. (including those discharges through municipal separate storm sewers) is contaminated. A permit application will be required when any discharge in the past three years or henceforth meets the test discussed above.

Under the proposed rule, the Agency stated at § 122.26(c)(1)(iii)(B) that the Director may require on a case-by-case basis the operator of an existing or new storm water discharge from an oil or gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operation, or transmission facility to submit an individual permit application. The Agency has removed this section since CWA section 402(1)(2), as codified in 122.26(c)(1)(iii)(A), adequately addresses every situation where a permit should be required for these facilities.

b. Use of Reportable Quantities to Determine if a Storm Water Discharge from an Oil or Gas Operation is Contaminated. Section 311(b)(5) of the CWA requires reporting of certain discharges of oil or a hazardous substance into waters of the United States (see 44 FR 50766 (August 29, 1979)). Section 304(b)(4) of the Act requires that notification levels for oil and hazardous substances be set at quantities which may be harmful to the public health or welfare of the United States, including but not limited to fish, shellfish, wildlife, and public or private property, shorelines and beaches. Facilities which discharge oil or a hazardous substance in quantities equal to or in excess of an RQ, with certain exceptions, are required to notify the National Response Center (NRC)

Section 102 of CERCLA extended the reporting requirement for releases equal to or exceeding an RQ of a hazardous substance by adding chemicals to the list of hazardous substances, and by extending the reporting requirement (with certain exceptions) to any releases to the environment, not just those to waters of the United States.

Pursuant to section 311 of the CWA, EPA determined reportable quantities for discharges by correlating aquatic animal toxicity ranges with 5 reporting quantities, i.e., 1-, 10-, 100-, 1000-, and 5000- pounds per 24 hour period levels. Reportable quantity adjustments made under CERCLA rely on a different methodology. The strategy for adjusting reportable quantities begins with an evaluation of the intrinsic physical, chemical, and toxicological properties of each designated hazardous substance. The intrinsic properties examined, called "primary criteria," are aquatic toxicity, mammalian toxicity (oral, dermal, and inhalation), ignitability, reactivity, and chronic toxicity. In addition, substances that were identified as potential carcinogens have been evaluated for their relative activity as potential carcinogens. Each intrinsic property is ranked on a five-tier scale, associating a specific range of values on each scale with a particular reportable quantity value. After the primary criteria reportable quantities are assigned, the hazardous substances are further evaluated for their susceptibility to certain extrinsic degradation processes (secondary criteria). Secondary criteria consider whether a substance degrades relatively rapidly to a less harmful compound, and can be used to raise the primary criteria reportable quantity one level.

Also pursuant to section 311, EPA has developed a reportable quantity for oil and associated reporting requirements at 40 CFR part 110. These requirements, known as the oil sheen regulation, define the RQ for oil to be the amount of oil that violates applicable water quality standards or causes a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines or causes a sludge or emulsion to be deposited.

Reportable quantities developed under the CWA and CERCLA were not developed as effluent guideline limitations which establish allowable limits for pollutant discharges to surface waters. Rather, a major purpose of the notification requirements is to alert government officials to releases of hazardous substances that may require rapid response to protect public health, welfare, and the environment. Notification based on reportable quantities serves as a trigger for informing the government of a release so that the need for response can be evaluated and any necessary response undertaken in a timely fashion. The reportable quantities do not themselves represent any determination that releases of a particular quantity are actually harmful to public health, welfare, or the environment.

EPA requested comment on the use of RQs for determining contamination in discharges from oil and gas facilities. As noted above numerous commenters supported the concept of using reportable quantities under certain circumstances. Comments on the measurement of oil sheens for the purpose of triggering a permit application were divided. Some commented that it is much too stringent because the amount of oil creating a sheen may be a relatively small amount. Others viewed the test as a quick, easy, practical method that has been effective in the past.

In relying on the reporting requirements associated with releases in excess of ROs for oil or hazardous substances to trigger the submittal of permit applications for oil and gas operations, the Agency believes that the use of the reporting requirements for oil will be particularly useful. The Agency believes that the release of oil to a storm water discharge in amounts that cause an oil sheen is a good indicator of the potential for water quality impacts from storm water releases from oil and gas operations. In addition, given the extremely high number of such operations (the Agency estimates that there are over 750,000 oil wells alone in the United States), relying on the oil sheen test to determine if storm water discharges from such sites are "contaminated" will be a far easier test for operators to determine whether to file a storm water permit application than a test based on sampling. The detection of a sheen does not require sophisticated instrumentation since a sheen is easily perceived by visual observation. EPA agrees with those comments calling the oil sheen test an appropriate measure for triggering a storm water permit application. In adopting this approach, EPA recognizes, as pointed out by many commenters that an oil sheen can be created with a relatively small amount of oil.

One commenter suggested that contamination must be caused by contact with on-site material before being subject to permit application requirements. The Agency agrees with this comment. Those facilities that have had releases in excess of reportable quantities will generally have contamination from contact with on-site material as described in the CWA. Thus, use of the RQ test is an appropriate trigger. As discussed above, determination of whether contamination is present to warrant issuance of a permit will be made in the context of the permit proceeding.

One commenter believed that the use of RQs is inappropriate because "the statute intended to exempt only oil and gas runoff that is not contaminated at all." The Agency wishes to clarify that reportable quantities are being used to determine what facilities need to file permit applications and to describe what is meant by the term

"contaminated." The Director may require a permit for any discharges of storm water runoff contaminated by contact with any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, by product or waste product at the site of such operations. The use of RQs is solely a mechanism for identifying the facilities most likely to need a storm water permit consistent with the legislative history of section 402(l)(2).

c. Mining Operations. The December 7, 1988 proposal would establish background levels as the standard used to define when a storm water discharge from a mining operation is contaminated. When a storm water discharge from a mining site was found to contain pollutants at levels that exceed background levels, the owner or operator of the site was required to submit a permit application for that operation. The proposal was founded upon language in the legislative history stating that the determination of whether storm water is contaminated by contact with overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste products "shall take into consideration whether these materials are present in such stormwater runoff . . . above natural background levels". [Vol. 132 Cong. Rec. H10574 (daily ed. Oct. 15, 1986) Conference Report].

Comments received on this component of the rule suggested that background levels of pollutants would be very difficult to calculate due to the complex topography frequently encountered in alpine mining regions. For example, if a mine is located in a mountain valley surrounded on all sides by hills, the site will have innumerable slopes feeding flow towards it. Under such circumstances, determining how the background level is set would prove impractical. Commenters indicated that it is very difficult to measure or determine background levels at sites where mining has occurred for prolonged periods. In many instances, data on original background levels may not be available due to long-term site activity. As a result, any background level established will vary based on the type and level of previous activity. In addition, mining sites typically have background levels that are naturally distinct from the surrounding areas. This is due to the geologic characteristics that makes them valuable as mining sites to begin with. This also makes it difficult to establish accurate background levels.

Because of these concerns EPA has decided to drop the use of background levels as a measure for determining whether a permit application is required. Accordingly, a permit application will be required when discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations come into contact with any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product located on the site. Similar to the RQ test for oil and gas operations, EPA intends to use the "contact" test solely as a permit application trigger. The determination of whether a mining operation's runoff is contaminated will be made in the context of the permit issuance proceedings.

If the owner or operator determines that no storm water runoff comes into contact with overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste products, then there is no obligation to file a permit application. This framework is consistent with the statutory provisions of section 402(1)(2) and is intended to encourage each mining site to adopt the best possible management controls to prevent such contact.

Several commenters stated that EPA's use of total pollutant loadings for determining permit applicability is not consistent with the general framework of the NPDES program. Their concern is that such evaluation criteria depart from how the NPDES program has been administered in the past, based on concentration limits. In addition, commenters requested that EPA clarify that information on mass loading will be used for determining the need for a permit only. Since the analysis of natural background levels as a basis for a permit application has been dropped from this rulemaking, these issues are moot.

Commenters noted that the proposed rule did not specify what impact this rulemaking has on the storm water exemptions in 40 CFR 440.131. The commenters recommended not changing any of these provisions. Some commenters indicated that mining facilities that have NPDES permits should not be subject to additional permitting under the storm water rule. EPA does not intend that today's rule have any effect on the conditional exemptions in 40 CFR 440.131. Where a facility has an overflow or excess discharge of process-related effluent due to stormwater runoff, the conditional exemptions in 40 CFR 440.131 remain available.

Several commenters note that the term overburden, as used in the context of the proposed storm water rule, is not defined and recommended that this term should be defined to delineate the scope of the regulation. EPA agrees that the term overburden should be defined to help properly define the scope the storm water rule. In today's rule, the term

overburden has been clarified to mean any material of any nature overlying a mineral deposit that is removed to gain access to that deposit, excluding topsoil or similar naturally-occurring surface materials that are not disturbed by mining operations. This definition is patterned after the overburden definition in SMCRA, and is designed to exclude undisturbed lands from permit coverage as industrial activity. However, the definition provided in this regulation may be revised at a later date, to achieve consistency with the promulgation of RCRA Subtitle D mining waste regulations in the future.

Numerous commenters raised issues pertaining to the inclusion of inactive mining areas as subject to the stormwater rule. Some commenters indicated that including inactive mine operations in the rule would create an unreasonable hardship on the industry. EPA has included inactive mining areas in today's rule because some mining sites represent a significant source of contaminated stormwater runoff. EPA has clarified that inactive mining sites are those that are no longer being actively mined, but which have an identifiable owner/operator. The rule also clarifies that active and inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined materials, nor sites where minimal activities required for the sole purpose of maintaining the mining claim are undertaken. The Agency would clarify that claims on land where there has been past extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mining materials, but there is currently no active mining are considered inactive sites. However, in such cases the exclusion discussed above for uncontaminated discharges will still apply.

EPA's definition of active and inactive mining operations also excludes those areas which have been reclaimed under SMCRA or, for non-coal mining operations, under similar applicable State or Federal laws. EPA believes that, as a general matter, areas which have undergone reclamation pursuant to such laws have concluded all industrial activity in such a way as to minimize contact with overburden, mine products, etc. EPA and NPDES States, of course, retain the authority to designate particular reclaimed areas for permit coverage under section 402(p)(2)(E).

The proposed rule had included an exemption for areas which have been reclaimed under SMCRA, although the language of the proposed rule inadvertently identified the wrong universe of coal mining areas. The final rule language has been revised to clarify that areas which have been reclaimed under SMCRA (and thus are no longer subject to 40 CFR part 434 subpart E) are not subject to today's rule. Today's rule thus is consistent with the coal mining effluent guideline in its treatment of areas reclaimed under SMCRA.

In response to comments, EPA has also expanded this concept to exclude from coverage as industrial activity noncoal mines which are released from similar State or Federal reclamation requirements on or after the effective date of this rule. EPA believes it is appropriate, however, to require permit coverage for contaminated runoff from inactive non-coal mines which may have been subject to reclamation regulations. but which have been released from those requirements prior to today's rule. EPA does not have sufficient evidence to suggest that each State's previous reclamation rules and/or Federal requirements, if applicable, were necessarily effective in controlling future storm water contamination.

8. Application Requirements for Construction Activities

As discussed above, EPA has included storm water discharges from activities involving construction operations that result in the disturbance of five acres total land in the regulatory definition of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity.

This is a departure from the proposed rule which required permit applications for discharges from activities involving construction operations that result in the disturbance of less than one acre total land area and (which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale; or operations that are for single family residential projects, including duplexes, triplexes, or quadruplexes, that result in the disturbance of less than five acre total land areas and which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale). The reasons for this change are noted below.

Many commenters representing municipalities, States, and industry requested that clearing, grading, and excavation activities not be included in the definition of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. It was suggested that EPA delay including construction activities until after the studies mandated in section 402(p)(5) of the CWA are completed. Other commenters felt that NPDES permits are not appropriate for construction discharges due to their short term, intermediate and seasonal nature. Another commenter felt that only the construction activities on the sites of the industrial facilities identified in the other subsections of the definition of "associated with industrial activity" should be included.

EPA believes that storm water permits are appropriate for the construction industry for several reasons. Construction activity at a high level of intensity is comparable to other activity that is traditionally viewed as industrial, such as natural resource extraction. Construction that disturbs large tracts of land will involve the use of heavy equipment such as bulldozers, cranes, and dump trucks. Construction activity frequently employs dynamite and/or other equipment to eliminate trees. bedrock, rockwork, and to fill or level land. Such activities also engage in the installation of haul roads, drainage systems, and holding ponds that are typical of the industrial activity identified in § 122.26(b)(14)(i-x). EPA cannot reasonably place such activity in the same category as light commercial or retail business.

Further, the runoff generated while construction activities are occurring has potential for serious water quality impacts and reflects an activity that is industrial in nature. Where construction activities are intensive, the localized impacts of water quality may be severe because of high unit loads of pollutants, primarily sediments. Construction sites can also generate other pollutants such as phosphorus, nitrogen and nutrients from fertilizer, pesticides, petroleum products, construction chemicals and solid wastes. These materials can be toxic to aquatic organisms and degrade water for drinking and water-contact recreation. Sediment runoff rates from construction sites are typically 10 to 20 times that of agricultural lands, with runoff rates as high as 100 times that of agricultural lands, and 1,000 to 2,000 times that of forest lands. Even small construction sites may have a significant negative impact on water quality in localized areas. Over a short period of time, construction sites can contribute more sediment to streams than was previously deposited over several decades.

EPA is convinced that because of the impacts of construction discharges that are directly to waters of the United States, such discharges should be addressed by permits issued by Federal or NPDES State permitting authorities. It is evident from numerous studies and reports submitted under section 319 of the CWA that discharges from construction sites continue to be a major source of water quality problems and water quality standard violations. Accordingly EPA is compelled to address these source under these regulations and thereby regulate these sources under a nationally consistent program with an appropriate level of enforcement and oversight.

Techniques to prevent or control pollutants in storm water discharges from construction are well developed and understood. A primary control technique is good site planning. A combination of nonstructural and structural best management practices are typically used on construction sites. **Relatively inexpensive nonstructural** vegetative controls, such as seeding and mulching, are effective control techniques. In some cases, more expensive structural controls may be necessary, such as detention basins or diversions. The most efficient controls result when a comprehensive storm water management system is in place. Another reason that EPA has decided to address this class of discharges is that it is part of the Agency's recent emphasis on pollution prevention. Studies such as NURP indicate that it is much more cost effective to develop measures to prevent or reduce pollutants in storm water during new development than it is to correct there problems later on. Many of these prevention and control practices, which can take the form of grading patterns as well as other controls, generally remain in place after the construction activities are completed.

a. Permit Application Requirements. In today's rulemaking, EPA has set forth distinct permit application requirements for these construction activities, at § 122.26(c)(1)(ii), to be used where general permits to be developed and promulgated by EPA are inapplicable. Such facilities will be required to provide a map indicating the site's location and the name of the receiving water and a narrative description of:

• The nature of the construction activity;

• The total area of the site and the area of the site that is expected to undergo excavation during the life of the permit;

• Proposed measures, including best management practices, to control pollutants in storm water discharges during construction, including a description of applicable Federal requirements and State or local erosion and sediment control requirements;

• Proposed measures to control pollutants in storm water discharges that will occur after construction operations have been completed, including a description of applicable State or local requirements, and

• An estimate of the runoff coefficient (fraction of total rainfall that will appear

as runoff) of the site and the increase in impervious area after the construction addressed in the permit application is completed, a description of the nature of fill material and existing data describing the soil or the quality of the discharge.

Permit application requirements for construction activities do not include the submission of quantitative data. EPA believes that the changing nature of construction activities at a site to be covered by the permit application requirements generally would not be adequately described by quantitative data. The comments received by EPA support this determination. One State commented that a program they instituted has been based on quantitative data for the past 10 years and has proven to be very awkward, even unworkable.

Twenty commenters responded to the issue of appropriate construction site application deadlines including: Three towns (<100.000 population); one medium municipality; one large municipality; one agency associated with a large municipality; three agencies associated counties; three agencies associated counties; three agencies five industrial associations; and one private organization representing industry. The commenters primarily focused on actual deadlines and permitting authority response time.

Applicants for permits to discharge storm water into the waters of the United States from a construction site would normally be required to submit permits in the same time frame as new sources and new discharges. This rulemaking requires permit applications from such sources to be submitted at least 180 days prior to the date on which the discharge is to commence. Four commenters agreed with the application deadline of 180 days prior to commencement of discharge. Three commenters felt it would be difficult to apply 180 days prior to when the discharge was to begin. Three commenters recommended shortening the time period to 90 days. Numerous other commenters were concerned over delays during the permitting authority's review of the permit application. The commenters requested that a maximum response time be set in the regulation. Suggested maximum response times. were 90 and 30 days.

In response to these comments, EPA has changed the application deadline for construction permits from at least 180 days prior to discharge to at least 90 days prior to the date when construction is to commence. This change reflects EPA's recognition of the nature of construction operations in that developers/builders may not be aware of projects 180 days before they are scheduled to begin.

Numerous commenters expressed concern over who should be responsible for applying for the permit. Two commenters felt the owner should be responsible so that construction bid documents can include the storm water management requirements and to avoid confusion among multiple subcontractors. One commenter thought that either the owner/developer, or general contractor should be responsible. Another commenter suggested that the designer should obtain the permit which would allow all necessary erosion controls to be part of the project plan. Several commenters requested that the responsibility simply be more clearly defined.

In response to these comments, EPA would clarify that the operator will generally be responsible for submitting the permit application. Under existing regulations at § 122.21(b), when a facility is owned by one person but operated by another, then it is the duty of the operator to apply for the permit. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, EPA believes that the operator is the most appropriate person to be responsible for both short and long term best management practices included on the site. EPA considers the term "operator" to include a general contractor, who would generally be familiar enough with the site to prepare the application or to ensure that the site would be in compliance with the permit requirements. General contractors, in many cases, will often be on site coordinating the operation among his/ her staff and any subcontractors. Furthermore, the operator/general contractor would be much more familiar with construction site operations than the owner and should be involved in the site planning from its initial stages. The application requirements in today's rule are designed to provide flexibility in developing controls to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges from construction sites. A significant aspect to this is the role of State and local authorities in control of construction storm water discharges. Sixty-three commenters addressed the question of what the role of State and local authorities should be. Most of these commenters supported local government control of construction discharges and that qualified State programs should satisfy Federal requirements.

Many commenters representing municipalities, States, and industry, felt that local government should have full control over construction storm water

discharges, either under existing programs or those required by their municipal permit. EPA agrees with these comments as far as discharges through municipal storm sewers are concerned. EPA is requiring municipalities that are required to submit municipal permit applications under this regulation to describe their program for controlling storm water discharges from construction activities into their separate storm sewers. It is envisioned that municipalities will have primary responsibility over these discharges through NPDES municipal storm water permits. However, EPA also plans to cover such discharges under general permits to be promulgated in the near future.

In response to several comments that the regulation should provide flexibility for qualified State programs to satisfy Federal requirements, the application requirements recognize that many States have implemented erosion and sediment control programs. The permit application requires a brief description of these programs. This is intended to ensure consistency between NPDES permit requirements and other State controls. Permit applicants will be in the best position to pass on this site-specific information to the permitting authority. States or Federal NPDES authorities will have the ability to exercise authority over these discharges as will other State and local authorities responsible for construction. EPA envisions NPDES permitting efforts will be coordinated with any existing programs.

The proposed rule requested comments on appropriate measures to reduce pollutants in construction site runoff. Numerous commenters representing municipalities, States, and industry responded. Some commenters recommended specific best management practices (BMPs) whereas others suggested ways in which the measures should be incorporated into the program. One commenter suggested that EPA establish design and performance standards for appropriate BMPs. One State commenter recommended requiring a schedule or sequence for use of BMPs. A municipality suggested developing guidance on erosion control at construction sites and disseminating the guidance to educate contractors and construction workers in proper erosion control techniques. The Agency is continuing to review these recommendations for the purposes of permit development and issuance.

Another commenter suggested that further research be done to determine the effectiveness of particular BMPs in reducing pollutants in construction site runoff. EPA agrees that more research and studies can be undertaken to develop methodologies for more effective storm water controls and will continue to lookat these concerns pursuant to section 402(p)(5) studies. However, EPA is convinced that enough information, technology, and proven BMP's are available to address these discharges in this regulation.

Specific BMPs suggested by the commenters include: wheel washing; locked exit roadways, street cleaning methods which exclude sheet washing; clearing and grading codes; construction standards; riparian corridors; solids retention basins; soil erosion barriers; selected excavation; adequate collection systems; vegetate disturbed areas; proper application of fertilizers; proper equipment storage; use of straw bales and filter fabrics; and use of diversions. to reduce effective length of slopes. EPA is continuing to evaluate these suggestions for developing appropriate permit conditions for construction activity.

b. Administrative Burdens. Many commenters representing municipalities, States, and industry commented on the administrative burdens of individually permitting each construction site discharging to waters of the United States. The extensive use of general permits for storm water discharges from construction activities that are subject to NPDES requirements is anticipated to minimize administrative delays associated with permit issuance. Many commenters strongly endorsed extensive use of general permits. In addition the Agency will provide as much assistance as possible for developing appropriate permit conditions.

Many commenters responded to the use of acreage limits in determining which construction sites are required to submit a permit application, including several cities, counties and States. Some commenters generally supported the use of an acre limit. Many commenters suggested increasing the acreage limit. Several suggested using a five acre limit for both residential and nonresidential development. Others suggested greater acreage as the cutoff. Two commenters concurred with the proposed limit of one acre/five acres and one commenter suggested lowering the residential limit to one acre.

Other factors were suggested as a means to create a cutoff for requiring permit applications. Several commenters suggested exempting construction that would be completed with a certain time frame, such as construction of less than 12 months. EPA believes that this is

inappropriate because some construction can be intensive and expansive, but nonetheless take place over a short period of time, such as a parking lot. One commenter suggested basing the limit on the quantity of soil moved, i.e., cubic yards. In response, this approach would not be particularly helpful since removal of soil will not necessarily relate to the amount of land surface disturbed and exposed to the elements. Another commenter suggested that where there is single family detached housing construction that should trigger applications as well as the proposed acreage limit. This would not be appropriate since EPA is attempting to focus only on those construction activities that resemble industrial activity. After considering these and similar comments EPA has limited the definition of "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity" by exempting from the definition those construction operations that result in the disturbance of less than five acres of total land area which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale. In considering the appropriate scope of the definition of storm water discharge associated with industrial activity as it relates to construction activities, EPA recognized that a wide variety of factors can affect the water quality impacts associated with construction site runoff, including the quality of receiving waters, the size of the area disturbed, soil conditions, seasonal rainfall patterns, the slope of area disturbed, and the intensity of construction activities. These factors will be considered by the permit writer when issuing the permit. However, as noted above, EPA views such sitespecific factors to be too difficult to define in a regulatory framework that is national in scope. For example, attempting to adjust permit application triggers based upon a myriad of regional rainfall patterns is not a practical solution. However, permit conditions adjusted for specific geographical areas may be appropriate.

Under the December 7, 1988, proposal the definition of industrial activity exempted: construction operations that resulted in the disturbance of less than one acre total land area which was not part of a larger common plan of development or sale; or operations for single family residential projects, including duplexes, triplexes, or quadruplexes, that result in the disturbance of less than five acre total land areas which were not part of a larger common plan of development or sale. EPA distinguished between single family residential development and other commercial development because other commercial development is more likely to occur in more densely developed areas. Also, it was reasoned that other commercial development provides a more complete opportunity to develop controls that remain in place after the construction activity is completed, since continued maintenance after the permit has expired, is more feasible.

However, EPA has decided to depart from the proposal and use an unqualified five acre area in today's final rule. This limit has been selected. in part, because of administrative concerns. EPA recognizes that State and local sediment and erosion controls may address construction activities disturbing less five acres for residential development; the five acre limit in today's rule is not intended to supersede more stringent State or local sediment and erosion controls. In light of the comments, EPA is convinced that the acreage limit is appropriate for identifying sites that are amount to industrial activity. Several comments suggested higher acreage limits without giving a supporting rationale except administrative concerns. Several commenters agreed that the five acre limit is suitable, but again without specifying why they agreed. EPA is convinced, however, that the acreage limits as finalized in today's rule reflect an earth disturbance and/or removal effort that is industrial in magnitude. Disturbances on large tracts of land will employ more heavy machinery and industrial equipment for removing vegetation and bedrock.

For construction facilities that are not included in the definition of storm water discharge associated with industrial activity, EPA will consider the appropriate procedures and methods to reduce pollutants in construction site runoff under the studies authorized by section 402(p)(5) of the CWA. EPA will also consider under section 402(p)(5) appropriate procedures and methods during post-construction for maintaining structural controls developed pursuant to NPDES permits issued for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from construction sites.

Numerous commenters requested clarification as to whether permits for storm water discharges from construction activities at an industrial facility are required. EPA is requiring permits for all storm water discharges from construction activities where the land disturbed meets the requirements established in § 122.26(b)(14)(x) and which discharge into waters of the United States. The location of the construction activity or the ultimate land use at the site does not factor into the analysis.

G. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

1. Municipal Separate Storm Sewers

Today's rule defines "municipal separate storm sewer" at § 122.26(b)(8) to include any conveyance or system of conveyances that is owned or operated by a State or local government entity and is designed for collecting and conveying storm water which is not part of a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) as defined at 40 CFR 122.2. It is important to note that today's permit application requirements for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more do not apply to discharges from combined sewers (systems designed as both a sanitary sewer and a storm sewer). For purposes of calculating whether a municipal separate storm sewer system meets the large or medium population criteria, a municipality may petition to have the population served by a combined sewer deducted from the total population. Section 122.26(f) of today's rule describes this procedure.

EPA requested comments on whether different language for the definition of municipal separate storm sewer would clarify responsibility under the NPDES permit system. Comments were also requested on whether the definition needed to be clarified by explicitly stating that municipal streets and roads with drainage systems (curb and gutter, ditches, etc.) are part of the municipal storm sewer system, and that the owners or operators of such roads are responsible for such discharges. Numerous comments were received by EPA on this issue. Some commenters questioned whether road culverts and road ditches were municipal separate storm sewers, while others specifically recommended that further clarifying language should be added so that owners and operators of roads and streets understand that they are covered by this regulation. In light of these comments, EPA has clarified that municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains that discharge into the waters of the United States are municipal separate storm sewers. One commenter asked if "other wastes" in the proposed definition of municipal separate storm sewer (40 CFR 122.26 (b)(8)(i)) included storm water. In response, EPA has added "storm water" to this definition in order to clarify that the rule addresses such systems.

EPA requested comments on whether legal classifications such as "storm sewers that are not private (e.g.-public, district or joint district sewers)" would provide a clearer definition of municipal separate storm sewer than an owner or operator criterion, especially for the purpose of determining responsibility under the NPDES program. Most commenters agreed that the owner/ operator concept, and the additional language noted above, is sufficient for this purpose. EPA also requested comments on to what extent the owner/ operator concept should apply to municipal governments with land-use authority over lands which contribute storm water runoff to the municipal storm sewer system, and how the responsibility should be clarified. In response to comments on this point, EPA has addressed these concerns in the context of clarifying what municipal entities are responsible for applying for a permit covering storm water discharges from municipal systems in section VI.H. below.

One commenter expressed a desire for clarification as to whether conveyances that were once used for the conveyance of storm water, but are no longer used in that manner, are covered by the definition. EPA emphasizes that this rulemaking only addresses conveyances that are part of a separate storm sewer system that discharges storm water into waters of the United States.

One-commenter stated that if EPA intends to regulate roadside collection systems then EPA must repropose since these were not considered by the public. EPA disagrees with this comment since one of the options specifically addressed the inclusion of roadside drainage systems and roads in the definition of municipal separate storm sewer system. In addition, the public recognized the issue in comments on the proposal. EPA would note that several commenters specifically endorsed EPA's inclusion of these conveyances.

2. Effective Prohibition on Non-Storm Water Discharges

Section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) of the amended CWA requires that permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers. Based on the legislative history of section 405 of the WQA, EPA does not interpret the effective prohibition on non-storm water discharges to municipal separate storm sewers to apply to discharges that are not composed entirely of storm water, as long as such discharge has been issued a separate NPDES permit. Rather, an "effective prohibition" would require separate NPDES permits for non-storm water discharges to municipal storm sewers. In many cases in the past, applicants for NPDES permits for process wastewaters and other nonstorm water discharges have been granted approval to discharge into municipal separate storm sewers, provided that the permit conditions for the discharge are met at the point where the discharge enters into the separate storm sewer. Permits for such discharges must meet applicable technology-based and water-quality based requirements of Sections 402 and 301 of the CWA. If the permit for a non-storm water discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer contains water-quality based limitations, then such limitations should generally be based on meeting applicable water quality standards at the boundary of a State established mixing zone (for States with mixing zones) located in the receiving waters of the United States.

All options will be considered when an applicant applies for a NPDES permit for a non-storm water discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer. In some cases, permits will be denied for discharges to storm sewers that are causing water quality problems in receiving waters. However, not all discharges present such problems; and in these cases EPA or State permit writers may allow such discharges to municipal separate storm sewers within appropriate permit limits.

Today's rule has two permit application requirements that are designed to begin implementation of the effective prohibition. The first requirement discussed in VI.H.6.a., below, addresses a screening analysis which is intended to provide sufficient information to develop priorities for a program to detect and remove illicit discharges. The second provision, discussed in VI.H.7.b., requires municipal applicants to develop a recommended site-specific management plan to detect and remove illicit discharges (or ensure they are covered by an NPDES permit) and to control improper disposal to municipal separate storm sewer systems.

Several commenters suggested that either the definition of "storm water" should include some additional classes of nonprecipitation sources, or that municipalities should not be held responsible for "effectively prohibiting" some classes of nonstorm water discharges into their municipal storm sewers. The various types of discharges addressed by these comments include detention and retention reservoir releases, water line flushing, fire hydrant flushing, runoff from fire fighting, swimming pool drainage and discharge, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, uncontaminated pumped ground water, rising ground water, discharges from potable water sources, uncontaminated waters from cooling towers, foundation drains, non-contact cooling water (such as heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC) water that POTWs require to be discharged to separate storm sewers rather than sanitary sewers), irrigation water, springs, roofdrains, water from crawl space pumps, footing drains, lawn watering, individual car washing, flows from riparian habitats and wetlands. Most of these comments were made with regard to the concern that these were commonly occurring discharges which did not pose significant environmental problems.

EPA disagrees that the above described flows will not pose, in every case, significant environmental problems. At the same time, it is unlikely Congress intended to require municipalities to effectively prohibit individual car washing or discharges resulting from efforts to extinguish a building fire and other seemingly innocent flows that are characteristic of human existence in urban environments and which discharge to municipal separate storm sewers. It should be noted that the legislative history is essentially silent on this point. Accordingly, EPA is clarifying that section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA (which requires permits for municipal separate storm sewers to 'effectively' prohibit non-storm water discharges) does not require permits for municipalities to prohibit certain discharges or flows of nonstorm water to waters of the United States through municipal separate storm sewers in all cases. Accordingly, § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1) states that the proposed management program shall include: "A description of a program, including inspections, to implement and enforce an ordinance, orders or similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system; the program description shall address the following categories of non-storm water discharges or flows only where such discharges are identified by the municipality as sources of pollutants to waters of the United States: Water line flushing, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, rising ground waters, uncontaminated ground water infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)) to separate storm sewers, uncontaminated pumped ground water discharges from potable water sources,

foundation drains, air conditioning condensation, irrigation water, springs, water from crawl space pumps, footing drains, lawn watering, individual residential car washing, flows from riparian habitats and wetlands, dechlorinated swimming pool discharges, and street wash waters. Program descriptions shall address discharges from fire fighting only where such discharges or flows are identified as significant sources of pollutants to waters of the United States."

However, the Director may include permit conditions that either require municipalities to prohibit or otherwise control any of these types of discharges where appropriate. In the case of fire fighting it is not the intention of these rules to prohibit in any circumstances the protection of life and public or private property through the use of water or other fire retardants that flow into separate storm sewers. However, there may be instances where specified management practices are appropriate where these flows do occur (controlled blazes are one example).

Conveyances which continue to accept other "non-storm water" discharges (e.g. discharges without an NPDES permit) with the exceptions noted above do not meet the definition of municipal separate storm sewer and are not subject to section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA unless the non-storm water discharges are issued separate NPDES permits. Instead, conveyances which continue to accept non-storm water discharges which have not been issued separate NPDES permits are subject to sections 301 and 402 of the CWA. For example, combined sewers which convey storm water and sanitary sewage are not separate storm sewers and must comply with permit application requirements at 40 CFR 122.21 as well as other regulatory criteria for combined sewers.

3. Site-Specific Storm Water Quality Management Programs for Municipal Systems

Section 402(p)(3)(iii) of the CWA mandates that permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewers shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), including management practices, control techniques and systems, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Director determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.

When enacting this provision, Congress was aware of the difficulties in regulating discharges from municipal separate storm sewers solely through traditional end-of-pipe treatment and intended for EPA and NPDES States to develop permit requirements that were much broader in nature than requirements which are traditionally found in NPDES permits for industrial process discharges or POTWs. The legislative history indicates, municipal storm sewer system "permits will not necessarily be like industrial discharge permits. Often, an end-of-the-pipe treatment technology is not appropriate for this type of discharge." [Vol. 132 Cong. Rec. S16425 (daily ed. Oct. 16, 1986)).

A shift towards comprehensive storm water quality management programs to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewer systems is appropriate for a number of reasons. First, discharges from municipal storm sewers are highly intermittent, and are usually characterized by very high flows occurring over relatively short time intervals. For this reason, municipal storm sewer systems are usually designed with an extremely high number of outfalls within a given municipality to reduce potential flooding. Traditional end-of-pipe controls are limited by the materials management problems that arise with high volume, intermittent flows occurring at a large number of outfalls. Second, the nature and extent of pollutants in discharges from municipal systems will depend on the activities occurring on the lands which contribute runoff to the system. Municipal separate storm sewers tend to discharge runoff drained from lands used for a wide variety of activities. Given the material management problems associated with end-of-pipe controls, management programs that are directed at pollutant sources are often more practical than relying solely on end-of-pipe controls.

In past rulemakings, much of the criticism of the concept of subjecting discharges from municipal separate storm sewers to the NPDES permit program focused on the perception that the rigid regulatory program applied to industrial process waters and effluents from publicly owned treatment works was not appropriate for the site-specific nature of the sources which are responsible for the discharge of pollutants from municipal storm sewers.

The water quality impacts of discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems depend on a wide range of factors including: The magnitude and duration of rainfall events, the time period between events, soil conditions, the fraction of land that is impervious to rainfall, land use

activities, the presence of illicit connections, and the ratio of the storm water discharge to receiving water flow. In enacting section 405 of the WQA, Congress recognized that permit requirements for municipal separate storm sewer systems should be developed in a flexible manner to allow site-specific permit conditions to reflect the wide range of impacts that can be associated with these discharges. The legislative history accompanying the provision explained that "[p]ermits for discharges from municipal separate stormwater systems * * * must include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into storm sewers and controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. * * * These controls may be different in different permits. All types of controls listed in subsection [[p](3)[C]] are not required to be incorporated into each permit" [Vol. 132 Cong. Rec. HI0576 (daily ed. October 15, 1986) Conference Report]. Consistent with the intent of Congress, this rule sets out permit application requirements that are sufficiently flexible to allow the development of site-specific permit conditions.

Several commenters agreed with this approach. One municipality recommended that there be as much flexibility as possible so that the permitting authority can work with each municipality in developing meaningful long-term goals with plans for improving storm water quality. This commenter noted that too many specific regulations that apply nationwide do not take into consideration the climatic and governmental differences within the States. EPA agrees that as much flexibility as possible should be incorporated into the program. However, flexibility should not be built into the program to such an extent that all municipalities do not face essentially the same responsibilities and commitment for achieving the goals of the CWA. EPA believes that these final regulations build in substantial flexibility in designing programs that meet particular needs, without abandoning a nationally consistent structure designed to create storm water control programs.

4. Large and Medium Municipal Storm Sewer Systems

During the 1987 reauthorization of the CWA, Congress established a framework for EPA to implement a permit program for municipal separate storm sewers and establishing phased deadlines for its implementation. The amended CWA establishes priorities for EPA to develop permit application requirements and issue permits for discharges from three classes of municipal separate storm sewer systems. The CWA requires that NPDES permits be issued for discharges from large municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of more than 250.000) by no later than February 4, 1991. Permits for discharges from medium municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of more than 100.000, but less than 250,000) must be issued by February 4, 1992. After October 1, 1992, the requirements of sections 301 and 402 of the CWA are restored for all other discharges from municipal separate storm sewers.

The priorities established in the Act are based on the size of the population served by the system. Municipal operators of these systems are generally thought to be more capable of initiating storm water programs and discharges from municipal separate storm sewers serving larger populations are thought to present a higher potential for contributing to adverse water quality impacts. NURP and other studies have verified that the event mean concentration of pollutants in urban runoff from residential and commercial areas remains relatively constant from one area to another, indicating that pollutant loads from urban runoff strongly depend on the total area and imperviousness of developed land, which in turn is related to population.

The term "municipal separate storm sewer system" is not defined by the Act. By not defining the term, Congress intended to provide EPA discretion to define the scope of municipal systems consistent with the objectives of developing site-specific management programs in NPDES permits. EPA considered two key issues in defining the scope of municipal separate storm sewer system: (1) What is a reasonable definition of the term "system," and (2) how to determine the number of people "served" by a storm sewer system. EPA found these two issues to be intertwined. Different approaches to defining the scope of a system allowed for greater or lesser certainty in deterining the population served by the system.

In the December 7, 1988, proposal, EPA described seven options for defining "municipal separate storm sewer system." In developing these options the EPA considered:

 The inter-jurisdiction complexities associated with municipal governments;
The fact that many municipal storm water management programs have traditionally focused on water quantity concerns, and have not evaluated water quality impacts of system discharges or developed measures to reduce pollutants in such discharges;

• The advantages of developing system-wide storm water management programs for municipal systems;

• The geographic basis necessary for planning of comprehensive management programs to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers to the maximum extent practicable;

• The geographic basis necessary to provide flexibility to target controls on areas where water quality impacts associated with discharges from municipal systems are the greatest and to provide an opportunity to develop cost effective controls;

• The need to establish a reasonable number of permits for municipal systems during the initial phases of program development that will provide an adequate basis for a storm water quality management program for over 13,000 municipalities after the October 1, 1992 general prohibition on storm water permits expires; and

• Congressional intent to allow the development of jurisdiction-wide, comprehensive storm water management programs with priorities given to the most heavily populated areas of the country.

a. Overview of Proposed Options and Comments. The December 7, 1988. proposal requested comment on seven options for defining large and medium municipal separate storm sewer system. With the addition of a watershed-based approach suggested by certain commenters, eight options or approaches were addressed by the over 200 commenters on this issue: Option 1-systems owned or operated by incorporated places augmented by integrated discharges; Option 2systems owned or operated by incorporated places augmented with significant other municipal discharges; Option 3-systems owned or operated by counties; Option 4—systems owned and operated by States or State departments of transportation; Option 5--systems within the boundaries of an incorporated place; Option 6—systems within the boundaries of counties; Option 7---systems in census designated urbanized areas; and Option 8---systems defined by watershed boundaries.

Generally, these options can be classified into two categories. The first category of options, Options 1, 2 and 3, define municipal systems in terms of the municipal entity which owns or operates storm sewers within municipal boundaries of the requisite population. The second category of options would define municipal systems on a geographic basis. Under Options 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 all municipal separate storm sewers within the specified geographic area would be part of the municipal system, regardless of which municipal entity owns or operates the storm sewer. EPA did not propose to define the scope of a municipal separate storm sewer system in engineering terms because of practical problems determining the boundaries of and the populations served by "systems" defined in such a manner. In addition an engineering approach based on physical interconnections of storm sewer pipes by itself does not provide a rational basis for developing a storm water program to improve water quality where a large number of individual storm water catchments are found within a municipality.

In the December 7, 1988, proposal, EPA favored those options that relied primarily on the municipal entity which owns or operates or otherwise has jurisdiction over storm sewers. These options were preferred because it was anticipated that the administrative complexities of developing the permit programs would be reduced by decreasing the number of affected municipal entities. However, most commenters were not satisfied that such an approach would reduce administrative burdens or complexities.

The diversity of arguments and rationales offered in comments justifying the selection of particular option, or combinations thereof, were generally a function of geographic, climatic, and institutional differences around the country. As such, there was little substantive agreement with how this program should be implemented as far as defining large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. Of all the options, Option 1 generally received the most favorable comment. However, the overwhelming majority of comments suggested different options or other alternatives. Having reviewed the comments at length, EPA is convinced that the definition of municipal separate storm sewers should possess elements of several of the options enumerated above and a mechanism that enables States or EPA Regions to define a system that best suits their various political and geographical conditions.

The following comments were the most pervasive, and represent those issues and concerns of greatest importance to the public: (1) The approach chosen initially must be realistic and achievable administratively; (2) the definition must be flexible enough to accommodate

development of the program on a watershed basis, and incorporate elements of existing programs and frameworks and regional differences in climate, geography, and political institutions; (3) permittees must have legal authority and control over land use: (4) discharges from State highways, identified as a significant source of runoff and pollutants, should be included in the program and combined in some manner with one or more of the other options; (5) the definition should address how the inclusion of interrelated discharges into the municipal separate storm sewer system are timed, decided upon, dealt with, etc.: (6) any approach must address the major sources of pollutants; (7) development of co-permittee management plans must be coordinated or developed on a regional basis and in the same time frame-fragmented or balkanized programs must be avoided; (8) municipalities should be regulated as equitably as possible; (9) flood control districts should be addressed as a system or part of a system; (10) the definition must conform to the legal requirements of the Clean Water Act; and (11) the definition should limit the number of co-permittees as much as possible.

b. Definition of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer system. A combination of the options outlined in the 1988 proposal would address most of these concerns, while achieving a realistic and environmentally beneficial storm water program. Accordingly, EPA has adopted the following definition of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. Large and medium separate storm sewer systems are municipal separate storm sewers that:

(i) Are located in an incorporated place with a population of 100,000 or more or 250,000 or more as determined by the latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census (see appendices F and G of part 122 for a list of these places based on the 1980 Census);

(ii) Are located within counties having areas that are designated as urbanized areas by latest decennial Bureau of Census estimates and where the population of such areas exceeds 100,000, after the population in the incorporated places, townships or towns within such counties is excluded (see appendices H and I for a listing of these counties based on the 1980 census) (incorporated places, towns, and townships within these counties are excluded from permit application requirements unless they fall under paragraph (i) or are designated under paragraph (iii)); or (iii) are owned or

.

operated by a municipality other than those described in paragraph (i) or (ii) that are designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described under paragraphs (i) or (ii). In making this determination the Director may consider the following factors:

(A) Physical interconnections between the municipal separate storm sewers;

(B) The location of discharges from the designated municipal separate storm sewer relative to discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described in subparagraph (i);

(C) The quantity and nature of pollutants discharged to waters of the United States;

(D) The nature of the receiving waters; or

(E) Other relevant factors.

(iv) The Director may, upon petition, designate as a system, any municipal separate storm sewers located within the boundaries of a region defined by a storm water management regional authority based on a jurisdictional, watershed, or other appropriate basis that includes one or more of the systems described in paragraphs (i), (ii), and (iii).

Under today's rule at § 122.26(a)(3)(iii) the regional authority shall be responsible for submitting a permit application under the following guidelines: The regional authority together with co-applicants shall have authority over a storm water management program that is in existence, or shall be in existence at the time part 1 of the application is due; the permit applicant or co-applicants shall establish their ability to make a timely submission of part 1 and part 2 of the municipal application; each of the operators of municipal separate storm systems described in paragraphs 122.26(b)(4) (i). (ii), and (iii) and (7)(i), (ii), and (iii), that are under the purview of the designated regional authority, shall comply with the application requirements of § 122.26(d).

As noted above, the finalized definition of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer system is combination of the approaches as proposed. (In the following discussion "paragraph (i)" refers to §§ 122.26 (b)(4)(i) and (b)(7)(i); "paragraph (ii)" refers to §§ 122.26(b)(4)(ii) and (b)(7)(ii); "paragraph (iii)" refers to §§ 122.26 (b)(4)(iii) and (b)(7)(ii); and "paragraph (iv)" refers to §§ 122.26 (b)(4)(iv) and (b)(7)(iv)). Paragraph (i) originates from proposed Option 5 (boundaries of incorporated places); paragraph (ii) originates from Option 6 (boundaries of counties) and Option 7 (urbanized areas); paragraph (iii) originates from Options 1 and 5; and paragraph (iv) is an outgrowth of comments on all options, especially Option 4 (State owned systems/State highways) and Option 8 (watersheds).

This definition creates a system by virtue of the fact that storm sewers within defined geographical and political areas, and the owner/operators of separate storm sewers in those areas. are addressed or required to obtain permits. Although within these systems, different segments and discharges of storm water conveyances may be owned or operated by different public entities, EPA is convinced by comments that discharges from such conveyances are interrelated to such an extent that all of these conveyances may be properly considered a "system." These comments are identified and discussed in greater detail below.

c. Response to comments. Many commenters urged that the approach taken must be administratively achievable. Option 5 of the proposal (boundaries of incorporated places), which can be equated to paragraphs (i) and (iii) above, was identified by several commenters as the most workable of all the options. Many commenters stated that Option 1 (systems owned or operated by incorporated places) was inappropriate because of special districts and other owners of systems within the incorporated area; and although EPA proposed a designation provision for interrelated discharges in Option 1, commenters advised that it would be impossible to identify these systems, account for their discharges, and exclude or include them in a timely manner if Option 1 was selected (Option 1 only addresses those systems owned or operated by the incorporated place). The final rule would obviate these concerns, since all the publicly owned sewers within the boundaries of the municipality will be required to be covered by a permit.

Other commenters noted that cities sometimes have storm water ° conveyances owned or operated by numerous entities. One municipality commented that these problems could be more easily resolved using a unified permit/district wide approach, which the final approach outlined above can accomplish. One county stated that Option 1 of the proposal would result in a permanent balkanization of stormwater programs and that a regional approach focusing on the entire system should be established. Another municipality recommended that all the systems of conveyances within the incorporated city boundaries be issued a permit. In rejecting Option 1 of the proposal, one municipality stated that program inefficiencies would result from implementing a piecemeal program in a contiguous urban environment with different owners and operators. One State conveyed similar concerns. Using a geographical approach, as described in paragraph (i) of the final definition, will best address all of these concerns.

One commenter criticized proposed Option 1 as being contrary to the legal requirements of the WQA, and a further example of EPA's continuing attempt to minimize the scope of a national storm water program. It was noted that the legislative history regarding requirements for large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems in section 402(p) of the CWA generally does not reference incorporated cities or towns. As a result, the commenter recommended that the term "municipal" in municipal separate storm sewer system refer to separate storm sewers operated by municipal entities meeting the definition of "municipality" in section 502 of the CWA and that the scope of the term "municipal separate storm sewer system" be defined as broadly as possible. This approach would result in defining large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems to include all municipal separate storm sewers within the 410 counties with a population of 100,000 or more. EPA has adopted the commenter's recommendation to extend the scope of the program to the extent that today's rule covers all municipal separate storm sewers within certain areas rather than only those operated by an incorporated place. EPA disagrees however that it must define the term "system" to include sewers within any municipal boundary of sufficient population with reference to section 502(4). By not providing explicit definitions, section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA gives EPA discretion to define how municipal separate storm sewer systems are defined. There is no indication in the language of the CWA or the legislative history that Congress intended that the scope of "municipality" and the scope of "municipal separate storm sewer system" to be identical, particularly since the latter term is not defined in the statute. Furthermore. for the reasons discussed elsewhere in this section, EPA believes that today's definition is a reasonable accommodation of the many conflicting concerns surrounding the proper way to delineate the extent of a

municipal separate storm sewer system serving over 100,000 people.

Several commenters concluded that EPA should be flexible enough to allow the permitting authority broad discretion to establish system wide permits, with flood control districts and/or counties acting as co-permittees with the various incorporated cities within the district boundaries. Commenters expressed concern that Option 1 would not allow for such flexibility.

Arguments that were advanced by commenters in support of proposed Option 1 are equally applicable to paragraph (i), above. Like proposed Option 1, the approach outlined above targets major cities. However, it also has the advantage of addressing municipal separate storm sewer systems which may be interrelated to those owned by the city, a benefit recognized by one municipality that endorsed the selection of proposed Option 5. This will also give the permitting authority more discretion to establish co-permittee relationships.

Paragraph (ii) of the final definition also uses a geographical approach to the definition of municipal storm sewer systems to include municipal storm sewers within urbanized counties. Thus, it closely resembles Option 7 of the proposal. The counties identified in paragraph (ii) have, based on the 1980 Census, a population of 100,000 or more in urbanized,⁵ unincorporated portions of the county. In the unincorporated areas of these counties (or in the 20 States where the Census recognizes minor civil divisions, unincorporated county areas outside of towns or townships), the county is the primary local government entity. In these cases, the county performs many of the same functions as incorporated cities with a population of 100,000, and is generally expected to have the necessary legal and land use authority in these areas to begin to implement storm water management programs. Due to the urbanized nature of their population, discharges from the municipal separate storm sewers in these counties will have many similarities to discharges from municipal systems in incorporated cities with a population of 100,000 or more. Addressing these counties in this fashion will not adversely affect small municipalities (incorporated places,

towns and townships) within the county, as municipal separate storm sewers that are located in the small incorporated places, townships or towns within these counties are not automatically included as part of the system.

EPA has focused on the unincorporated areas because permit applications cannot be required from systems that serve a population less than 100,000, unless designated. EPA received the comment that if the sewers in incorporated places within such counties were included as part of the system for that county, there would be the potential for systems serving a population less than 100,000 to be improperly subject to permit requirements. EPA agrees with the comment, except that EPA reserves the authority to designate sewers in small incorporated places as part of the system subject to permitting, pursuant to paragraph (iii) of the final definition. Incorporated areas within the identified counties will be required to file permit applications if the population served by the municipal separate storm sewer system is 100,000 or more.

As one commenter noted, the counties addressed by the definition will generally be areas of high growth with a growing tax base that can finance a storm water management program. Numerous counties affected by paragraph (ii) commented on the proposal. Several of these indicated a preference for the county government as the permittee. Others indicated that their county had the ability to perform the functions of the permit applicant and permittee. One county brought to EPA's attention that the county had laid plans for a storm water utility scheduled to be in operation in 1989. Several of the counties supported the use of watersheds, or flexible regional approaches, as the basis for the definition of municipal separate storm sewer systems. The modified definition should satisfy these concerns.

EPA recognizes that some of the counties addressed by today's rule have, in addition to areas with high unincorporated urbanized populations, areas that are essentially rural or uninhabited and may not be the subject of planned development. While permits issued for these municipal systems will cover municipal system discharges in unincorporated portions of the county, it is the intent of EPA that management plans and other components of the programs focus on the urbanized and developing areas of the county. Undeveloped lands of the county are not expected to have many, if any, municipal separate storm sewers.

Paragraphs (i) and (ii) above will help resolve the problems associated with permittees not having adequate land use controls, the legal authority to implement controls, and the ownership of the conveyances. This factor was mentioned by numerous commenters on the proposed options, especially county governments. Under paragraphs (i) and (ii), all publicly owned separate storm sewers within the appropriate municipal boundaries will be defined as part of the municipal system. In many cases, a number of municipal operators of these storm sewers will be responsible for discharges from these systems. Since a number of co-permittees may be addressed in the permits for these discharges, problems associated with the ability to control pollutants that are contributed from interrelated discharges will be minimized. State highways or flood control districts, which may have no land use authority in incorporated cities, will be co-permittees with the city which does possess land use authority. EPA envisions that permit conditions for these systems will be written to establish duties that are commensurate with the legal authorities of a copermittee. For example, under a permit, a flood control district may be responsible for the maintenance of drainage channels that they have jurisdiction over, while a city is responsible for implementing a sediment and erosion ordinance for construction sites which relates to discharges to the drainage channel. Confusion over ownership of conveyances or systems, at least for the purposes of determining whether they require a permit, will be minimized since all conveyances will be covered. Similarly, under paragraph (ii), the affected counties are expected to have the necessary legal and land use authority to implement programs and controls in unincorporated, urbanized areas because the county government is the primary political or governing entity in these geographical areas.

Many commenters from all levels of State and local government expressed concern about controlling pollutants from State highways. Paragraphs (i) and (ii) will result in discharges from separate storm sewers serving State highways and other highways through storm sewers that are located within incorporated places with the appropriate population or highways in unincorporated portions of specified counties being included as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system, since all municipal separate storm sewers within the boundaries of these political entities are included. Paragraph (iv) can facilitate

^b The Bureau of Census defines urbanized areas to provide a description of high-density development. Urbanized areas are comprised of a central city (or cities) with a surrounding closely settled area. The population of the entire urbanized area must be greater than 50,000 persons, and the closely settled area outside of the city, the urban fringe, must generally have a population density greater than 1,000 persons per square mile (just over 1.5 persons per acre) to be included

the submission of a permit application for storm sewers operated as part of an entire State highway system. Paragraph (iv) would allow an entire system in a geographical region under the purview of a State agency (such as a State Department of Transportation) to be designated, where all the permit application requirements and requirements established under § 122.26(a)(iii)(C) can be met.

Paragraphs (i) and (ii) can effectively deal with many of the major sources of pollutants. One municipality noted that Option 5 (paragraph (i)) would require all systems in the incorporated boundaries to obtain permits and institute control measures, rather than just the few owned or operated by incorporated cities. Another municipality noted that this approach could deal with many of the regional variations in sources of pollution. Many commenters, including environmental groups, believed that proposed Option 3 (systems owned or operated by counties), Option 6 (systems within the boundaries of counties), and Option 7 (system in urbanized areas) were good approaches because more sources of pollution would be addressed. It was also maintained that Options 3, 6 and 7 could incorporate watershed planning which, in the view of some commenters. is the only effective way to address pollutants in storm water.

Commenters noted that addressing counties and urbanized areas would focus attention on developing areas which would otherwise be left out in the initial phases of permitting. One commenter noted that most new development in large urbanized areas occurs outside of core cities (incorporated cities with a population of 100,000 or more). Newly developing areas provide opportunities for installing pollutant controls cost effectively. EPA agrees with these comments and notes that paragraph (ii) addresses a significant number of counties with highly developed or developing areas.

However, EPA is convinced that addressing all counties or urbanized areas in the initial phases of the storm water program is ill-advised. Commenters noted that some counties have inappropriate or nonexistent governmental structures, and that a program that addressed all counties in the country with a population of 100,000 or more would be unmanageable, because too many municipal entities nationwide would be involved in the program initially. Commenters advised that defining municipal storm sewer systems solely in terms of the boundaries of census urbanized areas

(Option 7) would result in systems which did not correspond to jurisdictions that are in a position to implement a storm water programs. Thus, EPA has modified Option 7 and combined it with Option 6 to create paragraph (ii) above.

Paragraph (iii) incorporates a designation authority such that municipalities that own or operate discharges from separate storm sewers systems other than those described in paragraph (i) or (ii) may be designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the other discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from the large or medium municipal separate storm sewers. In making this determination the physical interconnections between the municipal separate storm sewers, the location of discharges from the designated municipal separate storm sewer relative to discharges from large or medium municipal separate storm sewers, the quantity and nature of pollutants discharged to waters of the United States, the nature of the receiving waters, or other relevant factors may be considered.

Comments indicated that the designation authority as proposed and described above should be retained. One State noted that this approach gives the most flexibility in making the caseby-case designations, while also delineating in sufficient detail what criteria are used to make the determination. This commenter was concerned about being able to regulate many of the interrelated discharges from counties surrounding incorporated cities.

Paragraph (iv) of the final definition allows the permitting authority, upon petition, to designate as a medium or large municipal separate storm sewer system, municipal separate storm sewers located within the boundaries of a region defined by a storm water management regional authority based on a jurisdictional, watershed, or other appropriate basis that includes one or more of the systems described in paragraphs (i), (ii), (iii).

Paragraph (iv) was added to the final definitions to respond to a variety of concerns of commenters. One of the prime concerns of commenters was that the definition of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems must be flexible enough to accommodate: Programs on a watershed basis, existing storm water programs and frameworks and regional differences in climate, geography, and political institutions. Some States were particularly expressive regarding this concern. One State maintained that an inflexible program could totally disrupt ongoing State efforts. Other commenters urged that the regulation encourage the establishment of regional storm water authorities or other mechanisms that can deal with storm water quality on a watershed basis. One State proposed defining the municipal separate storm sewer system to include all municipal separate storm sewers within a core incorporated place of 100,000 or more. and all surrounding incorporated places within the State defined watershed. One of the State water districts advised that the regulations should be flexible enough to allow regional water quality boards to apply the regulations geographically. One national association expressed concern that existing institutional arrangements for flood control and drainage would be ignored, while another warned against fostering a proliferation of inconsistent patchwork programs based on arbitrary definitions and jurisdictions which bear no relationship to water quality.

EPA is convinced that the mechanism described in paragraph (iv) provides a means whereby the mechanisms and concepts identified above can be utilized or created in appropriate circumstances. In addition, § 122.26(f)(4) provides a means for State or local government agencies to petition the Director for the designation of regional authorities responsible for a portion of the storm water program. For example, some States or counties may currently or in the near future have regional storm water management authorities that have the ability to apply for permits under 'today's rule and carry out the terms of the permit. Some of these authorities may encompass within their jurisdiction large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems as defined in today's rule. EPA wishes to encourage such entities to assume the role as permittee under today's rule. That is the purpose of paragraph (iv). Such authorities may petition the Director to assume such a role.

Many commenters expressed the view that municipal management plans must be coordinated or developed among copermittees on a regional basis and in the same timeframe. Paragraphs (i), (iii) and (iv) would bring in all appropriate municipal entities with jurisdiction over a specified geographical area in the same timeframe. Several commenters. including one State, noted proposed Option 1 would lead to fragmented, illcoordinated programs. Paragraphs (i), (iii), and (iv) do not suffer this drawback to the same extent since all the municipal separate storm sewers are addressed within the incorporated place, instead of only those owned or operated by the incorporated place.

Equal treatment of municipalities within a watershed or other specified area was a major subject of comment. Many commenters urged that a degree of fairness could be achieved by requiring permit applications, and the concomitant expenditure of municipal dollars and resources, from all municipalities within an entire urban area that contributes to storm water pollution, rather than from a discrete system within an arbitrary political boundary, Paragraph (i), especially when coupled with paragraphs (ii), (iii), and (iv), can best accomplish a more equitable approach, because all owners and operators of municipal separate storm sewers within a system have responsibilities. In addition, some of the areas outside the incorporated city limits which are engaged in expansive urban or suburban development will be brought into the program. Paragraph (iv) will provide a means for State or regional authorities to use existing or emerging mechanisms to set up storm water management programs, and would require multiple agencies either to become regional co-permittees or to be subject to a regional permit.

Paragraphs (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) could also require flood control districts to be co-permittees, which was a major concern of counties and numerous cities. One municipality stated that the inclusion of flood control districts would greatly reduce the administrative burden required to prepare a single inter-city discharge agreement and would establish a common legal authority to implement the program. Numerous county agencies believed it imperative that flood control districts be brought into a system-wide permit strategy.

Paragraphs (i) and (iii) may not accommodate the concern of several commenters that the number of copermittees be kept to a minimum. The fact that all the municipal separate storm sewers within the boundaries of the appropriate incorporated places will be addressed dictates that some permits will have several co-permittees. This is a major concern since it goes directly to achieving an effective initial storm water program. There is concern about being able to bring all the co-permittees together under intra-municipal agreements or contracts within regulatory deadlines. This problem would be resolved in the short term by selecting Option 1. However, Option 1 may still require inter-municipal

agreements because of the designation authority under § 122.26 (b)(4)(ii) and (b)(7)(ii) of the proposal. In addition, such inter-jurisdictional problems will arise after October 1, 1992 when the moratorium on requiring NPDES permits for discharges from other municipal separate storm sewers ends. Under the permitting goals established by the CWA, multi-jurisdictional storm water programs and agreements cannot be avoided. Despite interest in limiting the number of co-permittees, EPA decided not to adopt Option 1 for the reasons already stated.

Section 402(p)(3)(B)(i) of the amended CWA provides that permits for municipal discharges from municipal storm sewers may be issued on a system-wide or jurisdiction-wide basis. This provision is an important mechanism for developing the comprehensive storm water management programs envisioned by the Act.

Under the permit application requirements of today's rule, if the appropriate co-applicants are identified, one permit application may be submitted for a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system (see section VI.G.4 above). System-wide permit applications can in turn be used to issue system-wide permits which could cover all discharges in the system.

Where several municipal entities are responsible for obtaining a permit for various discharges within a single system, EPA will encourage systemwide permit applications involving the several municipal entities for a number of reasons. The system-wide approach not only provides an appropriate basis for planning activities and coordinating development, but also provides municipal entities participating in a system-wide application the means to spread the resource burden of monitoring, evaluating water quality impacts, and developing and implementing controls.

The system-wide approach provided in today's rule recognizes differences between individual municipalities with responsibilities for discharges from the municipal system. Today's application rule requires information to be submitted that enables the permit issuing authorities to develop tailored programs for each permittee with responsibility for certain components, segments, or portions of the municipal separate storm sewer system. The permit application requirements allow individual municipal entities, participating in system-wide applications, to submit site specific information regarding storm water

quality management programs to reduce pollutants in system discharges as a whole, or from specific points within the system.

In some cases, it may be undesirable for all municipal entities with storm water responsibility within a municipal system to be co-permittees under one system-wide permit. The permit application requirements in today's rule allow individual municipal entities within the system to submit permit applications and obtain a permit for that portion of the storm sewer system for which they are responsible. Thus, several permits may be issued to cover various subdivisions of a single municipal system.

In summary, EPA believes that the definition of municipal storm sewer system adopted in today's rule has several distinct advantages that were identified in comments:

• The definition adopts features of several options;

• The definition targets areas that have the necessary police powers and land use authority to implement the program;

• The definition can utilize watersheds or accommodate existing administrative frameworks and storm water programs;

• The definition provides that all systems within a geographical area including highways and flood control districts will be covered, thereby avoiding fragmented and ill-coordinated programs;

• The definition has flexible designation authority; and

• The definition addresses major sources of pollutants without being overly broad.

H. Permit Application Requirements for Large and Medium Municipal Systems

1. Implementing the Permit Program

Given the differing nature of discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems in different parts of the country and the varying water quality impacts of municipal storm sewer discharges on receiving waters, today's permit application requirements are designed to lead to the development of site-specific storm water management programs. In order to effectively implement this goal, EPA intends to retain the overall structure of the municipal permit application as proposed in the December 7, 1988, proposal.

2. Structure of the Permit Application

EPA proposed a two-part permit application designed to meet the goal of developing site-specific storm water quality management programs in NPDES permits. In response to a request for comments on this aspect of the proposal. numerous comments were received. After reviewing these comments, EPA has decided to retain the two-part permit application. Many commenters agreed that the approach as proposed is appropriate for phasing in and developing site specific storm water management programs. One large municipality strongly endorsed the twopart application, stating that it would facilitate the identification of water quality problem areas and the development of priorities for control measures, thereby allowing for more cost-effective program development. Two State agencies expressed the same view, and noted that the two-part approach is reasonable and well structured for efficient development of programs. One large municipality noted it would allow the permit authority and the permit applicant the time needed to gain the knowledge and data to develop site-specific permits. A medium municipality expressed similar views.

Numerous commenters submitted endorsements of a proposal offered by one of the national municipal associations. This approach responded to EPA's request for comments on alternatives to a two-part application process. These comments recommended having permit applicants submit information regarding their existing legal authority, prepare source identification information, describe existing management plans, provide discharge characterization information based on existing data, and prepare a monitoring, characterization and illicit discharge and removal plan in a one-part application. The remaining requirements such as: implementing plans to remove illicit connections, obtaining legal authority, monitoring and characterization, plans for structural controls, preparation of control assessments, preparation of fiscal analysis, and management plan implementation would be part of the permit and take place during the compliance period of the permit. It was argued that this would result in a more orderly development of stormwater management programs while allowing for quick implementation of efforts to eliminate illicit discharges and initiate some BMPs.

After careful review and consideration of these comments, EPA is convinced that this approach would not meet the goals and requirements of section 402 of the Clean Water Act. Section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA requires

that permits effectively prohibit nonstorm water discharges into storm sewers and incorporate controls that reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques, and system design and engineering methods. The above comments suggesting an alternative for achieving this goal are not entirely compatible with these requirements. In light of the language in the statute. permit conditions should do more than plan for controls during the term of the permit. A strong effort to have the necessary police powers and controls based on pollutant data should be undertaken before permits are issued. In short, the one-part application described by these comments would result in permits that would focus too much on preparation and not enough on implementing controls for pollutants.

In comparison, EPA's approach requires municipalities to submit a twopart application over a two year period. Part one of the application would require information regarding existing programs and the means available to the municipality to control pollutants in its storm water discharges. In addition, part one would require field screening of major outfalls to detect illicit connections. Part two of the permit application would require a limited amount of representative quantitative data and a description of proposed storm water management plans. The purpose of the two-part application process is to develop information, in a reasonable time frame, that would build successful municipal storm water management programs and allow the permit writer to make informed decisions with regard to developing permit conditions. This will include initiating efforts to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into storm sewers, and initially implementing controls that reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices and control techniques during the term of the permit. Such an approach clearly meets the statutory mandate of section 402(p)(3)(B).

a. Part 1 Application. Part 1 of the permit application is intended to provide an adequate basis for identifying sources of pollutants to the municipal storm sewer system, to preliminarily identify discharges of storm water that are appropriate for individual permits, and to formulate a strategy for characterizing the discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems. Several commenters supported retaining these components of the application process. The components of part 1 of the permit application include:

• General information regarding the permit applicant or co-applicants (§ 122.26(d)(1)(i));

• A description of the existing legal authority of the applicant(s) to control pollutants in storm water discharges and a plan to augment legal authority where necessary (§ 122.26(d)(1)(ii));

• Source identification information including: a topographic map, description of the historic use of ordinances or other controls which limited the discharge of non-storm water discharges to municipal separate storm sewer systems, the location of known municipal separate storm sewer outfalls, projected growth, location of structural controls, and location of waste disposal facilities (§ 122.26(d)(1)(iii));

 Information characterizing the nature of system discharges including existing quantitative data, the results of a field screening analysis to detect illicit discharges and illegal dumping to the municipal system, an identification of receiving waters with known water quality impacts associated with storm water discharges, a proposed plan to characterize discharges from the municipal storm sewer system by estimating pollutant loads and the concentration of representative discharges, and a plan to obtain representative data (§ 122.26(d)(1)(iv)); and

• A description of existing structural and non-structural controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the municipal storm sewer (§ 122.26(d){1)(v)).

One commenter disagreed that source identification should be made part of the permit application process beyond the identification of major municipal storm sewer outfalls. In reply, EPA is convinced that the other elements of the source identification are critical for identifying sources of pollutants and creating a base of knowledge from which informed decisions about permit conditions and further data requirements can be determined. One county stated that it already had engaged in extensive monitoring and modeling of watersheds and that its programs should be substituted for EPA's. In response, EPA anticipates that information collected under various State, county or city programs that matches the information requirements in this rulemaking may be used by the applicants in submissions under this rulemaking where the requirements of the rule are met. However, because of the divergence in data collection techniques and information collected by

these programs, EPA disagrees that it would be appropriate to accept a substitution in its entirety without tailoring such a program to today's specific information requirements. One municipality noted that municipal systems are not well documented and responsibility for them is in question. In response, EPA notes that the source identification procedure is designed, in part, to address such shortcomings.

Several municipalities suggested that legal authority could be demonstrated by providing EPA with copies of appropriate local ordinances to demonstrate their legal authority and a statement from the city attorney. EPA agrees that these methods are appropriate for making this demonstration.

Several commenters noted that there was adequate existing municipal legal authority to carry out the program requirements or such authority could be obtained by the municipality. Other commenters stated that municipalities possess some authority over certain activities but may not have authority over discharges from roads and construction. Numerous commenters, however, claimed that certain municipalities had no existing legal authority to carry out the permit requirements and that obtaining all the necessary legal authority could take several years due to cumbersome legislative and political processes. In response, part 1 of the permit application will establish a schedule for the development of legal authority that will be needed to accomplish the goals of the permit application and permits. Some municipalities will have more advanced storm water programs with appropriate legal authority or the ability to establish necessary ordinances. Providing an appropriate schedule will not present difficulties in these circumstances. EPA also notes that the definitions of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems finalized in today's rule will in many cases result in a number of coapplicants participating in a system wide application. It is anticipated that the development of adequate interjurisdictional agreements specifying the various responsibilities of the copermittees may in some cases be very complex, thereby justifying the development of a schedule to complete the task. For example, clarifying the authority over discharges from roads may present difficulties where a number of municipal entities operate different roads in a given jurisdiction. In other limited cases, the MEP standard for municipal permits may translate into

permit conditions that extend the schedule for obtaining necessary legal authority into the term of the permit. These situations will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by permit issuing authorities.

Numerous commenters supported the field screening analysis as proposed. Comments from three municipalities noted that it would be a cost effective means of identifying problem areas. One municipality noted that illicit connections can be reliably detected by the screening method proposed. In view of these comments EPA has decided to retain this portion of the regulation. However many commenters expressed concern over how the proposed approach would work given the particular circumstances under which some municipal storm water systems are arranged. Several commenters questioned the effectiveness of dry weather monitoring for several reasons, including the shallow depth of some cities' water tables. Accordingly, an alternative approach may be utilized by the municipal permittee, and this is discussed later in section VI.H.3.

Some comments suggested that if any field screening is required that it be done during the term of the permit. EPA believes that field screening should not be done during the term of the permit exclusively. Unless a field screening is accomplished during the permit application phase there will be scant knowledge, if any, upon which illicit connection programs can be established for the term of the permits. EPA views field screening during the application process as an appropriate means of beginning to meet the CWA's requirement of effectively prohibiting non-storm water discharges into municipal separate storm sewers.

The submittal of part 1 of the permit application will allow EPA, or approved NPDES States, to adjust part 2 permit application requirements to assure flexibility for submitting information under part 2, given the site specific characteristics of each municipal storm sewer system.

EPA agrees with the concerns of commenters regarding the estimate of the reduction of pollutant loads from existing management programs. EPA agrees that sufficient data may not be available to establish meaningful estimates. Therefore this component of the proposed part 1 is not a requirement of today's rule.

b. Part 2 Application. Part 2 of the proposed permit application is designed to supplement information found in part 1 and to provide municipalities with the opportunity of proposing a comprehensive program of structural and non-structural control measures that will control the discharge of pollutants, to the maximum extent practicable, from municipal storm sewers. The components of the proposed part 2 of the permit application included:

• A demonstration that the legal authority of the permit applicant satisfies regulatory criteria (§ 122.26(d)(2)(i));

• Supplementation of the source identification information submitted in part 1 of the application to assure the identification of all major outfalls and land use activities (§ 122.26(d)(2)(ii);

• Information to characterize discharges from the municipal system;

• A proposed management program to control the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, from municipal storm sewers (§ 122.26(d)(2)(iv));

• Assessment of the performance of proposed controls (§ 122.26(d)(2)(v));

• A financial analysis estimating the cost of implementing the proposed management programs along with identifying sources of revenue § 122.26(d)(2)(vi);

• A description of the roles and responsibilities of co-applicants (§ 122.26(d)(2)(vii)).

One municipality agreed that the assessment of the performance of controls was a critical component of establishing a viable program and one that could be accomplished within the time frame of the permit application deadlines. One commenter suggested that the applicant describe what financial resources are currently available. In response, EPA will require applicants to describe the municipality's existing budget for storm water programs in part 1 of the permit application requirements. This information will be useful to evaluate the municipality's ability to prepare and implement management plans. In response to other comments, this information will also include an overview of the municipality's financial resources and a description of the municipality's budget, including overall indebtedness and assets.

EPA has retained the financial analysis in this portion of the rule on the advice of two municipal commenters, who agreed that this was an important component of establishing a viable program and one that could be accomplished within the time frame of the permit application deadlines. Another commenter noted that this requirement is appropriate to justify a municipality's proposed management plan.

3. Major Outfalls

In past rulemakings, a controversial issue has been the appropriate sampling requirements for municipal separate storm sewer systems. Earlier storm water rulemakings have been based primarily on the principle that all discharges to waters of the United States from municipal separate storm sewers located in urban areas must be covered by an individual permit. This approach requires that individual permit applications contain quantitative data to be submitted for all such discharges. This approach was criticized because of a potentially unmanageable number of outfalls in some municipal separate storm sewer systems. Most incorporated cities with a population of 100.000 or more do not know the exact number of outfalls from their municipal systems; but based on the comments, the number ranges from 500 to 8,000 or more.

In light of the increased flexibility provided by the WQA and the development of EPA's system-wide approach for regulating municipal separate storm sewer discharges. today's rule will not require submittal of individual permit applications with quantitative data for each outfall of a municipal system. Rather today's rule will encourage system-wide permit applications to provide information suitable for developing effective storm water management programs. Under this approach, not all outfalls of the municipal system will be sampled, but rather more specific and accurate models for estimating pollutant loads and discharge concentrations will be used. The use of these models will require the identification of sources which are responsible for discharging pollutants into municipal separate storm sewers and will not require as much data to calibrate due to the sourcespecific nature of the model. A number of standard and localized models have been developed for estimating pollutant loads from storm water discharges.

Several commenters support the use of models for developing management plans and estimating pollutant loadings and concentrations. EPA encourages their use where applicable to particular systems.

By adopting an approach that incorporates source identification measures, the amount of quantitative data required to characterize discharges from the municipal system will be reduced because of the increased accuracy of the site-specific models which can be used. Consistent with a system-wide permit application approach, EPA proposed to focus source identification measures on "major outfalls." The proposed definition of major outfalls includes any municipal separate storm sewer outfall that discharges from a pipe with a diameter of more than 36 inches or its equivalent (discharges from a drainage area of more than 50 acres), or for municipal separate storm sewers that receive storm water from lands zoned for industrial activities, an outfall that discharges from a pipe with a diameter of more than 12 inches or its equivalent (discharges from a drainage area of 2 acres or more).

Numerous entities offered comments on this definition. Several commenters concurred with this proposed definition. One commenter maintained that the data collected at such outfalls would be sufficient to estimate pollutant loads as well as concentrations using well calibrated models. Another municipality stated that 50 acres was an excellent approximation for the average drainage area served by a 36-inch storm sewer. Two States and one county supported the definition as proposed. One large municipal entity supported the definition, stating that screening major outfalls could be accomplished with available staff over a three month period. In light of these comments, EPA has decided to retain, in part, the definition as proposed.

Numerous commenters suggested alternative definitions or otherwise disagreed with the proposed definition. Most of these comments expressed concern about the number of outfalls that would have to be tested or screened if the definition was retained. For this reason EPA has decided to limit the total number of major outfalls or equivalent sampling points that have to be tested to 250 or 500 for medium or large systems respectively. This change is discussed in further detail below.

The following are examples of comments that opposed the definition of a "major outfall" as proposed. Several commenters stated that, in the southwest, 6 to 12 foot outfalls are the norm, and that smaller outfalls should not be addressed unless there is a compelling reason to suspect illicit connections. One commenter suggested a size of 54 inches and 50 acres, while another commenter suggested that 48 inches would be appropriate. One commenter suggested that the diameter for industrial pipes should be 18 inches, while another commenter suggested that 50 acres should be the only criterion.

One commenter noted that pipe size will vary according to rainfall patterns and that a single approach would not work universally. This comment, and other similar points of view as noted herein, convinces that Agency that a more flexible approach is needed to identify field screening and sampling locations. However, EPA is also convinced that a universal standard is necessary for purposes of identifying drainage areas within the municipal system and discrete areas of land use that are drained by certain sized outfalls. This information is critical since these conveyances, and lands they drain, are sources of pollutants to waters of the United States from municipal systems and are properly the subject of appropriate permit conditions.

Many commenters suggested placing a limit on the number of major outfalls addressed during the field screening phase of the permit application. Two municipalities stated that the proposed definition of major outfalls in terms to the pipe diameter was too small and that too many outfalls would be covered. One municipality stated that under the proposed definition, it would have over 4700 "major outfalls," a number viewed as being unacceptably large. Several municipalities argued that they would be penalized for over-design of their storm drain system. One municipality stated field screening of outfalls should be limited to 200 for medium cities and 500 for large cities. Some commenters suggested EPA set a percentage of major outfalls for screening, because all pipes in some municipalities meet the definition of major outfall. One commenter suggested that a sliding scale be used to determine the number of outfalls tested: those with 50 test all, those with 100-200 test 50%, etc. Other commenters suggested a flat percentage of outfalls or flat number such as 100.

4. Field Screening Program

EPA also received several comments in response to the proposed field screening methodology. Among the major concerns were: End of pipe sampling may not be practical and the more appropriate and accessible location is likely to be the nearest upstream manhole; the type of discharge should be the criterion for selecting sampling points as opposed to pipe size; a system wide evaluation is more appropriate than checking each outfall; within some systems, major outfalls or pipe size will not reflect discharges from suspect or old land use areas; efforts should be focused on locations where illicit connections are expected: sites should be determined by looking at sites within drainage basin areas based on land use within those basins; land use and hydrology of the watershed should be the criteria for selecting points;

screening should be performed at locations that will allow for the location of upstream discharges; the focus should be exclusively on drainage areas rather than pipe size, since pipe size will vary with slope; a prescribed percentage of total flow may be more appropriate; state water quality standards should be utilized along with focusing on actual quality in the reaches of a stream.

EPA is convinced by these comments that today's rule should allow applicants to either field screen all major outfalls as proposed (first procedure) or use a second procedure to provide for the strategic location of sampling points to pinpoint illicit connections. EPA agrees with comments that the size of the outfall will not always reflect the chance of uncovering illicit connections or discharges, and that field screening points should be easily accessible.

This second procedure is as follows: field screening points and/or outfalls are randomly located throughout the storm sewer system by placing a grid over a drainage system map and identifying those cells of the grid which contain a major outfall or segment of the storm sewer system. The grid shall be established using the following guidelines and criteria:

(1) A grid system consisting of perpendicular north-south and east-west lines spaced 1/4 mile apart shall be overlaid on a map of the municipal storm sewer system, creating a series of cells;

(2) All cells that contain a segment of the storm sewer system shall be identified; one field screening point shall be selected in each cell; major outfalls may be used as field screening points;

(3) Field screening points or major outfalls should be located downstream of any sources of suspected illegal or illicit activity;

(4) Field screening points shall be located to the degree practicable at the farthest manhole or other accessible location downstream in the system, within each cell; however, safety of personnel and accessibility of the location should be considered in making this determination;

(5) The assessment and selection of cells shall use the following criteria: Hydrological conditions; total drainage area of the site; population density of the site; traffic density; age of the structures or buildings in the area; history of the area; land use types;

(6) For medium municipal separate storm sewer systems, no more than 250 cells need have identified field screening points; in large municipal separate storm sewer systems, no more than 500 cells need to have identified field screening points for detecting illicit connections; cells established by the grid that contain no storm sewer segments will be eliminated from consideration; if fewer than 250 cells in medium municipal sewers are created, and fewer than 500 in large systems are created by the overlay on the municipal sewer map, then all those cells which contain a segment of the sewer system shall be subject to field screening (unless access to the separate storm sewer system is impossible);

(7) Large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems which are unable to utilize the procedures described in paragraphs (1) through (6) above, because a sufficiently detailed map of the separate storm sewer systems is unavailable, shall field screen at least 250 or 500 major outfalls respectively using the following method: the applicant shall establish a grid system consisting of north-south and east-west lines spaced 1/4 mile apart overlaid on a map of the boundaries of a large or medium municipal entity described at § 122.26(b), thereby creating a series of cells; major outfalls in as many different cells as possible shall be selected until 500 major outfalls (large municipalities) or 250 major outfalls (medium municipalities) are selected; a field screening analysis shall be undertaken at these major outfalls.

The methodology outlined above is in response to public comments which indicated that the field screening and sampling of major outfalls as proposed would lead to insurmountable logistical problems in some municipal systems. EPA believes that the above is an effective approach to pinpointing suspected problem points along a given trunkline or segment of separate storm sewer system. Jurisdictions with no extensive or previous history of monitoring, or lack of an intensive monitoring program can utilize the methods described in establishing a program. Furthermore, the approach will allow for the prioritization of outfalls, sampling points, or areas within the municipality where there are suspected illicit connections or discharges, or other circumstances creating higher concentrations and loadings of pollutants.

Paragraph (7) enables municipalities to select major outfalls without regard to the municipal sewer system map that is required for using the procedure described in paragraphs (1) through (6). However, the applicant must still select outfalls within the cells created by overlaying a 1/4 mile grid over a map of the boundaries of the large or medium municipal entity defined under § 122.26(b), and select major outfalls within as many of those cells as possible, up to 500 (large municipal systems) or 250 (medium municipal systems). In this manner, as many different areas and land uses within the municipal system will be covered by the field screening component of the municipal application.

In order to keep the costs of the program within the anticipated limits of the proposed regulation, the number of outfalls or sampling locations using the grid system is to be limited to 500 for large municipal separate storm sewer systems and 250 for medium municipal separate storm sewer systems.

In response to several comments, EPA has clarified the definition of major outfalls with regard to the words, "pipe with an inside diameter of 36 inches or more or its equivalent" and "a pipe with an inside diameter of 12 inches or more or its equivalent." This definition has been modified to specify that single pipes or single conveyances with the appropriate diameter or equivalent are covered.

EPA's proposal required municipal permit applicants to submit a fiscal analysis of expenditures that will be required in order to implement the proposed management plans required in part 2 of the application. The description of fiscal resources should include a description of the source of the funds. Some commonters felt that a fiscal analysis should only be required during the term of the permit. In response, EPA believes that during the two years of permit application development, the permit applicant should be in a position to submit information on the ability and means for financing storm water management programs during the term of the permit. EPA views this information as an important means of evaluating the scope of program and whether the permittee will be devoting adequate resources to implementing the program before that program is mapped out in the permit itself.

5. Source Identification

The identification of sources which contribute pollutants to municipal separate storm sewers is a critical step in characterizing the nature and extent of pollutants in discharges and in developing appropriate control measures. Source identification can be useful for providing an analysis of pollutant source contribution and for identifying the relationship between pollutant sources and receiving water quality problems. In cases where end-ofpipe controls alone are not practicable, it is essential to identify the source of pollutants into the municipal storm sewer systems to support a targeted approach to control pollutant sources.

The relative contribution of pollutants from various sources will be highly sitespecific. The first step in developing a targeted approach for controlling pollutants in discharges from municipal storm sewer systems is identifying the various sources in each drainage basin that will contribute pollutants to the municipal storm sewer system.

This rulemaking phases in the source identification requirements of the permit program by establishing minimum objectives in part 1 of the application and by requiring applicants to submit a source identification plan in part 2 of the application to provide additional information during the term of the permit. The minimum source identification requirements of part 1 of the application have been designed to provide sufficient information to provide an initial characterization of pollutants in the discharges from the municipal storm sewer system. EPA realizes that with many large, complex municipal storm sewer systems, it may be difficult to identify all outfalls during the permit application process. Accordingly, EPA is requiring that known outfalls be reported in part 1 of the application. Part 1 of the application will also include: A description of procedures and a proposed program to identify additional major outfalls; the identification of the drainage area associated with known outfalls; a description of major land use classifications in each drainage area, descriptions of soils, the location of industrial facilities, open dumps, landfills or RCRA hazardous waste facilities which discharge storm water to the municipal storm sewer system; and ten year projections of population growth and development activities (population data and development projections will be useful for future predictions of loadings to receiving waters from municipal storm sewer systems, and capacities required for treatment systems). In general, population projections should reflect various scenarios of development (high. medium, low relative to recent trends).

Part 2 of the application will supplement the information reported in part 1 of the application so that, at a minimum, all major outfalls are identified.

Under today's rule, municipal or public entities responsible for applying for and obtaining an NPDES permit will be required to identify the location of an open dump, sanitary landfill, municipal incinerator or hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facility under RCRA which may discharge storm water to the system as well as all facilities which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity into a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system.

Requiring these source identification measures is supported by the legislative history of section 405 of the WQA, which instructs that "[i]n writing any permit for a municipal separate storm sewer, EPA or the State should pay particular attention to the nature and uses of the drainage area and the location of any industrial facility, open dump, landfill, or hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility which may contribute pollutants to the discharge." (emphasis added) [Vol 133 Cong. Rec. S752 (daily ed. Jan. 14, 1987].

One municipality questioned the purpose of the topographic map and commented that the scale of the topographic map is too large to indicate any of the required outfall, drainage, industrial or structural control information. In response, the purpose of the topographic map is to identify receiving waters, major storm water sewer lines that contribute discharges to these waters, and potential sources of storm water pollution. EPA disagrees that a USGS 7.5 scale map is inappropriate for identifying these features within a municipal system. The scale afforded by such a map provides sufficient detail to allow specified delineation of outfalls, while not requiring an overly burdensome map in terms of size. Numerous commenters noted the value of source identification information and generally supported submitting this information in the permit application.

Many commenters questioned the value of the source identification information for the purpose of characterizing pollutant loads and concentrations. Conversely, one commenter opined that the requirement would provide sufficient information to estimate pollutant loadings from each outfall using loading models to estimate loadings by watershed. In response, the source identification information serves several purposes. It is the first step for identifying potential sources of pollutants from which more in depth analysis can be accomplished, under the discharge characterization component of the application. Also, where appropriate, it may be used in conjunction with models to estimate loadings and concentrations. EPA has also taken note of the many comments that question or dismiss the concept of determining pollutant loads and concentrations solely from source identification. Accordingly, EPA is convinced that at least some of the sampling requirements as proposed are

necessary to facilitate more accurate system specific estimates of pollutant concentrations and loadings. These are discussed below, in the discharge characterization section.

One commenter suggested that aerial photos be submitted in lieu of topographic maps. EPA agrees that an aerial photograph of the appropriate scale that communicates the same information as a topographic map may be substituted. Today's final rule reflects this flexibility.

The source identification component of the municipal application also requires that municipal applicants identify the industrial activity within the drainage area associated with each major outfall. One commenter stated that where multiple storm sewers outfalls discharge to a stream reach. municipalities should be allowed to delineate a single sewer-shed for identifying sources of industrial activity. In response, the rule does not delimit an applicant's ability to identify industries in groups according to a common series of storm sewer outfalls, if that is an easier or more appropriate methodology for that particular applicant. However, EPA would view this as appropriate only where the land use is of one type, such as industrial. Where land use is mixed within the drainage area associated with each major outfall, such differences need to be identified.

In response to comments, to the extent that EPA is requesting that applicants identify the types of industrial facilities operating within the municipality, the municipality is free to use Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) or other systems which identify the principal products or services of the facility. One commenter disagreed with EPA's decision to require a list of water bodies that are listed under CWA sections 304(1), 319(a), 314(a), and 320, because the States already have this information and that requesting it from permittees could result in "omissions, misunderstandings, and mistakes." EPA believes that these waters should be identified in the application so that appropriate permit conditions can be developed that address storm water discharges that are adversely effecting such waters. EPA believes that having this information immediately at the disposal of the municipality and the permit writer will speed the process and alert the municipality of storm water discharges to listed water bodies and potentially polluted storm water discharges to those waters.

6. Characterization of Discharges

The characterization plan and data collection required in today's rule as elements of Part-one and Part-two of the municipal permit application is comprised of several major components:

• A screening analysis to provide information to develop a program for detecting and controlling illicit connections and illegal dumping to the municipal separate storm sewer system;

• Initial quantitative data to allow the development of a representative sampling program to be incorporated as a permit condition;

• System-wide estimates of annual pollutant loadings and the mean concentration of pollutants in storm water discharges, and a schedule to provide estimates during the term of the permit for each major outfall of the seasonal pollutant loadings and the event mean concentration of pollutants in storm water discharges; and

• An identification of receiving waters with known water quality impacts associated with storm water discharges.

Several commenters noted the importance of developing and targeting management programs based on discharge characterization data and monitoring. Numerous other commenters stressed the importance of a program to identify and eliminate illicit connections and improper disposal. EPA agrees that discharge characterization is an important component of developing management programs. Most of the discharge characterization components of the municipal application procedure have been retained as proposed. However some changes and clarifications have been made, and these are noted below.

a. Screening analysis for illicit discharges (part 1 of application). Illicit discharges (non-storm water discharges without a NPDES permit), and illegal dumping to municipal separate storm sewer systems occur in a relatively haphazard manner. Due to the unpredictability of such discharges, today's permit applications require a field analysis for the development of priorities for detecting and controlling such discharges. A field screening approach will provide a means of detecting high levels of pollutants in dry weather flows, which is one indicator of illicit connections. Results of a field test of such discharges will provide further information about the nature of the discharge to determine if further investigation is warranted. Visual observation of dry weather flows has been shown to be one the most effective means for tracking down illicit connections and improper disposal.

As discussed in greater detail in section VI.H.7.b of today's preamble, EPA is proposing to require that municipal applicants submit a comprehensive plan to develop a program to detect and control illicit connections and illegal dumping. In order to develop appropriate priorities for these programs, applicants shall submit the results of a screening analysis to be performed on major outfalls or "field screening points" in the systems to detect the presence of illicit hookups and illegal dumping. The results of the screening analysis. referred to as the field screen, would be reported in part 1 of the permit application.

Under the requirements for a field screen, the applicant or co-applicants will submit a description of observations of dry weather discharges from major outfalls or "field screening points" identified in part 1 of the application. At a minimum, the field screen would include a description of visual observations made during a dry weather period. If any flow is observed during a dry weather period, two grab samples will be collected during a 24 hour period with a minimum period of four hours between samples. For all such samples, a description of the color, odor, turbidity, the presence of an oil sheen or surface scum as well as any other relevant observation regarding the potential presence of non-storm water discharges or illegal dumping would be provided. In addition, the applicant should provide the results of a field screen which includes on-site estimates of pH, total chlorine, total copper, total phenol, detergents (or surfacants) along with a description of the flow. EPA is not requiring analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136 be used exclusively in the field screen. Rather, the use of inexpensive field sampling techniques such as the use of colormetric detection methods is anticipated. Where the field screen does not involve analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136, the applicant is required to provide a description of the method used which includes the name of the manufacturer of the test method, including the range and accuracy of the test. Appropriate field techniques for a field screen of dry weather discharges are discussed in EPA guidance for municipal storm water discharge permit applications. It should be clarified that data from

It should be clarified that data from the field screen is generally not appropriate for comprehensive evaluation of water quality impacts, or estimating pollutant loadings. Rather, the information from the field screen in part 1 of the application will be used along with other information, such as the age of development and degree of industrial activity in the drainage basin, to identify areas or outfalls which are appropriate targets for management programs and for investigations directed at identifying and controlling non-storm water discharges to separate storm sewers during the term of the permit.

In the December 7, 1988, proposal, EPA proposed a second phase of the screening analysis requiring that wetweather and dry-weather samples be collected and analyzed in accordance with analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136 from designated major outfalls for a larger set of pollutants identified with illicit connections. Comments essentially viewed this proposal as too ambitious for the permit application. One commenter recommended that this procedure could best be accomplished during the term of the permit. Some comments maintained that the collection of analytical samples as a follow up to an initial field screen analysis was not the most cost-effective, practicable or efficient method for pinpointing illicit connections. EPA recognizes that several municipal programs to detect and control illicit connections and other non-storm water discharges have been successfully developed and implemented without the use of extensive analytical sampling (for example, programs in Fort Worth, TX and Washtenaw County, MI). After identifying and analyzing the comments on this aspect of the proposal EPA has withdrawn this element of the proposal from today's rule. EPA believes that a follow-up phase to the initial field screening is more appropriate during the term of the permit. Thus, EPA has dropped the field screening requirement proposed for Part 2 of the application.

b. Representative data (Part 2 of application). The NURP study showed that pollutant concentrations in urban runoff can exhibit significant variation. Pollutant concentrations in such discharges vary during storm events and from storm event to storm event. Given the complex, variable nature of storm water discharges from municipal systems, EPA favors a permit scheme where the collection of representative data is primarily a task that will be accomplished through monitoring programs during the term of the permit. Permit writers have the necessary flexibility to develop monitoring requirements that more accurately reflect the true nature of highly variable and complex discharges.

Today's rule provides for an initial assessment of the quality of discharges from municipal separate storm sewers based primarily on source identification measures and existing information received in the permit application. This information will be used to begin to characterize system discharges. The analysis developed under this approach will not rely soley on sampling data collected during the application process, but will also incorporate existing data bases such as the one developed under the NURP study. Today's rule requires that some quantitative data will be collected to ensure the system discharges can be appropriately represented by the various existing data bases and to provide a basis for developing a monitoring plan to be implemented as a permit condition.

Today's rule requires that quantitative data be submitted for discharges from selected storm events at between 5 and 10 outfalls or field screening points. The municipality will recommend and the Director will then designate the outfalls or field screening points as representative of the commercial, residential and industrial land use activities of the drainage area contributing to the system, on the basis of information received in part 1 of the application. The applicant will be required to collect samples of a storm discharge from three storm events occurring one month apart for each designated outfall or field screening point. This is a modification to the December 7, 1988, proposal wherein only one of the 5 to 10 outfalls was to be sampled during three storm events, and the remaining sampled only once. This requirement may be modified by the Director if the type and frequency of storm events require different sampling. The Director may require samples of discharges to be collected during snow melts or during specified seasons. The Director may also require additional testing during a single event if it is unlikely that there will be three storm events suitable for sampling during the year. Furthermore, the Director may allow exemptions to the three storm event requirement when climatic conditions create good cause for such exemptions; for example, arid regions or areas experiencing drought conditions during the period when applications are developed could be exempted.

EPA has added requirements to sample more storm events in response to comments that the sampling procedure proposed would not necessarily yield representative data. Commenters indicated that: rain events of different intensity may yield different levels and

types of pollutants; a rain event after a dry spell of several months will not be representative when compared to rain events occurring closer together, due to the build up of constituents; one sample may reflect short term effects such as improper disposal rather than long term effects: and that rain events are generally too variable to rely on the limited sampling as proposed. Clearly the data collected from sampling storm water discharges has a tendency to vary greatly. The more sampling that is accomplished, the greater extent to which this variability may be accounted for and appropriate management programs developed.

In selecting the amount of data to be collected during the permit application process, EPA has attempted to balance the usefulness of this data against the economic and logistical constraints in actually obtaining it. In some cases the data obtained will support initial loading and concentration estimates obtained using various modeling techniques, from which appropriate permit conditions can be developed. Data obtained may be supplemented with further data collection during the term of the permit.

EPA believes that the requirementthat selected major municipal outfalls or "field screening points" be sampled for more than one event will provide verification that the characterization of discharge is valid. Where an ongoing sampling program is defined for the term of the permit, samples taken during the first few years of this period can be used to verify the application results. If a municipality or an industry questions the conclusions drawn from the characterization sampling, it may at its discretion choose to perform additional sampling to either confirm or dispel these concerns.

All samples collected will be analyzed for all pollutants listed in Table II, (organic pollutants), and Table III, (toxic metals, cyanide and total phenol) of appendix D of 40 CFR part 122, and for the pollutants listed in Table M-1 below:

Table M-1

Total suspended solids (TSS).	Total dissolved solids.
COD	BOD ₅ .
Oil and grease	Fecal coliform.
Fecal streptococcus	pH.
Dissolved phosphorus	-
Total ammonia plus organic nitrogen.	Total phosphorus.
Total Kjeldahl nitrogen	Nitrate plus nitrite.

A portion of the NURP program involved monitoring 120 priority pollutants in storm water discharges from lands used for residential, commercial and light industrial activities. The NURP program excluded testing for asbestos and dioxin. Results for seven other organic priority pollutants were not considered valid due to changes in, or constraints on test methods. Seventy-seven priority pollutants were detected in samples of storm water discharges from lands used for residential, commercial and light industries taken during the NURP study, including 14 inorganic and 63 organic pollutants. Table M-2 shows the priority pollutants which were detected in at least ten percent of the discharge samples which were sampled for priority pollutants.

TABLE M-2.—PRIORITY POLLUTANTS DE-TECTED IN AT LEAST 10% OF NURP SAMPLES

[In percent]

Metals and inorganics	Frequency of detection
Antimony	13
Arsenic	52
Bervilium	12
Cadmium	48
Chromium	58
Copper	91
Cvanides	23
Lead	94
Nickel	43
Selenium	11
Zinc	94
Pesticides:	
Alpha-hexachlorocyclohexane	20
Alpha-endosulfan	19
Chlordane	17
Lindane	15
Halogenated aliphatics:	
Methane, dichloro	11
Phenois and cresols:	
Phenol	14
Phenol, pentachloro	19
Phenol, 4-nitro	· 10
Phthalate esters:	
Phthalate, bis(2-ethylhexyl)	22
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons:	ł
Chrysene	10
Fluoranthene	16
Phenanthrene	12
Pyrene	15
	1

The NURP data also showed a significant number of these samples exceeded various freshwater water quality criteria. The exceedence of water quality criteria does not necessarily imply that an actual violation of standards will exist in the receiving water body in question. Rather, the enumeration of exceedences serves as a screening function to identify those constituents whose presence in urban storm water runoff may warrant high priority for further evaluation.

Members of this group represent all of the major organic chemical fractions

found in Table II of appendix D of 40 CFR part 122 (volatiles, acid compounds, base/neutrals, pesticides). Today's rule requires testing for all organic constituents in Table II rather than limiting the sampling requirements to the 24 toxic constituents found in the NURP study because they will provide a better description of the discharge at essentially the same cost. (The cost of analyzing samples for organic chemicals strongly depends on the number of major organic chemical fractions tested). The NURP study focused on characterizing storm water discharges from lands used for residential. commercial and light industrial activities. In general, the NURP study did not focus on other sources of pollutants to municipal separate storm sewer systems and, therefore, does not reflect all potential pollutants that may be present in discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems.

The sampling requirements for the permit application address a limited number of sampling locations but require analysis for a wide range of pollutants. Sampling for a wide range of pollutants as a permit application requirement should provide permit writers with appropriate data to target more specific pollutants when developing requirements for a monitoring program during the term of the permit.

Numerous commenters stated that monitoring for all priority pollutants seemed excessive. However, EPA is convinced that it is more appropriate for permit conditions to focus on and prioritize particular pollutant problems after data covering a broad spectrum of pollutants are developed. As noted above, NURP identified 77 priority pollutants in urban runoff, but only from residential, commercial, and light industrial (e.g. industrial parks) areas. One municipal entity stated that this approach is a reasonable and realistic means of providing some useful baseline data, while others recommended sampling a variety of parameters that are included in Tables M-1 and M-2. Another municipal entity stated that characterization of outfall discharge quality during storm events is necessary as a means of targeting source control activities.

EPA is working with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) to evaluate the availability of USGS technical assistance to municipalities through cooperative funding programs to aid in collecting representative quantitative data of storm water discharges from municipal systems.

USGS data collection programs with municipalities typically include storm

water discharge samples obtained at various times during a storm hydrograph event. Various USGS field procedures can be used to obtain discharge data for pipes, culverts, etc., typically found in urban areas. Pollutant models can be calibrated with data and long-term rainfall records to simulate the quality of system discharges and compared to other storm water models.

In addition, EPA recognizes that many municipalities have participated in studies, such as NURP, that involve sampling of urban runoff as well as other components of discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems. All existing storm water sampling data along with relevant water quality data, sediment data, fish tissue data or biosurvey data taken over the last ten years is considered relevant and, under today's rule, must be submitted with part l of the application. Sampling data that is submitted must be accompanied with a narrative description of the drainage area served by the outfall monitored, a description of the sampling and quality control program, and the location of receiving water monitoring. EPA requested comments on the use

of existing data, such as that generated under the NURP study, to satisfy the requirement of providing representative sampling data. Commenters did not agree on the value of NURP results as an indicator of representative data. Several commenters expressed the view that existing data could be used to satisfy in whole or in part the representative sampling requirements of the storm water permit application. However, commenters generally did not offer suggested criteria that could be used to verify the validity of existing data. One commenter believed that intensive sampling over a period of ten years in 12 basins, when combined with NURP data, would be adequate.

One commenter supported the use of data, such as that obtained from the NURP study, to target sampling programs. EPA supports such a methodology and has retained this portion of the proposed discharge characterization component. EPA received strong support from an environmental group for retaining this information requirement in part 1 of the application.

In light of these comments EPA believes it is appropriate to retain the representative sampling requirements without resorting to the use of existing data exclusively. Because of the inherent variability in reliability and applicability of existing data, EPA is convinced that a nationally consistent methodology for collecting data is appropriate. This data can then be used in conjunction with other existing data and models to develop appropriate site specific management programs and more generalized management program strategies. Where existing data and data collected under today's rule varies or does not match, further sampling under the term of the permit will be accomplished to more accurately assess the discharge of pollutants.

c. Loading and Concentration Estimates (part 2 of application). The assessment of the water quality impacts of discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems on receiving waters requires the analysis of both pollutant loadings and concentrations of pollutants in discharges.

The loading and concentration estimates in today's rule will be used to evaluate two types of water quality impacts: (1) Short-term impacts: and (2) long-term impacts. Specifically, the regulation requires estimates of the annual pollutant load of the cumulative discharges to waters of the United States from municipal outfalls and the event mean concentration of the cumulative discharges to waters of the United States municipal outfalls during a storm event for BOD₅, COD, TSS, dissolved solids, total nitrogen, total ammonia plus organic nitrogen, total phosphorus, dissolved phosphorus, cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc. Estimates shall be accompanied by a description of the procedures for estimating constituent loads and concentrations, including any modelling, data analysis, and calculation methods. Municipalities have options in the use of methodologies, including those presented in NURP for calculating loads.

Short term impacts from discharges from municipal separate storm sewers involve changes in water quality that occur during and shortly after storm events. Examples of short-term impacts that can lead to impairments include periodic dissolved oxygen depression due to the oxidation of contaminants, high bacteria levels, fish kills, acute effects of toxic pollutants, contact recreation impairments and loss of submerged macrophytes. Characterization of instream pollutant concentrations based on estimated pollutant concentrations in system discharges are important for evaluating these types of impacts.

Long-term water quality impacts from discharges from municipal separate storm sewers may be caused by contaminants associated with suspended solids that settle in receiving water sediments and by nutrients which enter receiving water systems with long retention times. Pollutant loading data are important for evaluation of impairments such as loss of storage capacity in streams, estuaries, reservoirs, lakes and bays, lake eutrophication caused by high nutrient loadings, and destruction of benthic habitat. Other examples of the long-term water quality impacts include depressed dissolved oxygen caused by the oxidation of organics in bottom sediments and biological accumulation of toxics as a result of uptake by organisms in the food chain. An estimate of annual pollutant loading associated with discharges from municipal storm water sewer systems is necessary to evaluate the magnitude and severity of the environmental impacts of such discharges and to evaluate the effectiveness of controls which are imposed at a later time.

Municipal storm water sewer systems generally handle runoff from large drainage areas and the sources of pollution are usually very diffuse. The concentrations of many pollutants in discharges from these systems are often low relative to many industrial process and POTW discharges. The water quality impacts of low concentration pollution discharges tend to be cumulative and need to be evaluated in terms of aggregate loadings as well as pollutant concentrations. A site-specific loading analysis can be used to evaluate the relative contribution of various pollutant sources.

7. Storm Water Quality Management Plans

Today's rule facilitates the development of site-specific permit conditions by requiring large and medium municipal permit applicants to submit, along with other information, a description of existing structural and non-structural prevention and control measures on discharges of pollutants from municipal storm sewers in part I of the permit application. Section 122.26(d)(2)(iv) requires the applicant to identify in part 2 of the application, to the degree necessary to meet the MEP standard, additional prevention or control measures which will be implemented during the life of the permit. Although, in many cases, it will not be possible to identify all prevention and control measures that are appropriate as permit conditions, EPA believes that the process of identifying components of a comprehensive prevention and/or control program should begin early and that applicants should be given the opportunity to identify and propose the components of the program that they believe are

appropriate for first preventing or controlling discharges of pollutants.

As noted earlier, EPA recognizes that problems associated with storm water, combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and infiltration and inflow (I&I) are all interrelated even though they are treated somewhat differently under the law. EPA believes that it is important to begin linking these programs and activities and, because of the potential cost to local governments, to investigate the use of innovative, nontraditional approaches to reducing or preventing contamination of storm water. The application process for developing municipal storm water management plans provides an ideal opportunity between steps l and 2 for considering the full range of nontraditional, preventive approaches.

The permit application requirements in today's rule require the applicant or co-applicants to develop management programs for four types of pollutant sources which discharge to large and medium municipal storm sewer systems. Discharges from large and medium municipal storm sewer systems are usually expected to be composed primarily of: (1) Runoff from commercial and residential areas; (2) storm water runoff from industrial areas; (3) runoff from construction sites; and (4) nonstorm water discharges. Part 2 of the permit application has been designed to allow the applicant the opportunity to propose MEP control measures for each of these components of the discharge. Discharges from some municipal systems may also contain pollutants from other sources, such as runoff from land disposal activities (leaking septic tanks, landfills and land application of sewage sludge). Where other sources, such as land disposal, contribute significant amounts of pollutants to a municipal storm sewer system, appropriate control measures should be included on a site-specific basis. Proposed management programs will then be evaluated in the development of permit conditions.

There is some overlap in the manner in which these pollutant sources are characterized and their sources identified. For instance, improper disposal of oil into storm drains is often associated with do-it-yourself automobile oil changes in residential areas, or improper application or overuse of herbicides and pesticides in residential areas can also occur in industrial areas. Also, some control measures will reduce pollutant loads for multiple components of the municipal storm sewer discharge. These measures should be identified under all appropriate places in the application; as discussed below, however, double counting of pollutant removal must be avoided when the total assessment of control measures is performed.

Although many land use programs have multiple purposes, including the reduction of pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems, the proposed management programs in today's rule are intended to address only those controls which can be implemented by the permit applicant or co-applicants. EPA cannot abrogate its responsibilities under the CWA to implement the NPDES permit program by relying on pollution control programs that are outside the NPDES program. For example, municipal permit management programs may not rely exclusively on erosion or sediment control laws for implementing that portion of management programs that address discharges from construction sites, unless such laws implement NPDES permit program requirements entirely and that such implementation is a part of the permit.

EPA anticipates that storm water management programs will evolve and mature over time. The permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems will be written to reflect changing conditions that result from program development and implementation and corresponding improvements in water quality. The proposed permit applications will require applicants to provide a description of the range of control measures considered for implementation during the term of the permit. Flexibility in developing permit conditions will be encouraged by providing applicants an opportunity to identify in the permit application priority controls appropriate for the initial implementation of management programs. Many commenters endorsed the flexible sitespecific storm water program approach as proposed as a method for addressing regional water quality control programs in a cost effective manner. To this extent, EPA agrees with one municipality that management programs should focus on more serious problems and sources of pollutants identified in the municipal system. However, EPA believes that to implement section 402(p)(3), comprehensive storm water management programs which address a number of major sources of pollutants to a system are necessary. Municipal programs should not be focused solely on a single source of pollution, such as illicit connections.

One commenter maintained that management program development

should be flexible enough to allow for consideration of what is attainable based on the area's climate, vegetation, hydrology, and land uses. EPA agrees with this comment. Some strategies for reducing pollutants in the northeast will not be practical in the southwest, such as management programs for deicing activities. The permit application process will determine what strategies are appropriate in different locations.

Several commenters supported addressing storm water pollutant problems through management practices or programs rather than end of pipe controls or treatment. EPA agrees with this comment to the extent that storm water management practices are a general theme of this rulemaking with regard to municipal permits. However, there will be cases where such discharges are best addressed through technology such as retention, detention or infiltration ponds.

One commenter reacted unfavorably to the flexible site-specific management plan approach stating that there is no hard criteria upon which to judge the adequacy of programs. Another commenter felt that there should be a BAT standard for municipal permits. Another commenter stated that the rule should contain specific BMPs that the permittee must comply with. EPA disagrees with these comments. The **Clean Water Act requires municipalities** to apply for permits that will reduce pollutants in discharges to the maximum extent practicable and sets out the types of controls that are contemplated to deal with storm water discharges from municipalities. The language of CWA section 402(p)(3) contemplates that, because of the fundamentally different characteristics of many municipalities, municipalities will have permits tailored to meet particular geographical, hydrological, and climatic conditions. Management practices and programs may be incorporated into the terms of the permit where appropriate. Permit conditions, which require that storm water management programs be developed and implemented or require specific practices, are enforceable in accordance with the terms of the permit. EPA disagrees with the notion that this regulation, which addressed permit application requirements, should create mandatory permit requirements which may have no legitimate application to a particular municipality. The whole point of the permit scheme for these discharges is to avoid inflexibility in the types and levels of control. Further, to the degree that such mandatory requirements may be appropriate, these requirements should be established

under the authority of section 402(p)(6) of the CWA and not in this rulemaking, which addresses permit application requirements.

Some commenters suggested that management programs should be developed as part of the permit conditions and not as part of the permit application. EPA agrees that management programs and their ongoing development should be part of the permit term. However, EPA is convinced, and many commenters agree. that the permit application should contain information on what the permittee has done to date and what it proposes and plans to do during the permit term based upon its discharge characterization and source identification data. This is a reasonable and logical approach and one that meets the intent and letter of section 402(p)(3) of the CWA. As stated above, this would be an appropriate method for implementing storm water management programs that should mature and evolve over time.

Applicants will propose priorities based on a consideration of appropriate controls including, but not limited to, consideration of controls that address: reducing pollutants to municipal separate storm sewer system discharges that are associated with storm water from commercial and residential areas (§ 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)); illicit discharges and illegal disposal (§ 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)); storm water from industrial areas (§ 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C)); and runoff from construction sites (§ 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)). Permits for different municipalities will place different emphasis on controlling various components of discharges from municipal storm sewers. For example, the potential for cross-connections (such as municipal sewage or industrial process wastewater discharges to a municipal separate storm sewer) is generally expected to be greater in municipalities with older developed areas. On the other hand, municipalities with larger areas of new development will have a greater opportunity to focus controls to reduce pollutants in storm water generated by the area after it is developed, discharges from construction sites, and other planning activities.

EPA requested comments on the process and methods for developing appropriate priorities in management programs proposed in applications and how the development of these priorities can be coordinated with controls on other discharges to ensure the achievement of water quality standards and the goals of the CWA.

Discharges from diffuse sources in residential areas was recognized by several commenters as a significant source of pollutants. Accordingly, these elements of the management plans have been retained. In conjunction with the importance of developing programs for illicit connections, numerous commenters stated that education programs are a priority. Another commenter emphasized that ordinances prohibiting such discharges and their enforcement is a crucial means of a successful program in this regard. EPA agrees with these comments and consequently will retain those portions of management program development that include a description of a program for educational activities such as public information for the proper disposal of oil and toxic materials and the use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers.

Some commenters noted that discharge characterization is necessary for development of appropriate management plans. EPA agrees with these comments and has retained the discharge characterization components in this rulemaking. However, EPA disagrees that the results of all discharge characterization procedures (*i.e.*, part 1 and part 2) are necessary to describe and propose a program as required in part 2 of the application. The application of various models is available to permit applicants, where needed, to develop appropriate management programs. All available site specific discharge characterization data should be available to the permit writer to draft appropriate conditions for the term of the permit.

One commenter noted that an important aspect of developing management plans is establishing the necessary legal authority to improve water quality. EPA agrees with this comment and has retained those aspects of the regulation which call for development and attainment of adequate legal authority in both parts of the municipal application.

One commenter stated that programs should address previously identified water quality problems in other programs that are required by section 304(1) of the CWA. EPA agrees that identified water quality problems need to be addressed by management programs, and the municipal permit application will call for an identification of these waters. However, EPA does not endorse addressing these waters to the exclusion of all others within the boundaries of the municipal separate storm sewer system. Some waters may experience substantial degradation after rain events and still not be listed under

section 304(1). Further, water quality impacts in listed waters may not be related to storm water discharges, while other non-listed waters do have water quality impacts from storm water discharges. Similarly, EPA agrees with one commenter that it may be desirable to focus attention and resources on certain problem watersheds within a municipality, and controls may be imposed and programs prioritized on that basis. However, such a focus should not be to the exclusion of other waters and watersheds that have water quality problems (although less troublesome) traceable to storm water discharges. The CWA requires that permits address discharges to waters of the United States, not just waters previously targeted under special programs.

Some commenters expressed concern that the permit application requires the design of management programs before knowing what will be in the permits. EPA disagrees with the thrust of this comment, that is that the order of requirements is inappropriate. The permit applicant will have two years to develop proposed plans which can be considered by permit writers in the development of the permit. Based upon a consideration of the management program proposed by the municipality and other relevant information, permits can be tailored for individual programs. One commenter stated that the cornerstone of management programs are inspection and enforcement programs. EPA agrees that these two elements are important components. Without inspection and enforcement mechanisms the programs will undoubtedly falter. Accordingly these requirements in the description of management programs in the permit application have been retained. In a similar vein, one commenter emphasized the importance of developing legal authority, financial capability, and administrative infrastructure. EPA agrees with this comment and has retained those aspects of the regulation that call for a description of applicants plans and resources in these areas.

One commenter stressed that control of discharges into the municipal system from industries is an important goal of municipal storm water management programs. EPA agrees with this comment and has retained the proposed description of management programs to address discharges from industrial sources. Other commenters identified industries as the principal contributors of pollutants to municinal separate storm sewer systems.

In addition, EPA will continue to evaluate procedures and methods to control storm water discharges to the extent necessary to mitigate impacts on water quality in the studies required under section 402(p)(5) of the CWA. One purpose of these studies will be to evaluate the costs and water quality benefits associated with implementing these procedures and methods. This evaluation will address a number of factors which impact the implementation costs associated with these programs, such as the extent to which similar municipal ordinances are currently being implemented, the degree to which existing municipal programs (such as flood management programs or construction site inspections) can be expanded to address water quality concerns, the resource intensiveness of the control, and whether the control program will involve public or private expenditures. This information, along with information gained during permit implementation will aid in the dynamic long-term development of municipal storm water management programs.

a. Measures to reduce pollutants in runoff from commercial and residential areas. The NURP program evaluated runoff from lands primarily dedicated to residential and commercial activities. The areas evaluated in the study reflect some other activities, such as light industry, which are commonly dispersed among residential and commercial areas. The NURP study selected sampling locations that were thought to be relatively free of illicit discharges and storm water from heavy industrial sites including storm water runoff from heavy construction sites. Of course, in a study such as NURP it was impossible to totally isolate various contributions to the runoff. In developing the permit application requirements in today's rule EPA has, in general, relied on the NURP definition of urban runoff-runoff from lands used for residential, commercial and light industrial activities.

NURP and numerous other studies have shown that runoff from residential and commercial areas washes a number of pollutants into receiving waters. Of equal importance is the volume of storm water runoff leaving urban areas during storm events. Large intermittent volumes of runoff can destroy aquatic habitat. As the percentage of paved surfaces increases, the volume and rate of runoff and the corresponding pollutant loads also increase. Thus, the 🌶 amount of storm water runoff from commercial and residential areas and the pollutant loadings associated with storm water runoff increases as development progresses; and they

remain at an elevated level for the lifetime of the development.

Proposed § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) requires municipal storm sewer system applicants to provide in part 2 of the application a description of a proposed management program that will describe priorities for implementing management programs based on a consideration of appropriate controls including:

• A description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls;

• A description of planning procedures including a comprehensive master plan to control after construction is completed, the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers which receive discharges from new development and significant redevelopment after construction is completed (in response to comment this contemplates an engineering policy and procedure strategy with long term planning):

• A description of practices for operating and maintaining public highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of such discharges from municipal storm sewer system;

• A description of procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving water bodies; and

• A description of a program to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizer which will include, as appropriate, controls such as educational activities and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors, and controls for application in public rightof-ways and at municipal facilities.

Water quality problems caused by municipal storm sewer discharges will generally be most acute in heavily developed areas. Prevention measures may be desirable and cost effective. However, structural control measures may also be effective, although opportunities for implementing these measures may be limited in previously developed areas. Commonly used structural technologies include a wide variety of treatment techniques, including first flush diversion systems. detention/infiltration basins, retention basins, extended detention basins, infiltration trenches, porous pavement, oil/grit separators, grass swales, and swirl concentrators. A major problem associated with sound storm water management is the need for operating

and maintaining the system for its expected life.

The unavailability of land in highly developed areas often makes the use of structural controls infeasible for modifying many existing systems. Nonstructural practices can play a more important role. Non-structural practices can include erosion control, streambank management techniques, street cleaning operations, vegetation/lawn maintenance controls, debris removal, road salt application management and public awareness programs.

As noted above, the first component of the proposed program to reduce pollutants in storm water from commercial and residential areas which discharge to municipal storm sewer systems is to describe maintenance activities and schedule. The second component of the proposed program to reduce pollutants in storm water from commercial and residential areas which discharge to municipal storm sewer systems provides that applicants describe the planning procedures and a comprehensive master plan that will assure that increases of pollutant loading associated with newly developed areas are, to the maximum extent practicable, limited. These measures should address storm water from commercial and residential areas which discharge to the municipal storm sewer that occur after the construction phase of development is completed. Controls for construction activities are addressed later in today's rule. One commenter noted the feasibility of developing management plans for newly developing areas. EPA agrees with this comment and has retained that portion of the regulation that deals with a description of controls for areas of new development. Similarly, one municipality stressed the importance and achievability of addressing storm water discharges from construction sites.

As urban development occurs, the volume of storm water and its rate of discharge increases. These increases are caused when pavement and structures cover soils and destroy vegetation which otherwise would slow and absorb runoff. Development also accelerates erosion through alteration of the land surface. Areas that are in the process of development offer the greatest potential for utilizing the full range of structural and non-structural best management practices. If these measures are to provide controls to reduce pollutant discharges after the area has been developed, comprehensive planning must be used to incorporate these measures as the area is in the process of

developing. These measures offer an important opportunity to limit increases in pollutant loads.

The third component of § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) provides a description of practices for operating and maintaining public roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems. General guidelines recommended for managing highway storm water runoff include litter control, pesticide/herbicide use management. reducing direct discharges, reducing runoff velocity, grassed channels, curb elimination. catchbasin maintenance. appropriate streetcleaning, establishing and maintaining vegetation, development of management controls for salt storage facilities, education and calibration practices for deicing application, infiltration practices, and detention/retention practices.

The fourth component of § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) provides that applicants identify procedures that enable flood management agencies to consider the impact of flood management projects on the water quality of receiving streams. A welldeveloped storm water management program can reduce the amount of pollutants in storm water discharges as well as benefit flood control objectives. As discussed above, increased development can increase both the quantity of runoff from commercial and residential areas and the pollutant load associated with such discharges. Disturbing the land cover, altering natural drainage patterns, and increasing impervious area all increase the quantity and rate of runoff, thereby increasing both erosion and flooding potential. An integrated planning approach helps planners make the best decisions to benefit both flood control and water quality objectives.

The fifth component of § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) would provide that municipal applicants submit a description of a program to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizer. Such a program may include controls such as educational activities and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors and controls for application in public rights-of-way and at municipal facilities. Discharges of these materials to municipal storm sewer systems can be controlled by proper application of these materials. Some commenters noted that insecticides used in residential areas are a probable source of pollutants in storm water discharges from residential areas, as well as salting and other de-icing activities. In response to this comment, part of a community management plan may include controls or education programs to limit the impacts of these sources of pollutants. One commenter noted that many communities already have household toxic disposal programs. Where appropriate these can be incorporated into municipal management programs.

Some commenters suggested substituting the management program description for residential and commercial areas with a simple identification of applicable management practices. EPA agrees that identification of appropriate management practices is a critical component of a program description for these areas. In essence, this is what the program description is designed to achieve. However, for the reasons discussed in greater detail above, EPA is convinced that an appropriate program must address all of the components of the management program for residential and commercial areas that are outlined in today's rule. Further, for the purposes of writing a permit with enforceable conditions, the application should identify a schedule to implement management practices. The applicant should be able to estimate the reduction in pollutant loads as a result of the development of certain management practices and programs (§ 122.26(d)(2)(v). A program may also include public education programs, which are not necessarily viewed as traditional BMPs.

b. Measures for illicit discharges and *improper disposal.* The CWA requires that NPDES permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers "shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit nonstormwater discharges into the storm sewers." In today's rule, EPA will begin to implement this statutory mandate by focusing on two types of discharges to large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. See § 122.26(d)(1)(iv)(D) and (d)(2)(iv)(B). One type of non-storm water discharges are illicit discharges which are plumbed into the system or that result from leakage of sanitary sewage system. The other class of non-storm water discharges result from the improper disposal of materials such as used oil and other toxic materials.

Illicit discharges. In some municipalities, illicit connections of sanitary, commercial and industrial discharges to storm sewer systems have had a significant impact on the water quality of receiving waters. Although the

48055

NURP study did not emphasize identifying illicit connections to storm sewers other than to assure that monitoring sites used in the study were free from sanitary sewage contamination, the study concluded that illicit connections can result in high bacterial counts and dangers to public health. The study also noted that removing such discharges presented opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of urban storm water discharges.

Other studies have shown that illicit connections to storm sewers can create severe, wide-spread contamination problems. For example, the Huron River **Pollution Abatement Program inspected** 660 businesses, homes and other buildings located in Washtenaw County, Michigan and identified 14% of the buildings as having improper storm drain connections. Illicit discharges were detected at a higher rate of 60% for automobile related businesses, including service stations, automobile dealerships, car washes, body shops and light industrial facilities. While some of the problems discovered in this study were the result of improper plumbing or illegal connections, a majority were approved connections at the time they were built. Many commenters emphasized the identification and elimination of illicit connections as a priority, including leakage from sanitary sewers. EPA agrees with these comments and intends to retain this portion of the program without modification.

A wide variety of technologies exist for detecting illicit discharges. The effectiveness of these measures largely depends upon the site-specific design of the system. Under today's rule, permit applicants would develop a description of a proposed management program, including priorities for implementing the program and a schedule to implement a program to identify illicit discharges to the municipal storm sewer system. This rulemaking will require the initial priorities for analyzing various portions of the system and the appropriate detection techniques to be used.

Improper disposal. The permit application requirements for municipal storm sewer systems include a requirement that the municipal permit applicant describe a program to assist and facilitate in the proper management of used oil and toxic materials. Improper management of used oil can lead to discharges to municipal storm sewers that in turn may have a significant impact on receiving water bodies. EPA estimates that, annually, 267 million gallons of used oil, including 135 million gallons of used oil from do-it-yourself automobile oil changes, are disposed of improperly. An additional 70 million gallons of used oil, most coming from service stations and repair shops, are used for road oiling. Many commenters emphasized the elimination of discharges composed of improperly disposed of oil and toxic material. One commenter identified motor oil as the major source of oil contamination and that EPA needs to encourage proper disposal of used oil. Several other commenters emphasized the importance of recycling programs for oil. EPA agrees with these comments and intends to retain this portion of the program without modification. One commenter identified public awareness and timely reporting of illegal dumping as critical components of this portion of the program. EPA agrees with this comment and intends for management programs to deal with this problem.

c. Measures to reduce pollutants.in storm water discharges through municipal separate storm sewers from municipal landfills, hazardous waste treatment, disposal and recovery facilities that are subject to section 313 of title III of SARA. As discussed in section VI.C of today's preamble, industrial facilities that discharge storm water through a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system are required to apply for a permit under § 122.26(c) or seek coverage under a promulgated general permit. Today's rule also requires the municipal storm sewer permittee to describe a program to address industrial dischargers that are covered under the municipal storm sewer permit. Today's rule requires the municipal applicant to identify such discharges (see source identification requirements under § 122.26(d)(2)(ii)), provide a description of a program to monitor pollutants in runoff from certain industrial facilities that discharge to the municipal separate storm sewer system, identify priorities and procedures for inspections, and establish and implement control measures for such discharges. Should a municipality suspect that an individual discharger is discharging pollutants in storm water above acceptable limits, and the owner/ operator of the system has no authority over the discharge, the municipality should contact the NPDES permitting authority for appropriate action. Two example of possible action are: if the facility already has an individual permit, the permit may be reopened and further controls imposed; or if the facility is covered by a promulgated general permit, then an individual site-specific permit application may be required.

In the December 7, 1988, proposal, EPA requested comments concerning what storm water discharges from industrial facilities through municipal systems should be monitored. One of the proposed approaches was to require data on portions of the municipal system which receive storm water from facilities which are listed in the proposed regulatory definition at § 122.26(b)(14) of "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity" (with the exception of construction activities and uncontaminated storm water from oil and gas operations) which discharge through the municipal system. However, given the large number of facilities meeting this definition that discharge through municipal systems, a monitoring program that requires the submission of quantitative data regarding portions of the municipal systems receiving storm water from such facilities may not be practicable. Such a requirement could, for some systems, potentially become the most resource intensive requirements in the municipal permit. Therefore, EPA proposed various ways to develop appropriate targeting for monitoring programs.

EPA requested comments on a requirement that, at a minimum, monitoring programs address discharges from municipal separate storm sewer outfalls that contain storm water discharges from municipal landfills, hazardous waste treatment, disposal and recovery facilities, and runoff from industrial facilities that are subject to section 313 of title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA). Section 313 of title III requires that operators or certain facilities that manufacture, import, process, or otherwise use certain toxic chemicals report annually their releases of those chemicals to any environmental media. Section 313(b) of title III specifies that a facility is covered for the purposes of reporting if it meets all of the following criteria:

• The facility has ten or more fulltime employees;

• The facility is in Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes 20 through 39;

• The facility manufactured (including quantities imported), processed, or otherwise used a listed chemical in amounts that exceed certain threshold quantities during the calendar year for which reporting is required.

Listed chemicals include 329 toxic chemicals listed at 40 CFR 372.45. After 1989, the threshold quantities of listed chemicals that the facility must manufacture, import or process (in order to trigger the submission of a release report) is 25,000 pounds per year. The threshold for a use other than manufacturing, importing or processing of listed toxic chemicals is 10,000 pounds per year. EPA promulgated a final regulation clarifying these reporting requirements on February 16, 1988, (53 FR 4500).

EPA received numerous comments regarding limiting the types of facilities that are initially subject to monitoring and municipal management programs. Numerous municipalities agreed that focusing on the above facilities is an appropriate means for setting priorities for the development of control measures to eliminate or reduce pollutants associated with industrial facilities. Commenters agreed that the potential for toxic materials in discharges is high because of the high volume of such materials at these facilities and that information regarding discharges and material management practices will be available through section 313 of SARA. One commenter noted that building on an established program will contribute to establishing an effective storm water program. Accordingly, EPA has specified at § 122.26(d)(2)(ii)(C) that the municipal applicant must describe a program that identifies priorities and procedures for inspections and establishing and implementing control measures for these facilities.

Several commenters suggested that these facilities should not be singled out because the presence of the threshold amounts of SARA 313 chemicals does not indicate that significant quantities of those chemicals are likely to enter the facility's storm water runoff. Instead it was suggested that municipalities should monitor storm sewers as a whole to determine what chemicals are present and therefore what facilities are responsible. EPA disagrees with these comments. The object of these requirements is initially to set priorities for monitoring requirements. Then, if the situation requires, controls can be developed and instituted. If a facility is a member of this class of facilities and does not discharge excessive quantities of SARA 313 chemicals, then it may not be subjected to further monitoring and controls. As noted above, the selection of facilities is only a means of setting priorities for facilities for the development of municipal plans.

EPA agrees, however, that there will be other facilities that are significant sources of pollutants and should be addressed by municipalities as soon as possible under management programs. Accordingly, those industrial facilities that the municipal permit applicant determines to be contributing a substantial pollutant loading to the municipal storm sewer system shall be addressed in this portion of the municipal management program.

EPA also requested comments on monitoring programs for municipal discharges including the submission of quantitative data on the following constituents;

• Any pollutants limited in an effluent guidelines for the industry subcategories, where applicable;

• Any pollutant listed in a discharging facility's NPDES permits for process wastewater, where applicable;

• Oil and grease, pH, BOD5, COD, TSS, total phosphorus, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, and nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen;

• Any information on discharges required under 40 CFR 122.21(g)(7)(iii) and (iv).

These are the same constituents that are to be addressed in individual permit applicants for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity.

Several industries and municipalities submitted comments on this issue. Some commenters agreed that these are appropriate parameters. Some commenters advised that the ability of municipalities to implement this aspect of the program depended on industries submitting this data. Several industries provided comments suggesting that the approach should allow the permittee flexibility in determining which parameters are chosen because of the burdens of monitoring and the complexity of materials and flows in municipal systems.

In light of these comments, EPA has retained § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C) as proposed requiring municipalities to describe a monitoring program which utilizes the above parameters. Monitoring for these parameters provides consistency with the individual application requirements for industries, provides uniformity in municipal applications, and will narrow the parameters to conform to the types of industries discharging into the municipal systems. Monitoring programs may consist of programs undertaken by the municipality exclusively or requirements imposed on industry by the municipality, or a combination of approaches. Appropriate procedures are discussed in municipal permit application guidance.

EPA requested comments on appropriate means for municipalities to determine what facilities are contributing pollutants to municipal systems. Many commenters responded with numerous methodologies. Some of these have been addressed in guidance. Municipalities will have options in selecting the most appropriate methodology given their circumstances as described in their permit applications.

EPA initially favors establishing monitoring requirements to be applied to those outfalls that directly discharge to waters of the United States. EPA received one comment from a municipality with regard to this issue which agreed that this was the most logical approach. Monitoring of outfalls close to the point of discharge to waters of the United States is generally preferable when attempting to identify priorities for developing pollutant control programs. However, under certain circumstances, it may be preferable to monitor at the point where the runoff from the industrial facility discharges to the municipal system. For example, if many facilities discharge substantially similar storm water to a municipal system it may be more practicable to monitor discharges from representative facilities in order to characterize pollutants in the discharge.

As noted by numerous industries, if municipal characterization plans reveal problems from certain industrial dischargers, then such facilities may be required to provide further data from their own monitoring. As noted above, EPA envisions that this data could then be used to develop appropriate control practices or techniques and/or require individual permit applications if a general permit covering the facility proves inadequate.

Comments were also solicited as to whether end-of-pipe treatment generally was more appropriate than source controls for storm water from industrial facilities which discharge to municipal systems. Many commenters, including both municipalities and industries, stated that source controls are the only practical and feasible means of controlling pollutants in storm water runoff, and specifically opposed the concept of end-of-pipe treatment or other controls. Some commenters maintained that, from an economic and environmental standpoint, end-of-pipe treatment may be the only effective means. One advised that the prompt cleanup of spills, controlled wash down of process areas, covering of material loading areas, storm water runoff diversion, covered storage areas, detention basins or other such mechanisms would prevent storm water from mixing with pollutants and possibly discharging them into receiving waters. Another noted that in the urban areas, there is little potential for treatment; consequently, it would seem

÷,

that controls and/or retrofitting existing facilities would be necessary when violations are found and that citizens will be better served by source controls appropriate to the individual problem.

ÉPA agrees with these comments to the extent that source controls and management programs are the general thrust of these regulations. However, in some situations end-of-pipe treatment, such as holding ponds, may be the only reasonable alternative. EPA disagrees with one industrial commenter that the municipalities should be almost entirely responsible for treating municipal discharges at the end of-the-pipe without reliance on source controls by industrial dischargers. Municipal programs may require controls on industrial sources with demonstrated storm water discharge problems. One industrial association noted that its member companies already have incentive to properly handle their materials and facilities because of other environmental programs with spill and erosion controls.

Numerous commenters stated that the program addressing industrial dischargers through municipal systems needs to be clearly defined in order to eliminate, as much as possible, potential conflicts between the system operator and dischargers. EPA has provided a framework for development of management plans to control pollutants from these particular sources. However, because of the differences in municipal systems and hydrology nationwide, EPA is not convinced that program specificity is an appropriate approach. The concept of the management program is to provide flexibility to the permit applicants to develop regional site specific control programs.

One commenter suggested that required controls should be limited to a facility's proportional contribution (based on concentration) of pollutants. **EPA disagrees. Most facilities** discharging through a municipal separate storm sewer will need to be covered by a general or individual permit. These permits will control the introduction of pollutants from that facility through the municipal storm sewer to the waters of the U.S. Any additional controls placed on the facility by the municipality will be at the discretion of the municipality. EPA is not requiring municipalities to adopt a particular level of controls on industrial facilities as suggested by the commenter.

One commenter questioned how dischargers that discharged both into the waters of the United States and ihrough a municipal system will be addressed and whether there is a

potential for inconsistent requirements. Industries that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity into the waters of the United States are required to be covered by individual permits or general permits for such discharges. Dischargers of storm water associated with industrial activity through municipal separate storm sewer systems will be subject to municipal management programs that address such discharges as well as to an individual or general NPDES permit for those discharges. EPA does not believe there is a significant risk of inconsistent requirements, since each industrial facility must meet BAT/BCT-level controls in its NPDES permit. EPA doubts that municipalities will impose much more stringent controls.

Many commenters stated that if cities and municipalities are to be responsible for industrial storm water discharges through their system, then municipalities should have authority to make determinations as to what industries should be regulated, how they are regulated, and when enforcement actions are undertaken. In response. EPA notes that the proposal has been changed and that municipalities will not be solely responsible for industries discharging through their system. Nonetheless, municipalities will be required to meet the terms of their permits related to industrial dischargers. Municipalities may undertake programs that go beyond the threshold requirements of the permit. Some municipal entities stated that municipal permittees should be able to require permit applications from industries in the same manner that EPA does and also require permits. In response, if operators of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems wish to employ such a program, then this portion of the management program may incorporate such practices.

d. Measures to reduce pollutants in runoff from construction sites into municipal systems. Section VI.F.8 of today's rule discusses EPA's proposal to define the term "storm water discharge associated with industrial activity" to include runoff from construction sites, including preconstruction activities except operations that result in the disturbance of less than 5 acres total land area which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale. Under today's rule, facilities that discharge runoff from construction sites that meet this definition will be required to submit permit applications unless they are to be covered by another individual or general NPDES permit. Permit application requirements for such discharges are at 40 CFR 122.26(c)(1)(ii).

Section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D) of today's rule requires applicants for a permit for large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems to submit a description of a proposed management program to control pollutants in construction site runoff that discharges to municipal systems. Under this provision, municipal applicants will submit a description of a program for implementing and maintaining structural and non-structural best management practices for controlling storm water runoff at construction sites. The program will address procedures for site planning, enforceable requirements for nonstructural and structural best management practices, procedures for inspecting sites and enforcing control measures, and educational and training measures. Generally, construction site ordinances are effective when they are implemented. However, in many areas, even though ordinances exist, they have limited effectiveness because they are not adequately implemented. Maintaining best management practices also presents problems. Retention and infiltration basins fill up and silt fences may break or be overtopped. Weak inspection and enforcement point to the need for more emphasis on training and education to complement regulatory programs. Permits issued to municipalities will address these concerns.

8. Assessment of Controls

EPA proposed that municipal applicants provide an initial assessment of the effectiveness of the control method for structural or non-structural controls which have been proposed in the management program. Some commenters stated that the assessment of controls should be left to the term of the permit because the effectiveness of controls will be hard to establish. EPA believes that an initial estimate or assessment is needed because the performance of appropriate management controls is highly dependent on sitespecific factors. The assessment will be used in conjunction with the development of pollutant loading and concentration estimates (see VI.H.6.c) and the evaluation of water quality benefits associated with implementing controls. Such assessments do not have to be verified with quantitative data, but can be based on accepted engineering design practices. Further more precise assessments based upon quantitative data can be undertaken during the term of the permit.

I. Annual Reports

As discussed earlier in today's preamble, EPA has provided for proposed flexible permit application requirements to facilitate the development of site-specific programs to control the discharge of pollutants from large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. Many municipalities are in the early stages of the complex task of developing a program suitable for controlling pollutants in discharges under a NPDES permit, while other municipalities have relatively sophisticated programs in place. In order to ensure that such sitespecific programs are developed in a timely manner, EPA proposed to require permittees of municipal separate storm sewer systems to submit status reports every year which reflect the development of their control programs.

The reports will be used by the permitting authority to aid in evaluating compliance with permit conditions and where necessary, modify permit conditions to address changed conditions. EPA requested comments on the appropriate content of the annual reports. Based on these comments EPA has added the following in these reports: an analysis of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the year; new outfalls or discharges; annual expenditures; identification of water quality improvements or degradation on watershed basis; budget for year following each annual report; and administrative information including enforcement activities, inspections, and public education programs. EPA views this information as important for evaluating the municipal program. Annual monitoring data and identified water quality improvements are important for evaluating the success of management programs in reducing pollutants. If new outfalls come into existence during the term of the permit, these may be sources of pollutants and appropriate permit conditions will be developed. Annual reports should reflect the level of enforcement activity and inspections undertaken to ensure that the legal authority developed by the municipality is properly exercised. Many of the management programs depend upon an ongoing high level of public education. Accordingly, the undertaking of these programs on an annual basis should be documented.

J. Application Deadlines

The CWA provided a statutory time frame for implementing the storm water permit application process and issuance and compliance with permits.

The CWA requires EPA to promulgate permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and for large municipal separate storm sewer systems by "no later than two years" after the date of enactment (i.e. no later than February 4, 1989). In conjunction with this requirement, the Act requires that permit applications for these classes of discharges be submitted within one year after the statutory date by which EPA is to promulgate permit application requirements by providing that such applications "shall be filed no later than three years" after the date of enactment of the WQA (i.e., no later than February 4, 1990).

The CWA also requires EPA topromulgate final regulations governing storm water permit application requirements for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more but less than 250,000 by "no later than four years" after enactment (*i.e.* no later than February 4, 1991). Permit applications for medium municipal separate storm sewer systems "shall be filed no later than five years" after the date of enactment of the CWA (i.e., no later than February 4, 1992). The CWA did not establish the time period between designation and permit application submittal for case-by-case designations under section 402(p)(2)(E).

Comments on earlier rulemakings involving storm water application deadlines have established that applicants need adequate time to obtain "representative" storm water samples. Many commenters have indicated that at least one full year is needed to obtain such samples. This is because many discharges are located in areas where testing during dry seasons or winter would not be feasible. The intermittent and unpredictable nature of storm water discharges can result in difficult and time-consuming data gathering. Moreover, some operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems have many storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, which can require considerable time to identify analyze, and submit applications. This creates a tremendous practical problem for the extremely high number of unpermitted storm water discharges. The public's interest in a sound storm water program and the development of a useful storm water data base is best served by establishing an application deadline which will allow sufficient time to gather, analyze, and prepare meaningful applications. Based on a consideration of these factors, EPA proposed that individual permit

applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which currently are not covered by a permit and that are required to obtain a permit, be submitted one year after the final rule is promulgated.

EPA received numerous comments from industries on the one year requirement for submitting applications. Several commenters supported the proposed deadline as realistic, while others believed more time was needed to meet the information and quantitative requirement.

EPA rejects the assertion by some commenters that a year is too short a period of time to obtain the required quantitative data. Today's rule generally requires applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity to be submitted on or before November 18, 1991. Operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge through a municipal separate storm sewer are subject to the same application deadline as other storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. Since final regulation at § 122.21(g)(7) provides considerable latitude for selecting rain events for quantitative data, EPA is convinced that in most cases data can be obtained during the one year time frame. If data cannot be collected during the one year time frame because of anomalous weather (e.g. drought conditions), then permitting authorities may grant additional time for submitting that data on a case-by-case basis. See § 122.21(g)(7).

Operators of storm water discharges which are currently covered by a permit will not be required to submit a permit application until their existing permit expires. In recognition of the time required to collect storm water discharge data, EPA will allow facilities which currently have a NPDES permit for a storm water discharge and which must reapply for permit renewal during the first year following promulgation of today's permit application requirements the option of applying in accordance with existing Form 1 and Form 2C requirements (in lieu of applying in accordance with the revised application requirements).

As discussed in section VI.D.4 and section VI.F.6 of today's preamble, EPA has established a two part permit application both for both group applications for sufficiently similar facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity and for operators of large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. The deadlines for submitting permit applications in today's rule provide adequate time for: (1) Applicants to prepare Part 1 of the application; (2) EPA or an approved State to adequately review applications; and (3) applicants to prepare the contents of the part 2 application.

Part 1 of the group application for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity must be submitted within 120 days from the publication of these final permit application regulations. This time is necessary to form groups and for individual members of the group to prepare the nonquantitative information required in part 1 of the application. Part 1 of the group application will be submitted to EPA Headquarters in Washington, DC and reviewed within 60 days after being received. Part 2 of the application would then be submitted within one year after the part 1 application is approved. It should be noted that many facilities located in States in which general permits can be issued, will be eligible for coverage by a storm water general permit to be promulgated in the near future. Such facilities may either seek coverage under such general permits or participate in the group application.

Several comments were received by EPA that indicated that a period of 120 days was too short a period for groups to be formed. EPA disagrees with these comments. The information that EPA is requiring to be submitted by the group or group representative is information that is generally available such as the location of the facility, its industrial activity, and material management practices. EPA believes that 120 days is sufficient to gather and submit this information along with an identification of 10% of the facilities which will submit quantitative data. To ameliorate any difficulties for applicants, EPA has provided a means for late facilities to 'add on" where appropriate, on a caseby-case basis, as discussed in section VI.F.4. above.

Several comments were received with regard to the requirement that new dischargers submit an application at least 180 days before the date on which the discharge is to commence. One commenter noted that it will be difficult for a facility to know when a storm water discharge is to commence since precipitation and runoff cannot be predicted to any degree of accuracy. In response, new dischargers must apply for a storm water permit application 180 days before that facility commences manufacturing, processing, or raw material storage operations which may result in the discharge of pollutants from storm water runoff, and 90 days for new construction sites.

For large municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of more than 250,000), EPA proposed that part 1 of the permit application be submitted within one year of the date of the final regulations, with approval or disapproval by the permit issuing authority of the provisions of the part 1 permit application within 90 days after receiving part 1 of the application. The Part 2 portion of the application was to be submitted within two years of the date of promulgation.

For medium municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of more than 100,000, but less than 250,000), EPA proposed that permit applications would be required nine months after the date of the final rule, with approval or disapproval of the provisions of the part 1 permit application within 90 days after receiving the part 1 application. The part 2 portion of the application would then be submitted no later than one year after the part 1 application has been approved.

Númerous comments were received by EPA from municipalities on these proposed deadlines. Many of these comments reflect the sentiment that the deadlines are too tight and that the required information would not be available for submission within the required time frame. Some commenters suggested deadlines that would add over three years to the permit application process. Other commenters suggested a revamped application process and a shorter deadline of 18 months. Some commenters explained that additional time would be needed to obtain adequate legal authority, while another stated that an inventory of outfalls required more time. One commenter maintained that intergovernmental agreements will require more time to prepare, and others expressed the view that more time was needed for the review of part 1 of the application by permitting authorities. Others felt more time was needed for collecting data, or hiring additional staff to accomplish the work. Most of these commenters did not provide specific details regarding what would be an appropriate amount of time and why.

After reviewing these comments EPA has decided to modify some of the deadlines as proposed. EPA is convinced that to properly achieve the goals of the CWA, the permit application requirements as discussed in previous sections are appropriate; but that the deadlines for medium municipal separate storm sewer systems should be adjusted so that the program's goals can be properly accomplished. After reviewing comments, EPA believes that medium municipalities will have fewer resources and existing institutional arrangements than large cities and therefore more time should be granted to these cities for submitting parts 1 and 2 of the application.

Accordingly EPA will require large municipal systems to submit part 1 of the permit application no later than November 18, 1991. Part 1 will be reviewed and approved or disapproved by the Director within 90 days. Part 2 of the application will then be submitted November 16, 1992. Medium municipal systems will submit part 1 of the application on May 18, 1992. Approval or disapproval by the Director will be accomplished within 90 days. Part 2 of the application will be submitted by May 17, 1993. These deadlines will give large systems two years to complete the application process, and medium systems 2 years and 6 months to submit applications. EPA is convinced that the permit application schedule is warranted and should provide adequate time to prepare the application.

In establishing these regulatory deadlines EPA is fully aware that they are not synchronized with the statutory deadlines as established by Congress. One commenter argued that the deadlines as proposed were contrary to the deadlines established by Congress and that EPA had no authority to extend these deadlines. (For large municipal separate storm sewer systems and storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, Congress established a deadline of February 4, 1990, for submission of permit applications; for medium municipal separate storm sewer systems, the deadline is February 4, 1992.) In response, this regulation provides certain deadlines for meeting the substantive requirements of this rulemaking-requirements which EPA is convinced are necessary for the development of enforceable and sound storm water permits. EPA believes it is important to give applicants sufficient time to reasonably comply with the permit application requirements set out today. EPA will therefore accept applications for storm water discharge permits up to the dates specified in today's rule. By establishing these regulatory deadlines, however, EPA is not attempting to waive or revoke the statutory deadlines established in Section 402(p) of the CWA and does not assert the authority to do so. The statutory permit application deadlines

continue to be enforceable requirements.

EPA was not able to promulgate the final application regulations for storm water discharges before the February 4. 1990, deadline for industrial and large municipal dischargers despite its best efforts. Further, as noted above, EPA is not able to waive the statutory deadline. Dischargers concerned with complying with the statutory deadline should submit a permit application as required under this rulemaking as expeditiously as possible.

Operators of storm water discharges that are not specifically required to file a permit application under today's rule may be required to obtain a permit for their discharge on the basis of a caseby-case designation by the Administrator or the NPDES State.

The Administrator or NPDES State may also designate storm water discharges (except agricultural storm water discharges), that contribute to a violation of a water quality standard or that are significant contributors of pollutants to waters of the United States for a permit. Prior to a case-by-case determination that an individual permit is required for a storm water discharge, the Administrator or NPDES State may require the operator of the discharge to submit a permit application. 40 CFR 124.52(c) requires the operator of designated storm water discharges to submit a permit application within 60 days of notice, unless permission for a later date is granted. The 60-day deadline is consistent with the procedures for designating other discharges for a NPDES permit on a case-by-case basis found at 40 CFR 124.52. The 60-day deadline recognizes that case-by-case designations often require an expedited response, however, flexibility exists to allow for case-bycase extensions.

The December 7, 1988, proposal also proposed Part 504 State Storm Water Management Programs. The Agency has not included this component in today's rule. The Agency believes this program element is appropriate for addressing in regulations promulgated under section 402(p)(6) of the CWA.

VII. Economic Impact

EPA has prepared an Information Collection Request for the purpose of estimating the information collection burden imposed on Federal, State and local governments and industry for revisions to NPDES permit application requirements for storm water discharges codified in 40 CFR part 122. EPA is promulgating these revisions in response to Section 402(p)(4) of the Clean Water Act, as amended by the Water Quality

Act of 1987 (WQA). The revisions would VIII. Paperwork Reduction Act apply to: Storm water discharges associated with industrial activity; discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 250,000 or more and discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250.000.

The estimated annual cost of applying for NPDES permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems is \$4.2 million. EPA estimates that an average permit application for a large municipality will cost \$76,681 and require 4,534 hours to prepare. The average application for a medium municipality will cost \$49,249 (2,912 hours) to prepare. The annual respondent cost for NPDES permit applications, notices of intent, and notifications for facilities with discharges associated with industrial activity is estimated to be \$9.5 million (271,248 hours). EPA estimates that the average preparation cost of an individual industrial permit application' would be \$1,007 (28.6 hours). Average Group application will cost \$74.00 per facility (2.1 hours). The average cost of the notification and notice of intent to be covered by general permit is \$17.00 (0.5 hours).

The annual cost to the Federal Government and approved States for administration of the program is estimated to be \$588,603. The total cost for municipalities, industry, and State and Federal authorities is estimated to be \$14.5 million annually.

In general, the cost estimates provided in the ICR focus primarily on the costs associated with developing, submitting and reviewing the permit applications associated with today's rule. EPA will continue to evaluate procedures and methods to control storm water discharges to the extent necessary to mitigate impacts on water quality in the studies required under section 402(p)(5) of the CWA. Executive Order 12291 requires EPA and other agencies to perform regulatory analyses of major regulations. Major rules are those which impose a cost on the economy of \$100 million or more annually or have certain other economic impacts. Today's proposed amendments would generally make the NPDES permit application regulations more flexible and less burdensome for the regulated community. These regulations do not, satisfy any of the criteria specified in section 1(b) of the Executive Order and. as such, do not constitute a major rule. This regulation was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

The information collection requirements in this rule have been submitted for approval to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under provision of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. and have been assigned OMB control number 2040-0086.

48061

Public reporting burden for permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity (other than from construction facilities) is . estimated to average 28.6 hours per individual permit application, 0.5 hours per notice of intent to be covered by general permit, and 2.1 hours per group applicant. The public reporting burden for permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from construction activities submitting individual applications is estimated to average 4.5 hours per response. The public reporting burden for facilities which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity to municipal separate storm sewers serving a population over 100,000 to notify the operator of the municipal separate storm sewer system is estimated to average 0.5 hours per response.

The reporting burden for system-wide permit applications for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 250,000 or more is estimated to average 4,534 hours per response. The reporting burden for system-wide permit applications for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250,000 is estimated to average 2,912 hours per response. Estimates of reporting burden include time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

IX. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., EPA is required to prepare a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis to assess the impact of rules on small entities. No Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is required, however, where the head of the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Today's amendments to the regulations would generally make the NPDES permit applications regulations more flexible and less burdensome for permittees. Accordingly, I hereby
certify, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that these amendments do not, have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124

Administrative practice and procedure, Environmental protection, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Water pollution control.

Authority: Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.

Dated: October 31, 1990. William K. Reilly,

Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, parts 122, 123, and 124 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

PART 122-EPA ADMINISTERED PERMIT PROGRAMS: THE NATIONAL **POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM**

Subpart B—Permit Application and **Special NPDES Program Requirements**

1. The authority citation for part 122 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.

2. Section 122.1 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(2)(iv) to read as follows:

§ 122.1 Purpose and scope. ٠

- *
- (b) * * *
- (2) * * *

(iv) Discharges of storm water as set forth in § 122.26; and * *

*

3. Section 122.21 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(1), by removing the last sentence of paragraph (f)(7), by removing paragraph (f)(9), by adding two sentences at the end of paragraph (g)(3), by revising paragraph (g)(7) introductory text, by removing and reserving paragraph (g)(10) and by revising the introductory text of paragraph (k) to read as follows:

§ 122.21 Application for a permit (applicable to State programs, see § 123.25).

(c) Time to apply. (1) Any person proposing a new discharge, shall submit an application at least 180 days before the date on which the discharge is to commence, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the Director. Facilities proposing a new discharge of storm water associated with industrial activity shall submit an application 180 days before that facility commences

industrial activity which may result in a discharge of storm water associated with that industrial activity. Facilities described under § 122.26(b)(14)(x) shall submit applications at least 90 days before the date on which construction is to commence. Different submittal dates may be required under the terms of applicable general permits. Persons proposing a new discharge are encouraged to submit their applications well in advance of the 90 or 180 day requirements to avoid delay. See also paragraph (k) of this section and § 122.26 (c)(1)(i)(G) and (c)(1)(ii).

* (g) * * *

(3) * * * The average flow of point sources composed of storm water may be estimated. The basis for the rainfall event and the method of estimation must be indicated.

(7) Effluent characteristics. Information on the discharge of pollutants specified in this paragraph (except information on storm water discharges which is to be provided as specified in § 122.26). When "quantitative data" for a pollutant are required, the applicant must collect a sample of effluent and analyze it for the pollutant in accordance with analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136. When no analytical method is approved the applicant may use any suitable method but must provide a description of the method. When an applicant has two or more outfalls with substantially identical effluents, the Director may allow the applicant to test only one outfall and report that the quantitative data also apply to the substantially identical outfalls. The requirements in paragraphs (g)(7) (iii) and (iv) of this section that an applicant must provide quantitative data for certain pollutants known or believed to be present do not apply to pollutants present in a discharge solely as the result of their presence in intake water; however, an applicant must report such pollutants as present. Grab samples must be used for pH, temperature, cyanide, total phenols, residual chlorine, oil and grease, fecal coliform and fecal streptococcus. For all other pollutants, 24-hour composite samples must be used. However, a minimum of one grab sample may be taken for effluents from holding ponds or other impoundments with a retention period greater than 24 hours. In addition, for discharges other than storm water discharges, the Director may waive composite sampling for any outfall for which the applicant demonstrates that the use of an automatic sampler is infeasible and that

the minimum of four (4) grab samples will be a representative sample of the effluent being discharged. For storm water discharges, all samples shall be collected from the discharge resulting from a storm event that is greater than 0.1 inch and at least 72 hours from the previously measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event. Where feasible, the variance in the duration of the event and the total rainfall of the event should not exceed 50 percent from the average or median rainfall event in that area. For all applicants, a flowweighted composite shall be taken for either the entire discharge or for the first three hours of the discharge. The flowweighted composite sample for a storm water discharge may be taken with a continuous sampler or as a combination of a minimum of three sample aliquots taken in each hour of discharge for the entire discharge or for the first three hours of the discharge, with each aliquot being separated by a minimum period of fifteen minutes (applicants submitting permit applications for storm water discharges under § 122.26(d) may collect flow weighted composite samples using different protocols with respect to the time duration between the collection of sample aliquots, subject to the approval of the Director). However, a minimum of one grab sample may be taken for storm water discharges from holding ponds or other impoundments with a retention period greater than 24 hours. For a flowweighted composite sample, only one analysis of the composite of aliquots is required. For storm water discharge samples taken from discharges associated with industrial activities, quantitative data must be reported for the grab sample taken during the first thirty minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of the discharge for all pollutants specified in § 122.26(c)(1). For all storm water permit applicants taking flow-weighted composites, quantitative data must be reported for all pollutants specified in § 122.26 except pH, temperature, cyanide, total phenols, residual chlorine, oil and grease, fecal coliform, and fecal streptococcus. The Director may allow or establish appropriate site-specific sampling procedures or requirements, including sampling locations, the season in which the sampling takes place, the minimum duration between the previous measurable storm event and the storm event sampled, the minimum or maximum level of precipitation required for an appropriate storm event, the form of precipitation sampled (snow melt or rain fall), protocols for collecting samples under 40 CFR part 136, and additional time for submitting data on a

case-by-case basis. An applicant is expected to "know or have reason to believe" that a pollutant is present in an effluent based on an evaluation of the expected use, production, or storage of the pollutant, or on any previous analyses for the pollutant. (For example, any pesticide manufactured by a facility may be expected to be present in contaminated storm water runoff from the facility.)

(k) Application requirements for new sources and new discharges. New manufacturing, commercial, mining and silvicultural dischargers applying for NPDES permits (except for new discharges of facilities subject to the requirements of paragraph (h) of this section or new discharges of storm water associated with industrial activity which are subject to the requirements of § 122.26(c)(1) and this section (except as provided by § 122.26(c)(1)(ii)) shall provide the following information to the Director, using the application forms provided by the Director:

4. Section 122.22(b) introductory text is revised to read as follows:

§ 122.22 Signatories to permit applications and reports (applicable to State programs, see § 123.25).

(b) All reports required by permits, and other information requested by the Director shall be signed by a person described in paragraph (a) of this section, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

5. Section 122.26 is revised to read as follows:

*

§ 122.26 Storm water discharges (applicable to State NPDES programs, see § 123.25).

(a) *Permit requirement.* (1) Prior to October 1, 1992, discharges composed entirely of storm water shall not be required to obtain a NPDES permit except:

(i) A discharge with respect to which a permit has been issued prior to February 4, 1987;

(ii) A discharge associated with industrial activity (see § 122.26(a)(4));

(iii) A discharge from a large
municipal separate storm sewer system;
(iv) A discharge from a medium

municipal separate storm sewer system; (v) A discharge which the Director, or

in States with approved NPDES programs, either the Director or the EPA Regional Administrator, determines to contribute to a violation of a water

quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States. This designation may include a discharge from any conveyance or system of conveyances used for collecting and conveying storm water runoff or a system of discharges from municipal separate storm sewers. except for those discharges from conveyances which do not require a permit under paragraph (a)(2) of this section or agricultural storm water runoff which is exempted from the definition of point source at § 122.2. The Director may designate discharges from municipal separate storm sewers on a system-wide or jurisdiction-wide basis. In making this determination the Director may consider the following factors:

(A) The location of the discharge with respect to waters of the United States as defined at 40 CFR 122.2.

(B) The size of the discharge;

(C) The quantity and nature of the pollutants discharged to waters of the United States; and

(D) Other relevant factors.

(2) The Director may not require a permit for discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations or oil and gas exploration, production, processing or treatment operations or transmission facilities, composed entirely of flows which are from conveyances or systems of conveyances (including but not limited to pipes, conduits, ditches, and channels) used for collecting and conveying precipitation runoff and which are not contaminated by contact with or that has not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished product, byproduct or waste products located on the site of such operations.

(3) Large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. (i) Permits must be obtained for all discharges from large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems.

(ii) The Director may either issue one system-wide permit covering all discharges from municipal separate storm sewers within a large or medium municipal storm sewer system or issue distinct permits for appropriate categories of discharges within a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system including, but not limited to: all discharges owned or operated by the same municipality; located within the same jurisdiction: all discharges within a system that discharge to the same watershed; discharges within a system that are similar in nature; or for individual discharges from municipal separate storm sewers within the system.

(iii) The operator of a discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer which is part of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system must either:

(A) Participate in a permit application (to be a permittee or a co-permittee) with one or more other operators of discharges from the large or medium municipal storm sewer system which covers all, or a portion of all, discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer system;

(B) Submit a distinct permit application which only covers discharges from the municipal separate storm sewers for which the operator is responsible; or

(C) A regional authority may be responsible for submitting a permit application under the following guidelines:

(1) The regional authority together with co-applicants shall have authority over a storm water management program that is in existence, or shall be in existence at the time part 1 of the application is due;

(2) The permit applicant or coapplicants shall establish their ability to make a timely submission of part 1 and part 2 of the municipal application;

(3) Each of the operators of municipal separate storm sewers within the systems described in paragraphs (b)(4)
(i), (ii), and (iii) or (b)(7) (i), (ii), and (iii) of this section, that are under the purview of the designated regional authority, shall comply with the application requirements of paragraph (d) of this section.

(iv) One permit application may be submitted for all or a portion of all municipal separate storm sewers within adjacent or interconnected large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. The Director may issue one system-wide permit covering all, or a portion of all municipal separate storm sewers in adjacent or interconnected large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems.

(v) Permits for all or a portion of all discharges from large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems that are issued on a system-wide, jurisdiction-wide, watershed or other basis may specify different conditions relating to different discharges covered by the permit, including different management programs for different drainage areas which contribute storm water to the system.

(vi) Co-permittees need only comply with permit conditions relating to discharges from the municipal separate storm sewers for which they are operators.

(4) Discharges through large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems. In addition to meeting the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section, an operator of a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity which discharges through a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system shall submit, to the operator of the municipal separate storm sewer system receiving the discharge no later than May 15, 1991, or 180 days prior to commencing such discharge: the name of the facility; a contact person and phone number; the location of the discharge; a description, including Standard Industrial Classification, which best reflects the principal products or services provided by each facility; and any existing NPDES permit number.

(5) Other municipal separate storm sewers. The Director may issue permits for municipal separate storm sewers that are designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section on a system-wide basis, jurisdiction-wide basis, watershed basis or other appropriate basis, or may issue permits for individual discharges.

(6) Non-municipal separate storm sewers. For storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from point sources which discharge through a non-municipal or non-publicly owned separate storm sewer system, the Director, in his discretion, may issue: a single NPDES permit, with each discharger a co-permittee to a permit issued to the operator of the portion of the system that discharges into waters of the United States; or, individual permits to each discharger of storm water associated with industrial activity through the non-municipal conveyance system.

(i) All storm water discharges associated with industrial activity that discharge through a storm water discharge system that is not a municipal separate storm sewer must be covered by an individual permit, or a permit issued to the operator of the portion of the system that discharges to waters of the United States, with each discharger to the non-municipal conveyance a copermittee to that permit.

(ii) Where there is more than one operator of a single system of such conveyances, all operators of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity must submit applications.

(iii) Any permit covering more than one operator shall identify the effluent limitations, or other permit conditions, if any, that apply to each operator.

(7) *Combined sewer systems*. Conveyances that discharge storm water runoff combined with municipal sewage are point sources that must obtain NPDES permits in accordance with the procedures of § 122.21 and are not subject to the provisions of this section.

(8) Whether a discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer is or is not subject to regulation under this section shall have no bearing on whether the owner or operator of the discharge is eligible for funding under title II, title III or title VI of the Clean Water Act. See 40 CFR part 35, subpart I, appendix A(b)H.2.j.

(b) Definitions. (1) Co-permittee means a permittee to a NPDES permit that is only responsible for permit conditions relating to the discharge for which it is operator.

(2) *Illicit discharge* means any discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit (other than the NPDES permit for discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer) and discharges resulting from fire fighting activities.

(3) Incorporated place means the District of Columbia, or a city, town, township, or village that is incorporated under the laws of the State in which it is located.

(4) Large municipal separate storm sewer system means all municipal separate storm sewers that are either:

(i) Located in an incorporated place with a population of 250,000 or more as determined by the latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census (appendix F); or

(ii) Located in the counties listed in appendix H, except municipal separate storm sewers that are located in the incorporated places, townships or towns within such counties; or

(iii) Owned or operated by a municipality other than those described in paragraph (b)(4) (i) or (ii) of this section and that are designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described under paragraph (b)(4) (i) or (ii) of this section. In making this determination the Director may consider the following factors:

(A) Physical interconnections between the municipal separate storm sewers;

(B) The location of discharges from the designated municipal separate storm sewer relative to discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described in paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section;

(C) The quantity and nature of pollutants discharged to waters of the United States;

(D) The nature of the receiving waters: and

(E) Other relevant factors; or

(iv) The Director may, upon petition, designate as a large municipal separate storm sewer system, municipal separate storm sewers located within the boundaries of a region defined by a storm water management regional authority based on a jurisdictional, watershed, or other appropriate basis that includes one or more of the systems described in paragraph (b)(4) (i), (ii), (iii) of this section.

(5) Major municipal separate storm sewer outfall (or "major outfall") means a municipal separate storm sewer outfall that discharges from a single pipe with an inside diameter of 36 inches or more or its equivalent (discharge from a single conveyance other than circular pipe which is associated with a drainage area of more than 50 acres); or for municipal separate storm sewers that receive storm water from lands zoned for industrial activity (based on comprehensive zoning plans or the equivalent), an outfall that discharges from a single pipe with an inside diameter of 12 inches or more or from its equivalent (discharge from other than a circular pipe associated with a drainage area of 2 acres or more).

(6) *Major outfall* means a major municipal separate storm sewer outfall.

(7) Medium municipal separate storm sewer system means all municipal separate storm sewers that are either:

(i) Located in an incorporated place with a population of 100,000 or more but less than 250,000, as determined by the latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census (appendix G); or

(ii) Located in the counties listed in appendix I, except municipal separate storm sewers that are located in the incorporated places, townships or towns within such counties; or

(iii) Owned or operated by a municipality other than those described in paragraph (b)(4) (i) or (ii) of this section and that are designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described under paragraph (b)(4) (i) or (ii) of this section. In making this determination the Director may consider the following factors: (A) Physical interconnections between the municipal separate storm sewers;

(B) The location of discharges from the designated municipal separate storm sewer relative to discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described in paragraph (b)(7)(i) of this section;

(C) The quantity and nature of pollutants discharged to waters of the United States;

(D) The nature of the receiving waters; or

(E) Other relevant factors; or

(iv) The Director may, upon petition, designate as a medium municipal separate storm sewer system, municipal separate storm sewers located within the boundaries of a region defined by a storm water management regional authority based on a jurisdictional, watershed, or other appropriate basis that includes one or more of the systems described in paragraphs (b)(7) (i), (ii), (iii) of this section.

(8) Municipal separate storm sewer means a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains):

(i) Owned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to State law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, storm water, or other wastes, including special districts under State law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under section 208 of the CWA that discharges to waters of the United States:

(ii) Designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water;

(iii) Which is not a combined sewer; and

(iv) Which is not part of a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) as defined at 40 CFR 122.2.

(9) Outfall means a point source as defined by 40 CFR 122.2 at the point where a municipal separate storm sewer discharges to waters of the United States and does not include open conveyances connecting two municipal separate storm sewers, or pipes, tunnels or other conveyances which connect segments of the same stream or other waters of the United States and are used to convey waters of the United States.

(10) Overburden means any material of any nature, consolidated or unconsolidated, that overlies a mineral deposit, excluding topsoil or similar naturally-occurring surface materials that are not disturbed by mining operations.

(11) *Runoff coefficient* means the fraction of total rainfall that will appear at a conveyance as runoff.

(12) Significant materials includes, but is not limited to: raw materials; fuels; materials such as solvents, detergents, and plastic pellets; finished materials such as metallic products; raw materials used in food processing or production; hazardous substances designated under section 101(14) of CERCLA; any chemical the facility is required to report pursuant to section 313 of title III of SARA; fertilizers; pesticides; and waste products such as ashes, slag and sludge that have the potential to be released with storm water discharges.

(13) *Storm water* means storm water runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.

(14) Storm water discharge associated with industrial activity means the discharge from any conveyance which is used for collecting and conveying storm water and which is directly related to manufacturing, processing or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant. The term does not include discharges from facilities or activities excluded from the NPDES program under 40 CFR part 122. For the categories of industries identified in paragraphs (b)(14) (i) through (x) of this section, the term includes, but is not limited to, storm water discharges from industrial plant yards; immediate access roads and rail lines used or traveled by carriers of raw materials, manufactured products, waste material, or by-products used or created by the facility; material handling sites; refuse sites; sites used for the application or disposal of process waste waters (as defined at 40 CFR part 401); sites used for the storage and maintenance of material handling equipment; sites used for residual treatment, storage, or disposal; shipping and receiving areas; manufacturing buildings; storage areas (including tank farms) for raw materials, and intermediate and finished products; and areas where industrial activity has taken place in the past and significant materials remain and are exposed to storm water. For the categories of industries identified in paragraph (b)(14)(xi) of this section, the term includes only storm water discharges from all the areas (except access roads and rail lines) that are listed in the previous sentence where material handling equipment or activities, raw materials, intermediate products, final products, waste materials, by-products, or industrial machinery are exposed to

storm water. For the purposes of this paragraph, material handling activities include the storage, loading and unloading, transportation, or conveyance of any raw material, intermediate product, finished product, by-product or waste product. The term excludes areas located on plant lands separate from the plant's industrial activities, such as office buildings and accompanying parking lots as long as the drainage from the excluded areas is not mixed with storm water drained from the above described areas. Industrial facilities (including industrial facilities that are Federally, State, or municipally owned or operated that meet the description of the facilities listed in this paragraph (b)(14)(i)-(xi) of this section) include those facilities designated under the provisions of paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section. The following categories of facilities are considered to be engaging in "industrial activity" for purposes of this subsection:

(i) Facilities subject to storm water effluent limitations guidelines, new source performance standards, or toxic pollutant effluent standards under 40 CFR subchapter N (except facilities with toxic pollutant effluent standards which are exempted under category (xi) in paragraph (b)(14) of this section);

(ii) Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 24 (except 2434), 26 (except 265 and 267), 28 (except 283), 29, 31l, 32 (except 323), 33, 344l, 373;

(iii) Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 10 through 14 (mineral industry) including active or inactive mining operations (except for areas of coal mining operations no longer meeting the definition of a reclamation area under 40 CFR 434.11(1) because the performance bond issued to the facility by the appropriate SMCRA authority has been released, or except for areas of non-coal mining operations which have been released from applicable State or Federal reclamation requirements after December 17, 1990) and oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that discharge storm water contaminated by contact with or that has come into contact with. any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished products, byproducts or waste products located on the site of such operations; (inactive mining operations are mining sites that are not being actively mined, but which have an identifiable owner/ operator; inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined

materials, nor sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim);

(iv) Hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities, including those that are operating under interim status or a permit under subtitle C of RCRA;

(v) Landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that receive or have received any industrial wastes (waste that is received from any of the facilities described under this subsection) including those that are subject to regulation under subtitle D of RCRA;

(vi) Facilities involved in the recycling of materials, including metal scrapyards, battery reclaimers, salvage yards, and automobile junkyards, including but limited to those classified as Standard Industrial Classification 5015 and 5093;

(vii) Steam electric power generating facilities, including coal handling sites;

(viii) Transportation facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classifications 40, 41, 42 (except 4221-25), 43, 44, 45, and 5171 which have vehicle maintenance shops, equipment cleaning operations, or airport deicing operations. Only those portions of the facility that are either involved in vehicle maintenance (including vehicle rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling, and lubrication), equipment cleaning operations, airport deicing operations, or which are otherwise identified under paragraphs (b)(14) (i)-(vii) or (ix)-(xi) of this section are associated with industrial activity;

(ix) Treatment works treating domestic sewage or any other sewage sludge or wastewater treatment device or system, used in the storage treatment. recycling, and reclamation of municipal or domestic sewage, including land dedicated to the disposal of sewage sludge that are located within the confines of the facility, with a design flow of 1.0 mgd or more, or required to have an approved pretreatment program under 40 CFR part 403. Not included are farm lands, domestic gardens or lands used for sludge management where sludge is beneficially reused and which are not physically located in the confines of the facility, or areas that are in compliance with section 405 of the CWA;

(x) Construction activity including clearing, grading and excavation activities except: operations that result in the disturbance of less than five acres of total land area which are not part of a larger common plan of development or sale;

(xi) Facilities under Standard Industrial Classifications 20, 21, 22, 23, 2434, 25, 265, 267, 27, 283, 285, 30, 31 (except 311), 323, 34 (except 3441), 35, 36, 37 (except 373), 38, 39, 4221–25, (and which are not otherwise included within categories (ii)–(x));

(c) Application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity-(1) Individual application. Dischargers of storm water associated with industrial activity are required to apply for an individual permit, apply for a permit through a group application, or seek coverage under a promulgated storm water general permit. Facilities that are required to obtain an individual permit, or any discharge of storm water which the Director is evaluating for designation (see 40 CFR 124.52(c)) under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section and is not a municipal separate storm sewer, and which is not part of a group application described under paragraph (c)(2) of this section, shall submit an NPDES application in accordance with the requirements of § 122.21 as modified and supplemented by the provisions of the remainder of this paragraph. Applicants for discharges composed entirely of storm water shall submit Form 1 and Form 2F. Applicants for discharges composed of storm water and non-storm water shall submit Form 1, Form 2C, and Form 2F. Applicants for new sources or new discharges (as defined in § 122.2 of this part) composed of storm water and non-storm water shall submit Form 1, Form 2D, and Form 2F

(i) Except as provided in § 122.26(c)(1) (ii)-(iv), the operator of a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity subject to this section shall provide:

(A) A site map showing topography (or indicating the outline of drainage areas served by the outfall(s) covered in the application if a topographic map is unavailable) of the facility including: each of its drainage and discharge structures; the drainage area of each storm water outfall; paved areas and buildings within the drainage area of each storm water outfall, each past or present area used for outdoor storage or disposal of significant materials, each existing structural control measure to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff. materials loading and access areas, areas where pesticides, herbicides, soil conditioners and fertilizers are applied, each of its hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facilities (including each area not required to have a RCRA permit which is used for accumulating hazardous waste under 40 CFR 262.34); each well where fluids from the facility are injected underground; springs, and other surface water bodies which receive storm water discharges from the facility;

(B) An estimate of the area of impervious surfaces (including paved areas and building roofs) and the total area drained by each outfall (within a mile radius of the facility) and a narrative description of the following: Significant materials that in the three years prior to the submittal of this application have been treated, stored or disposed in a manner to allow exposure to storm water; method of treatment, storage or disposal of such materials; materials management practices employed, in the three years prior to the submittal of this application, to minimize contact by these materials with storm water runoff; materials loading and access areas; the location, manner and frequency in which pesticides, herbicides, soil conditioners and fertilizers are applied; the location and a description of existing structural and non-structural control measures to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff; and a description of the treatment the storm water receives, including the ultimate disposal of any solid or fluid wastes other than by discharge;

(C) A certification that all outfalls that should contain storm water discharges associated with industrial activity have been tested or evaluated for the presence of non-storm water discharges which are not covered by a NPDES permit; tests for such non-storm water discharges may include smoke tests, fluorometric dye tests, analysis of accurate schematics, as well as other appropriate tests. The certification shall include a description of the method used, the date of any testing, and the onsite drainage points that were directly observed during a test;

(D) Existing information regarding significant leaks or spills of toxic or hazardous pollutants at the facility that have taken place within the three years prior to the submittal of this application;

(E) Quantitative data based on samples collected during storm events and collected in accordance with § 122.21 of this part from all outfalls containing a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity for the following parameters:

 (1) Any pollutant limited in an effluent guideline to which the facility is subject;
 (2) Any pollutant listed in the facility's

NPDES permit for its process wastewater (if the facility is operating under an existing NPDES permit);

(3) Oil and grease, pH, BOD5, COD, TSS, total phosphorus, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, and nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen;

(4) Any information on the discharge required under paragraph § 122.21(g)(7) (iii) and (iv) of this part; (5) Flow measurements or estimates of the flow rate, and the total amount of discharge for the storm event(s) sampled, and the method of flow measurement or estimation; and

(6) The date and duration (in hours) of the storm event(s) sampled, rainfall measurements or estimates of the storm event (in inches) which generated the sampled runoff and the duration between the storm event sampled and the end of the previous measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event (in hours);

(F) Operators of a discharge which is composed entirely of storm water are exempt from the requirements of § 122.21 (g)(2), (g)(3), (g)(4), (g)(5), (g)(7)(i), (g)(7)(ii), and (g)(7)(v); and

(G) Operators of new sources or new discharges (as defined in § 122.2 of this part) which are composed in part or entirely of storm water must include estimates for the pollutants or parameters listed in paragraph (c)(1)(i)(E) of this section instead of actual sampling data, along with the source of each estimate. Operators of new sources or new discharges composed in part or entirely of storm water must provide quantitative data for the parameters listed in paragraph (c)(1)(i)(E) of this section within two years after commencement of discharge, unless such data has already been reported under the monitoring requirements of the NPDES permit for the discharge. Operators of a new source or new discharge which is composed entirely of storm water are exempt from the requirements of § 122.21 (k)(3)(ii), (k)(3)(iii), and (k)(5).

(ii) The operator of an existing or new storm water discharge that is associated with industrial activity solely under paragraph (b)(14)(x) of this section, is exempt from the requirements of 122.21(g) and paragraph (c)(1)(i) of this section. Such operator shall provide a narrative description of:

(A) The location (including a map) and the nature of the construction activity;

(B) The total area of the site and the area of the site that is expected to undergo excavation during the life of the permit;

(C) Proposed measures, including best management practices, to control pollutants in storm water discharges during construction, including a brief description of applicable State and local erosion and sediment control requirements;

(D) Proposed measures to control pollutants in storm water discharges that will occur after construction operations have been completed, including a brief description of applicable State or local erosion and sediment control requirements;

(E) An estimate of the runoff coefficient of the site and the increase in impervious area after the construction addressed in the permit application is completed, the nature of fill material and existing data describing the soil or the quality of the discharge; and

(F) The name of the receiving water. (iii) The operator of an existing or new discharge composed entirely of storm water from an oil or gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operation, or transmission facility is not required to submit a permit application in accordance with paragraph (c)(1)(i) of this section, unless the facility:

(A) Has had a discharge of storm water resulting in the discharge of a reportable quantity for which notification is or was required pursuant to 40 CFR 117.21 or 40 CFR 302.6 at anytime since November 16, 1987; or

(B) Has had a discharge of storm water resulting in the discharge of a reportable quantity for which notification is or was required pursuant to 40 CFR 110.6 at any time since November 16, 1987; or

(C) Contributes to a violation of a water quality standard.

(iv) The operator of an existing or new discharge composed entirely of storm water from a mining operation is not required to submit a permit application unless the discharge has come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished product, byproduct or waste products located on the site of such operations.

(v) Applicants shall provide such other information the Director may reasonably require under § 122.21(g)(13) of this part to determine whether to issue a permit and may require any facility subject to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section to comply with paragraph (c)(1)(i) of this section.

(2) Group application for discharges associated with industrial activity. In lieu of individual applications or notice of intent to be covered by a general permit for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, a group application may be filed by an entity representing a group of applicants (except facilities that have existing individual NPDES permits for storm water) that are part of the same subcategory (see 40 CFR subchapter N, part 405 to 471) or, where such grouping is inapplicable, are sufficiently similar as to be appropriate for general permit coverage under § 122.28 of this part. The part 1 application shall be submitted to the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits, U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460 (EN-336) for

approval. Once a part 1 application is approved, group applicants are to submit Part 2 of the group application to the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits. A group application shall consist of:

(i) *Part 1.* Part 1 of a group application shall:

(A) Identify the participants in the group application by name and location. Facilities participating in the group application shall be listed in nine subdivisions, based on the facility location relative to the nine precipitation zones indicated in appendix E to this part.

(B) Include a narrative description summarizing the industrial activities of participants of the group application and explaining why the participants, as a whole, are sufficiently similar to be a covered by a general permit;

(C) Include a list of significant materials stored exposed to precipitation by participants in the group application and materials management practices employed to diminish contact by these materials with precipitation and storm water runoff;

(D) Identify ten percent of the dischargers participating in the group application (with a minimum of 10 dischargers, and either a minimum of two dischargers from each precipitation zone indicated in appendix E of this part in which ten or more members of the group are located, or one discharger from each precipitation zone indicated in appendix E of this part in which nine or fewer members of the group are located) from which quantitative data will be submitted in part 2. If more than 1,000 facilities are identified in a group application, no more than 100 dischargers must submit quantitative data in Part 2. Groups of between four and ten dischargers may be formed. However, in groups of between four and ten, at least half the facilities must submit quantitative data, and at least one facility in each precipitation zone in which members of the group are located must submit data. A description of why the facilities selected to perform sampling and analysis are representative of the group as a whole in terms of the information provided in paragraph (c)(1) (i)(B) and (i)(C) of this section, shall accompany this section. Different factors impacting the nature of the storm water discharges, such as processes used and material management, shall be represented, to the extent feasible, in a manner roughly equivalent to their proportion in the group.

(ii) *Part 2.* Part 2 of a group application shall contain quantitative

data (NPDES Form 2F), as modified by paragraph (c)(1) of this section, so that when part 1 and part 2 of the group application are taken together, a complete NPDES application (Form 1, Form 2C, and Form 2F) can be evaluated for each discharger identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(D) of this section.

(d) Application requirements for large and medium municipal separate storm sewer discharges. The operator of a discharge from a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer or a municipal separate storm sewer that is designated by the Director under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section, may submit a jurisdiction-wide or systemwide permit application. Where more than one public entity owns or operates a municipal separate storm sewer within a geographic area (including adjacent or interconnected municipal separate storm sewer systems), such operators may be a coapplicant to the same application. Permit applications for discharges from large and medium municipal storm sewers or municipal storm sewers designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section shall include;

(1) Part 1. Part 1 of the application shall consist of;

(i) General information. The applicants' name, address, telephone number of contact person, ownership status and status as a State or local government entity.

(ii) Legal authority. A description of existing legal authority to control discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system. When existing legal authority is not sufficient to meet the criteria provided in paragraph (d)(2)(i) of this section, the description shall list additional authorities as will be necessary to meet the criteria and shall include a schedule and commitment to seek such additional authority that will be needed to meet the criteria.

(iii) Source identification. (A) A description of the historic use of ordinances, guidance or other controls which limited the discharge of nonstorm water discharges to any Publicly Owned Treatment Works serving the same area as the municipal separate storm sewer system.

(B) A USGS 7.5 minute topographic map (or equivalent topographic map with a scale between 1:10,000 and 1:24,000 if cost effective) extending one mile beyond the service boundaries of the municipal storm sewer system covered by the permit application. The following information shall be provided:

(1) The location of known municipal storm sewer system outfalls discharging to waters of the United States; (2) A description of the land use activities (e.g. divisions indicating undeveloped, residential, commercial, agricultural and industrial uses) accompanied with estimates of population densities and projected growth for a ten year period within the drainage area served by the separate storm sewer. For each land use type, an estimate of an average runoff coefficient shall be provided;

(3) The location and a description of the activities of the facility of each currently operating or closed municipal landfill or other treatment, storage or disposal facility for municipal waste;

(4) The location and the permit number of any known discharge to the municipal storm sewer that has been issued a NPDES permit;

(5) The location of major structural controls for storm water discharge (retention basins, detention basins, major infiltration devices, etc.); and

(6) The identification of publicly owned parks, recreational areas, and other open lands.

(iv) Discharge characterization. (A) Monthly mean rain and snow fall estimates (or summary of weather bureau data) and the monthly average number of storm events.

(B) Existing quantitative data describing the volume and quality of discharges from the municipal storm sewer, including a description of the outfalls sampled, sampling procedures and analytical methods used.

(C) A list of water bodies that receive discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer system, including downstream segments, lakes and estuaries, where pollutants from the system discharges may accumulate and cause water degradation and a brief description of known water quality impacts. At a minimum, the description of impacts shall include a description of whether the water bodies receiving such discharges have been:

(1) Assessed and reported in section 305(b) reports submitted by the State, the basis for the assessment (evaluated or monitored), a summary of designated use support and attainment of Clean Water Act (CWA) goals (fishable and swimmable waters), and causes of nonsupport of designated uses;

(2) Listed under section 304(1)(1)(A)(i), section 304(1)(1)(A)(ii), or section 304(1)(1)(B) of the CWA that is not expected to meet water quality standards or water quality goals;

(3) Listed in State Nonpoint Source Assessments required by section 319(a) of the CWA that, without additional action to control nonpoint sources of pollution, cannot reasonably be expected to attain or maintain water quality standards due to storm sewers, construction, highway maintenance and runoff from municipal landfills and municipal sludge adding significant pollution (or contributing to a violation of water quality standards);

(4) Identified and classified according to eutrophic condition of publicly owned lakes listed in State reports required under section 314(a) of the CWA (include the following: A description of those publicly owned lakes for which uses are known to be impaired; a description of procedures, processes and methods to control the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers into such lakes; and a description of methods and procedures to restore the quality of such lakes);

(5) Areas of concern of the Great Lakes identified by the International Joint Commission;

(6) Designated estuaries under the National Estuary Program under section 320 of the CWA;

(7) Recognized by the applicant as highly valued or sensitive waters;

(8) Defined by the State or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services's National Wetlands Inventory as wetlands; and

(9) Found to have pollutants in bottom sediments, fish tissue or biosurvey data.

(D) Field screening. Results of a field screening analysis for illicit connections and illegal dumping for either selected field screening points or major outfalls covered in the permit application. At a minimum, a screening analysis shall include a narrative description, for either each field screening point or major outfall, of visual observations made during dry weather periods. If any flow is observed, two grab samples shall be collected during a 24 hour period with a minimum period of four hours between samples. For all such samples, a narrative description of the color, odor, turbidity, the presence of an oil sheen or surface scum as well as any other relevant observations regarding the potential presence of non-storm water discharges or illegal dumping shall be provided. In addition. a narrative description of the results of a field analysis using suitable methods to estimate pH, total chlorine, total copper. total phenol, and detergents (or surfactants) shall be provided along with a description of the flow rate. Where the field analysis does not involve analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136, the applicant shall provide a description of the method used including the name of the manufacturer of the test method along with the range and accuracy of the test. Field screening points shall be either major outfalls or other outfall points (or

any other point of access such as manholes) randomly located throughout the storm sewer system by placing a grid over a drainage system map and identifying those cells of the grid which contain a segment of the storm sewer system or major outfall. The field screening points shall be established using the following guidelines and criteria:

(1) A grid system consisting of perpendicular north-south and east-west lines spaced ¼ mile apart shall be overlayed on a map of the municipal storm sewer system, creating a series of cells;

(2) All cells that contain a segment of the storm sewer system shall be identified; one field screening point shall be selected in each cell; major outfalls may be used as field screening points;

(3) Field screening points should be located downstream of any sources of suspected illegal or illicit activity;

(4) Field screening points shall be located to the degree practicable at the farthest manhole or other accessible location downstream in the system, within each cell; however, safety of personnel and accessibility of the location should be considered in making this determination;

(5) Hydrological conditions; total drainage area of the site; population density of the site; traffic density; age of the structures or buildings in the area; history of the area; and land use types;

(6) For medium municipal separate storm sewer systems, no more than 250 cells need to have identified field screening points; in large municipal separate storm sewer systems, no more than 500 cells need to have identified field screening points; cells established by the grid that contain no storm sewer segments will be eliminated from consideration; if fewer than 250 cells in medium municipal sewers are created. and fewer than 500 in large systems are created by the overlay on the municipal sewer map, then all those cells which contain a segment of the sewer system shall be subject to field screening (unless access to the separate storm sewer system is impossible); and

(7) Large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems which are unable to utilize the procedures described in paragraphs (d)(1)(iv)(D) (1) through (6) of this section, because a sufficiently detailed map of the separate storm sewer systems is unavailable, shall field screen no more than 500 or 250 major outfalls respectively (or all major outfalls in the system, if less); in such circumstances, the applicant shall establish a grid system consisting of north-south and east-west lines spaced ¼ mile apart as an overlay to the boundaries of the municipal storm sewer system, thereby creating a series of cells; the applicant will then select major outfalls in as many cells as possible until at least 500 major outfalls (large municipalities) or 250 major outfalls (medium municipalities) are selected; a field screening analysis shall be undertaken at these major outfalls.

(E) Characterization plan. Information and a proposed program to meet the requirements of paragraph (d)(2)(iii) of this section. Such description shall include: the location of outfalls or field screening points appropriate for representative data collection under paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(A) of this section, a description of why the outfall or field screening point is representative, the seasons during which sampling is intended, a description of the sampling equipment. The proposed location of outfalls or field screening points for such sampling should reflect water quality concerns (see paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(C) of this section) to the extent practicable.

(v) Management programs. (A) A description of the existing management programs to control pollutants from the municipal separate storm sewer system. The description shall provide information on existing structural and source controls, including operation and maintenance measures for structural controls, that are currently being implemented. Such controls may include, but are not limited to: Procedures to control pollution resulting from construction activities; floodplain management controls; wetland protection measures; best management practices for new subdivisions; and emergency spill response programs. The description may address controls established under State law as well as local requirements.

(B) A description of the existing program to identify illicit connections to the municipal storm sewer system. The description should include inspection procedures and methods for detecting and preventing illicit discharges, and describe areas where this program has been implemented.

(vi) Fiscal resources. (A) A description of the financial resources currently available to the municipality to complete part 2 of the permit application. A description of the municipality's budget for existing storm water programs, including an overview of the municipality's financial resources and budget, including overall indebtedness and assets, and sources of funds for storm water programs.

(2) Part 2. Part 2 of the application shall consist of:

(i) Adequate legal authority. A demonstration that the applicant can

operate pursuant to legal authority established by statute, ordinance or series of contracts which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to:

(A) Control through ordinance, permit, contract, order or similar means, the contribution of pollutants to the municipal storm sewer by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and the quality of storm water discharged from sites of industrial activity;

(B) Prohibit through ordinance, order or similar means, illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer;

(C) Control through ordinance, order or similar means the discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer of spills, dumping or disposal of materials other than storm water;

(D) Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system;

(E) Require compliance with conditions in ordinances, permits, contracts or orders; and

(F) Carry out all inspection, surveillance and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with permit conditions including the prohibition on illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer.

(ii) Source identification. The location of any major outfall that discharges to waters of the United States that was not reported under paragraph (d)(1)(iii)(B)(1) of this section. Provide an inventory, organized by watershed of the name and address, and a description (such as SIC codes) which best reflects the principal products or services provided by each facility which may discharge, to the municipal separate storm sewer, storm water associated with industrial activity;

(iii) Characterization data. When "quantitative data" for a pollutant are required under paragraph (d)(a)(iii)(A)(3) of this paragraph, the applicant must collect a sample of effluent in accordance with 40 CFR 122.21(g)(7) and analyze it for the pollutant in accordance with analytical methods approved under 40 CFR part 136. When no analytical method is approved the applicant may use any suitable method but must provide a description of the method. The applicant must provide information characterizing the quality and quantity of discharges covered in the permit application, including:

(A) Quantitative data from representative outfalls designated by the Director (based on information received

48069

in part 1 of the application, the Director shall designate between five and ten outfalls or field screening points as representative of the commercial, residential and industrial land use activities of the drainage area contributing to the system or, where there are less than five outfalls covered in the application, the Director shall designate all outfalls) developed as follows:

(1) For each outfall or field screening point designated under this subparagraph, samples shall be collected of storm water discharges from three storm events occurring at least one month apart in accordance with the requirements at § 122.21(g)(7) (the Director may allow exemptions to sampling three storm events when climatic conditions create good cause for such exemptions);

(2) A narrative description shall be provided of the date and duration of the storm event(s) sampled, rainfall estimates of the storm event which generated the sampled discharge and the duration between the storm event sampled and the end of the previous measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event:

(3) For samples collected and described under paragraphs (d)(2)(iii) (A)(1) and (A)(2) of this section, quantitative data shall be provided for: the organic pollutants listed in Table II; the pollutants listed in Table III (toxic metals, cyanide, and total phenols) of appendix D of 40 CFR part 122, and for the following pollutants:

Total suspended solids (TSS) Total dissolved solids (TDS) COD BOD₅ Oil and grease Fecal coliform Fecal streptococcus pH Total Kjeldahl nitrogen Nitrate plus nitrite Dissolved phosphorus Total ammonia plus organic nitrogen Total phosphorus

(4) Additional limited quantitative data required by the Director for determining permit conditions (the Director may require that quantitative data shall be provided for additional parameters, and may establish sampling conditions such as the location, season of sample collection, form of precipitation (snow melt, rainfall) and other parameters necessary to insure representativeness);

(B) Estimates of the annual pollutant load of the cumulative discharges to waters of the United States from all identified municipal outfalls and the event mean concentration of the cumulative discharges to waters of the United States from all identified municipal outfalls during a storm event (as described under § 122.21{c}(7)) for BOD₅, COD, TSS, dissolved solids, total nitrogen, total ammonia plus organic nitrogen, total phosphorus, dissolved phosphorus, cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc. Estimates shall be accompanied by a description of the procedures for estimating constituent loads and concentrations, including any modelling, data analysis, and calculation methods;

(C) A proposed schedule to provide estimates for each major outfall identified in either paragraph (d)(2)(ii) or (d)(1)(iii)(B)(1) of this section of the seasonal pollutant load and of the event mean concentration of a representative storm for any constituent detected in any sample required under paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(A) of this section; and

(D) A proposed monitoring program for representative data collection for the term of the permit that describes the location of outfalls or field screening points to be sampled (or the location of instream stations), why the location is representative, the frequency of sampling, parameters to be sampled, and a description of sampling equipment.

(iv) Proposed management program. A proposed management program covers the duration of the permit. It shall include a comprehensive planning process which involves public participation and where necessary intergovernmental coordination, to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable using management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions which are appropriate. The program shall also include a description of staff and equipment available to implement the program. Separate proposed programs may be submitted by each coapplicant. Proposed programs may impose controls on a systemwide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls. Proposed programs will be considered by the Director when developing permit conditions to reduce pollutants in discharges to the maximum extent practicable. Proposed management programs shall describe priorities for implementing controls. Such programs shall be based on:

(A) A description of structural and source control measures to reduce pollutants from runoff from commercial and residential areas that are discharged from the municipal storm sewer system that are to be implemented during the life of the permit, accompanied with an estimate of the expected reduction of pollutant loads and a proposed schedule for implementing such controls. At a minimum, the description shall include:

(1) A description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls to reduce pollutants (including floatables) in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers;

(2) A description of planning procedures including a comprehensive master plan to develop, implement and enforce controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers which receive discharges from areas of new development and significant redevelopment. Such plan shall address controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers after construction is completed. (Controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers containing construction site runoff are addressed in paragraph (d)(2)(iv)(D) of this section;

(3) A description of practices for operating and maintaining public streets, roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems, including pollutants discharged as a result of deicing activities;

(4) A description of procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving water bodies and that existing structural flood control devices have been evaluated to determine if retrofitting the device to provide additional pollutant removal from storm water is feasible;

(5) A description of a program to monitor pollutants in runoff from operating or closed municipal landfills or other treatment, storage or disposal facilities for municipal waste, which shall identify priorities and procedures for inspections and establishing and implementing control measures for such discharges (this program can be coordinated with the program developed under paragraph (d)(2)(iv)(C) of this section); and

(6) A description of a program to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizer which will include, as appropriate, controls such as educational activities, permits, certifications and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors, and controls for application in public right-of-ways and at municipal facilities. (B) A description of a program, including a schedule, to detect and remove (or require the discharger to the municipal separate storm sewer to obtain a separate NPDES permit for) illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer. The proposed program shall include:

(1) A description of a program, including inspections, to implement and enforce an ordinance, orders or similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system; this program description shall address all types of illicit discharges, however the following category of non-storm water discharges or flows shall be addressed where such discharges are identified by the municipality as sources of pollutants to waters of the United States: water line flushing, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, rising ground waters, uncontaminated ground water infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)) to separate storm sewers, uncomtaminated pumped ground water. discharges from potable water sources, foundation drains, air conditioning condensation, irrigation water, springs, water from crawl space pumps, footing drains, lawn watering, individual residential car washing, flows from riparian habitats and wetlands, dechlorinated swimming pool discharges, and street wash water (program descriptions shall address discharges or flows from fire fighting only where such discharges or flows are identified as significant sources of pollutants to waters of the United States);

(2) A description of procedures to conduct on-going field screening activities during the life of the permit, including areas or locations that will be evaluated by such field screens;

(3) A description of procedures to be followed to investigate portions of the separate storm sewer system that, based on the results of the field screen, or other appropriate information, indicate a reasonable potential of containing illicit discharges or other sources of non-storm water (such procedures may include: sampling procedures for constituents such as fecal coliform, fecal streptococcus, surfactants (MBAS), residual chlorine, fluorides and potassium; testing with fluorometric dyes; or conducting in storm sewer inspections where safety and other considerations allow. Such description shall include the location of storm sewers that have been identified for such evaluation);

(4) A description of procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer; (5) A description of a program to promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of the presence of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges from municipal separate storm sewers;

(6) A description of educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials; and

(7) A description of controls to limit infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to municipal separate storm sewer systems where necessary;

(C) A description of a program to monitor and control pollutants in storm water discharges to municipal systems from municipal landfills, hazardous waste treatment, disposal and recovery facilities, industrial facilities that are subject to section 313 of title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), and industrial facilities that the municipal permit applicant determines are contributing a substantial pollutant loading to the municipal storm sewer system. The program shall:

(1) Identify priorities and procedures for inspections and establishing and implementing control measures for such discharges;

(2) Describe a monitoring program for storm water discharges associated with the industrial facilities identified in paragraph (d)(2)(iv)(C) of this section, to be implemented during the term of the permit, including the submission of quantitative data on the following constituents: any pollutants limited in effluent guidelines subcategories, where applicable; any pollutant listed in an existing NPDES permit for a facility; oil and grease, COD, pH, BOD, TSS, total phosphorus, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen, and any information on discharges required under 40 CFR 122.21(g)(7) (iii) and (iv).

(D) A description of a program to implement and maintain structural and non-structural best management practices to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff from construction sites to the municipal storm sewer system, which shall include:

(1) A description of procedures for site planning which incorporate consideration of potential water quality impacts;

(2) A description of requirements for nonstructural and structural best management practices;

(3) A description of procedures for identifying priorities for inspecting sites and enforcing control measures which consider the nature of the construction activity, topography, and the characteristics of soils and receiving water quality; and

(4) A description of appropriate educational and training measures for construction site operators.

(v) Assessment of controls. Estimated reductions in loadings of pollutants from discharges of municipal storm sewer constituents from municipal storm sewer systems expected as the result of the municipal storm water quality management program. The assessment shall also identify known impacts of storm water controls on ground water.

(vi) Fiscal analysis. For each fiscal year to be covered by the permit, a fiscal analysis of the necessary capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to accomplish the activities of the programs under paragraphs (d)(2) (iii) and (iv) of this section. Such analysis shall include a description of the source of funds that are proposed to meet the necessary expenditures, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.

(vii) Where more than one legal entity submits an application, the application shall contain a description of the roles and responsibilities of each legal entity and procedures to ensure effective coordination.

(viii) Where requirements under paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(E), (d)(2)(ii), (d)(2)(iii)(B) and (d)(2)(iv) of this section are not practicable or are not applicable, the Director may exclude any operator of a discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer which is designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v), (b)(4)(ii) or (b)(7)(ii) of this section from such requirements. The Director shall not exclude the operator of a discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer identified in appendix F, G, H or I of part 122, from any of the permit application requirements under this paragraph except where authorized under this section.

(e) Application deadlines. Any operator of a point source required to obtain a permit under paragraph (a)(1) of this section that does not have an effective NPDES permit covering its storm water outfalls shall submit an application in accordance with the following deadlines:

(1) For any storm water discharge associated with industrial activity identified in paragraph (b)(14) (i)-(xi) of this section, that is not part of a group application as described in paragraph (c)(2) of this section or which is not covered under a promulgated storm water general permit, a permit application made pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section shall be submitted to the Director by November 18, 1991; (2) For any group application submitted in accordance with paragraph (c)(2) of this section:

(i) Part 1 of the application shall be submitted to the Director, Office of Water Enforcement and Permits by March 18, 1991;

(ii) Based on information in the part 1 application, the Director will approve or deny the members in the group application within 60 days after receiving part 1 of the group application.

(iii) Part 2 of the application shall be submitted to the Director, Office of Water Enforcement and Permits no later than 12 months after the date of approval of the part 1 application.

(iv) Facilities that are rejected as members of a group by the permitting authority shall have 12 months to file an individual permit application from the date they receive notification of their rejection.

(v) A facility listed under paragraph (b)(14) (i)-(xi) of this section may add on to a group application submitted in accordance with paragraph (e)(2)(i) of this section at the discretion of the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits, and only upon a showing of good cause by the facility and the group applicant; the request for the addition of the facility shall be made no later than February 18,1992; the addition of the facility shall not cause the percentage of the facilities that are required to submit quantitative data to be less than 10%, unless there are over 100 facilities in the group that are submitting quantitative data; approval to become part of group application must be obtained from the group or the trade association representing the individual facilities.

(3) For any discharge from a large

municipal separate storm sewer system; (i) Part 1 of the application shall be submitted to the Director by November 18, 1991;

(ii) Based on information received in the part 1 application the Director will approve or deny a sampling plan under paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(E) of this section within 90 days after receiving the part 1 application;

(iii) Part 2 of the application shall be submitted to the Director by November 16, 1992.

(4) For any discharge from a medium municipal separate storm sewer system;

(i) Part 1 of the application shall be submitted to the Director by May 18, 1992.

(ii) Based on information received in the part 1 application the Director will approve or deny a sampling plan under paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(E) of this section within 90 days after receiving the part 1 application. (iii) Part 2 of the application shall be submitted to the Director by May 17, 1993.

(5) A permit application shall be submitted to the Director within 60 days of notice, unless permission for a later date is granted by the Director (*see* 40 CFR 124.52(c)), for:

(i) A storm water discharge which the Director, or in States with approved NPDES programs, either the Director or the EPA Regional Administrator, determines that the discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States (see paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section);

(ii) A storm water discharge subject to paragraph (c)(1)(v) of this section.

(6) Facilities with existing NPDES permits for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity shall maintain existing permits. New applications shall be submitted in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 122.21 and 40 CFR 122.26(c) 180 days before the expiration of such permits. Facilities with expired permits or permits due to expire before May 18, 1992, shall submit applications in accordance with the deadline set forth under paragraph (e)(1) of this section.

(f) Petitions. (1) Any operator of a municipal separate storm sewer system may petition the Director to require a separate NPDES permit (or a permit issued under an approved NPDES State program) for any discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer system.

(2) Any person may petition the Director to require a NPDES permit for a discharge which is composed entirely of storm water which contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

(3) The owner or operator of a municipal separate storm sewer system may petition the Director to reduce the Census estimates of the population served by such separate system to account for storm water discharged to combined sewers as defined by 40 CFR 35.2005(b)(11) that is treated in a publicly owned treatment works. In municipalities in which combined sewers are operated, the Census estimates of population may be reduced proportional to the fraction, based on estimated lengths, of the length of combined sewers over the sum of the length of combined sewers and municipal separate storm sewers where an applicant has submitted the NPDES permit number associated with each discharge point and a map indicating areas served by combined sewers and

the location of any combined sewer overflow discharge point.

(4) Any person may petition the Director for the designation of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system as defined by paragraphs (b)(4)(iv) or (b)(7)(iv) of this section.

(5) The Director shall make a final determination on any petition received under this section within 90 days after receiving the petition.

6. Section 122.28(b)(2)(i) is revised to read as follows:

§ 122.28 General permits (applicable to State NPDES programs, see § 123.25).

*

* * (b) * * *

(2) Requiring an individual permit. (i) The Director may require any discharger authorized by a general permit to apply for and obtain an individual NPDES permit. Any interested person may petition the Director to take action under this paragraph. Cases where an individual NPDES permit may be required include the following:

(A) The discharger or "treatment works treating domestic sewage" is not in compliance with the conditions of the general NPDES permit;

(B) A change has occurred in the availability of demonstrated technology or practices for the control or abatement of pollutants applicable to the point source or treatment works treating domestic sewage;

(C) Effluent limitation guidelines are promulgated for point sources covered by the general NPDES permit;

(D) A Water Quality Management plan containing requirements applicable to such point sources is approved;

(E) Circumstances have changed since the time of the request to be covered so that the discharger is no longer appropriately controlled under the general permit, or either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge is necessary;

(F) Standards for sewage sludge use or disposal have been promulgated for the sludge use and disposal practice covered by the general NPDES permit; or

(G) The discharge(s) is a significant contributor of pollutants. In making this determination, the Director may consider the following factors:

(1) The location of the discharge with respect to waters of the United States;

(2) The size of the discharge:

(3) The quantity and nature of the pollutants discharged to waters of the United States; and

(4) Other relevant factors;

. .

7. Section 122.42 is amended by adding paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 122.42 Additional conditions applicable to specified categories of NPDES permits (applicable to State NPDES programs, see § 123.25).

(c) Municipal separate storm sewer systems. The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system or a municipal separate storm sewer that has been designated by the Director under § 122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such system. The report shall include:

(1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions;

(2) Proposed changes to the storm water management programs that are established as permit condition. Such proposed changes shall be consistent with § 122.26(d)[2](iii) of this part; and

(3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit

application under § 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and (d)(2)(v) of this part;

(4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year;

(5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report;

(6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs;

(7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation;

7a. Part 122 is amended by adding appendices E through I as follows:





Not Shown: Alaska (Zone 7); Hawaii (Zone 7); Northern Mariana Islands (Zone 7); Guam (Zone 7); American Samoa (Zone 7); Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Zone 7); Puerto Rico (Zone 3) Virgin Islands (Zone 3).

Source: Methodology for Analysis of Detention Basins for Control of Urban Runoff Quality, prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Nonpoint Source Division, Washington, DC, 1986. Appendix F to Part 122—Incorporated Places With Populations Greater Than 250,000 According to Latest Decennial Census by Bureau of Census.

State	incorporated place				
Alabama	Birmingham.				
Arizona	Phoenix.				
	Tucson.				
California	Long Beach.				
	Los Angeles.				
	Oakland.				
	Sacramento.				
	San Diego.				
	San Francisco.				
•	San Jose.				

State	incorporated place
Colorado District of Columbia Florida	Denver. Jacksonville. Miami
Georgia tilinois Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maryland Maryland Michigan Minnesota	Tampa. Atlanta. Chicago. Indianapolis. Wichita. Louisville. New Orleans. Battimore. Boston. Detroit. Minneapolis St. Paul.

Incorporated place

State

State	Incorporated place
Missouri	Kansas City.
	St. Louis.
Nebraska	Omaha.
New Jersey	Newark.
New Mexico	Albuquerque.
New York	Buffalo.
	Bronx Borough.
	Brooklyn Borough
	Manhattan Borough
	Queens Borough.
	Staten Island Borough
North Carolina	Charlotte.
Ohio	Cincinnati.
	Cleveland.
	Columbus.
	Toledo.
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City.
•	Tulsa.
Oregon	Portland.
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia.
	Pittsburgh.
Tennessee	Memphis.
	Nashville/Davidson.
Texas	Austin.
	Dallas.
	El Paso.
	Fort Worth.
	Houston.
	San Antonio.
Virginia	Norfolk.
	Virginia Beach.
wasnington	Seattle.
wisconsin	Milwaukee.

Appendix G to Part 122—Incorporated Places With Populations Greater Than 100,000 and Less Than 250,000 According to Latest Decennial Census by Bureau of Census

State	Incorporated place
Alahama	Hustavilla
Alabama	Mobilo
	Montagmon
Alaska	Anchorage
Arizona	Mesa
	Tempe
Arkansas	Little Bock
California	Anabeim
	Bakersfield.
	Berkelev.
•	Concord.
	Fremont.
	Fresno.
	Fullerton.
	Garden Grove.
· · ·	Glendale.
	Huntington Beach.
	Modesto.
	Oxnard.
	Pasadena.
	Riverside.
	San Bernadino.
	Santa Ana.
	Stockton.
	Sunnyvale.
O .1	Torrance.
Colorado	Aurora.
	Colorado Springs.
	Lakewood.
Connections	Pueblo.
Connecticut	Bridgeport.
	Hartford.
	Stamford
	Waterbury
Florida	Fort Lauderdale
	TON LAUGOUDIO.

	Hislash
	Hollywood
	Orlando.
	St. Petersburg.
Georgia	Columbus.
5	Macon.
	Savannah.
Idaho	Boise City.
Illinois	Peoria.
	Rockford.
Indiana	Evansville.
	Fort Wayne.
	Gary.
	South Bend.
lowa	Cedar Rapids.
	Davenport.
¥	Des Moines.
Kansas	Kansas City.
Contucky	Topeka.
Neniucky	Lexington-Fayette.
Louisiana	Shrevenort
Massachusotte	Springfield
	Worcester
Michigan	Ann Arbor
3	Flint
	Grand Rapids
	'Lansing.
	Livonia.
	Sterling Heights.
ĺ	Warren.
Mississippi	Jackson.
Missouri	Independence.
	Springfield.
Nebraska	Lincoln.
Vevada	Las Vegas.
	Reno.
New Jersey	Elizabeth.
	Jersey City.
	Paterson.
New York	Albany.
	Rochester.
	Syracuse.
teath Occurting	Yonkers.
vorth Carolina	Durnam.
	Greensboro.
	Haleign.
	Minston Colom
Ohio	Winston-Salem.
Dhio	Winston-Salem. Akron. Davton
Ohio	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown
Dhio	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Fugene
Ohio Oregon	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown.
Dhio Dregon Pennsylvania	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence.
Dhio Dregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee	Winston-Salem, Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee	Winston-Salem, Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Artington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Texas Utah	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Texas Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newson
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newport News. Portsmouth
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Artington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newport News. Portsmouth. Bichmond
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newport News. Portsmouth. Richmond. Boanoke.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newport News. Portsmouth. Richmond. Roanoke. Spokane.
Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia	Winston-Salem. Akron. Dayton. Youngstown Eugene. Allentown. Erie. Providence. Columbia. Chattanooga. Knoxville. Amarillo. Arlington. Beaumont. Corpus Christi. Garland. Irving. Lubbock. Pasadena. Waco. Salt Lake City. Alexandria. Chesapeake. Hampton. Newport News. Portsmouth. Richmond. Roanoke. Spokane. Tacoma.

Appendix H to Part 122— Counties with Unincorporated Urbanized Areas With a Population of 250,000 or More According to the Latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census

		· ·
State	County	Unincorporat- ed urbanized population
California	Los Angeles	912,664
	Sacramento	449.056
	San Diego	304,758
Delaware	New Castle	257,184
Florida	Dade	781,949
Georgia	DeKalb	386.379
Hawaii	Honolulu	688,178
Maryland	Anne Arundel	271,458
	Baltimore	601,308
	Montgomery	447,993
	Prince George's	450,188
Texas	Harris	409,601
Utah	Salt Lake	304,632
Virginia	Fairfax	527,178
Washington	King	336,800

Appendix I to Part 122—Counties With Unincorporated Urbanized Areas Greater Than 100,000, But Less Than 250,000 According to the Latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census

State	County	Unincorporat- ed urbanized population
Alabama Arizona	Jefferson Pima	102,917 111,479 187,474
California	Contra Costa	158,452
	Orange Riverside	210,693 115,719
Florida	San Bernardino Broward	148,644 159,370
	Escambia Hillsborough	147,892 238,292
	Orange Paim Beach	245,325 167,089
Georgia	Pinelias Polk Sarasota Clayton Cobb	194,389 104,150 110,009 100,742 204,121
Kentucky	Richmond	118,529 224,958
Louisiana	Jefferson	140,836
North Carolina	Cumberland	142,727
Oregon	Multnomah	141,100
South Carolina	Greenville	135,398
Virginia	Arlington Henrico	152,599 161,204
Washington	Chesterfield Snohomish Pierce	108,348 103,493 196,113

PART 123-STATE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

8. The authority citation for part 123 continues to read as follows:

44

Authority: Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.

9. Section 123.25 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(9) to read as follows:

§ 123.25 Requirements for permitting. (a) * * *

(9) § 122.26—(Storm water discharges);

PART 124—PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONMAKING

10. The authority citation for part 124 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6901 *et seq.*; Safe Drinking Water Act, 42 U.S.C. 300f *et seq.*; Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*; and Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857 *et seq.*

11. Section 124.52 is revised to read as follows:

§ 124.52 Permits required on a case-bycase basis.

(a) Various sections of part 122, subpart B allow the Director to

determine, on a case-by-case basis, that certain concentrated animal feeding operations (§ 122.23), concentrated aquatic animal production facilities (§ 122.24), storm water discharges (§ 122.26), and certain other facilities covered by general permits (§ 122.28) that do not generally require an individual permit may be required to obtain an individual permit because of their contributions to water pollution.

(b) Whenever the Regional Administrator decides that an individual permit is required under this section, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, the Regional Administrator shall notify the discharger in writing of that decision and the reasons for it, and shall send an application form with the notice. The discharger must apply for a permit under § 122.21 within 60 days of notice, unless permission for a later date is granted by the Regional Administrator. The question whether the designation was proper will remain open for consideration during the public comment period under § 124.11 or

§ 124.118 and in any subsequent hearing.

(c) Prior to a case-by-case determination that an individual permit is required for a storm water discharge under this section (see 40 CFR 122.26 (a)(1)(v) and (c)(1)(v), the Regional Administrator may require the discharger to submit a permit application or other information regarding the discharge under section 308 of the CWA. In requiring such information, the Regional Administrator shall notify the discharger in writing and shall send an application form with the notice. The discharger must apply for a permit under § 122.26 within 60 days of notice, unless permission for a later date is granted by the Regional Administrator. The question whether the initial designation was proper will remain open for consideration during the public comment period under § 124.11 or § 124.118 and in any subsequent hearing.

Note: The following form will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations. BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

lease acies or time in the une	hoded props only	EPA 1D Number	(copy from Item I	of Form 1)	Form Approved. Of	MB No. 2040	0-0086 5/31/	
Form	naded aleas only	l	United State	s Environmental	Protection Agency	proval expires	112/21/	
	אר	•		Washington, DC	20460			
	Ά	Application for Permit To Discharge Stormwater						
		Discital	Yes Assu	ciated wi	in musmar	ACTIVITY		
Public reporting burden 1 searching existing data so comments regarding the 1 suggestions which may ir 401 M St., SW, Washing Washington, DC 20503.	for this application surces, gathering an burden estimate, an bcrease or reduce th ton, DC 20460, or	Paperwork is estimated to a d maintaining the d maintaining the source of his burden to: Chi r Director, Office	rk Reduction Ac verage 28.6 hou data needed, an this collection of ief, Information F of Information	t Notice urs per applicati d completing an information, or Policy Branch, P and Regulatory	ion, including time for ad reviewing the collectic suggestions for improvi 2M-223, U.S. Environment Affairs, Office of Man	reviewing instru on of information ing this form, inc ntal Protection A agement and B	ctions, Send Juding gency, udget,	
Outfall Location	k			1 a 1 a		all star i se	an ta di Alamata	
For each outfall, list the lat	itude and longitude	of its location to the	he nearest 15 sec	conds and the na	ame of the receiving wat	ler.		
A. Outfall Number	n Latitud	_	0.1		D. Receiving	Water	1	
(#St)	B. Latitude	e	C. Longitude		(name)			
<u></u>					·			
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		├			·		[
		<u> </u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		<u> </u>						
described in this app compliance schedule	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations,	tate, or local auth ipment or practic des, but is not lim court orders, and	ority to meet an es or any othen hited to, permit of grant or loan con	y implementatio r environmental conditions, admi iditions.	on schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enford 4. F	ling or harges cement	
described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	ate, or local auth pment or practic des, but is not lim court orders, and 2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental conditions, admi ditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme escription of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ding or harges cement Final nce Date b. proj.	
described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	ate, or local auth pment or practic des, but is not lim court orders, and 2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other bited to, permit or grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrac affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F <u>Complia</u> a. req.	ling or harges rement inal nce Date b. proj.	
described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi Iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F <u>Complia</u> a. req.	ling or harges eement inal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any othe grant or loan con Ils scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi ditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges eement inal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any other ited to, permit or grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrac affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F <u>Complia</u> a. req.	ling or harges ement inal nce Date b. proj.	
1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges erment Tinal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. P Complia a. req.	ling or harges rement inal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any other sited to, permit of grant or loan con Ils scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi ditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges rement Tinal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This incluc letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges erment Tinal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges erment Tinal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	tions, number	2. Affected Outfa	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. P Complia a. req.	ling or harges rement inal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa 2. Affected Outfa 3. Source of di 4. Source of di 4	ority to meet an es or any other ited to, permit of grant or loan con Ils scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi ditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ing or harges ement inal nce Date b. proj.	
1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	tions, number	2. Affected Outfa Source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit o grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi ditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme bescription of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F <u>Complia</u> a. req.	ling or harges rement inal nce Date b. proj.	
 operation of wastewidescribed in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc. 	ater treatment equi lication? This includ letters, stipulations, tions, number	2. Affected Outfa source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. F Complia a. req.	ling or harges rement inal nce Date b. proj.	
operation of wastew described in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc.	tions, number	2. Affected Outfa Source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	on schedule for the con I programs which may inistrative or enforceme Description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc 4. P Complia a. req.	ling or harges rement Tinal nce Date b. proj.	
 bed in this app compliance schedule 1. Identification of Condi Agreements, Etc. B. You may attach add discharges) you now actual or planned schu 	itional sheets desc have under way or edules for construct	2. Affected Outfa 5. Source of di	ority to meet an es or any other itied to, permit of grant or loan con Ils scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi ditions, admi di ditions, admi dition	environmental projects s now under way or plan	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforc	ting or harges eement inal <u>nce Date</u> b. proj. b. proj. b. proj. c. your	
 B. You may attach add discharges) you now actual or planned schular 	itional sheets desc have under way or edules for construct	2. Affected Outfa 5. Source of di	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementation r environmental sonditions, admi iditions. 3. Brief D	en schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme description of Project	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforce 4. P Complia a. req.	ting or harges eement inal nce Date b. proj.	
B. You may attach add discharges) you now actual or planned sche II. Site Drainage Map Attach a site map showir topographic map is unava waste treatment, storage or dispo materials loading and ac waste treatment, storage or dispo materials loading and ac	itional sheets desc have under way or edules for constructions is al of significant n cess areas, areas v or disposal units (in 12) each well where or disposal units (in 13) each well where or dispo	Alter of iocal auth prent or practic jes, but is not lin court orders, and 2. Affected Outfa source of di source of di attributed and a source of di attributed attributed	ority to meet an es or any other lited to, permit of grant or loan con lls scharge	y implementatio r environmental sonditions, admi iditions, admi ditions, admi ditions, admi ditions, admi as areful to administration areas served b ake and dischargorn water outfal control measure conditioners and have a RCRA pe	en schedule for the con programs which may inistrative or enforceme bescription of Project environmental projects s now under way or plan by the outfall(s) covered ge structures; the drain II, each known past or re to reduce pollutants d fertilizers are applied; primit which is used for a sorinos and other surf	struction, upgrad affect the disc nt orders, enforce 4. P Complia a. req.	ding or harges eement inal nce Date b. proj. b. proj. b. proj. c. your c. your te your te your te your te your te your	

8

	a from the Front				6 - 1 - 1 - 1
A. Fo	rrative Description of Pol or each outfall, provide an estim the outfall, and an estimate of t	Ilutant Sources the second sec	of imperviou by the outfall.	us surfaces (including paved are	as and building roofs) drained
tfall	Area of Impervious Surface	Total Area Drained	Outfall	Area of Impervious Surface	Total Area Drained
nber	(provide units)	(provide units)	Number	(provide units)	(provide units)
	•	· ·			
		<u>.</u>		1	
3. Pr a: en th	ovide a narrative description of manner to allow exposure to stan nployed, in the last three years, e location, manner, and frequen	significant materials that are of orm water; method of treatme , to minimize contact by these rcy in which pesticides, herbici	currently or in nt, storage, o materials wi des, soil con	n the past three years have been or disposal; past and present ma th storm water runoff; materials I ditioners, and fertilizers are appli	treated, stored or disposed in iterials management practices oading and access areas; and ed.
•					
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
FC Ste	or each outfall, provide the loca orm water runoff; and a descrip	ation and a description of exis tion of the treatment the storm	sting structur water receiv	al and nonstructural control me res, including the schedule and t	asures to reduce pollutants in ype of maintenance for control
ar	d treatment measures and the	ultimate disposal of any solid c	or fluid waste	s other than by discharge.	List Codes from
Tall		Treater			List Codes from
iper			ient		1 able 27-1
•					
Nor	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater discharg	by this appli	cation have been tested or e se outfall(s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C
Nor . I nc or	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law protormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print)	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischard fall.	by this appli ges from the	cation have been tested or e se outfall(s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C
Nor nc or ne an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print)	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature	by this appli ges from the	cation have been tested or en se outfall(s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed
Nor . I nc or	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print)	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater discharg fall. Signature	by this appli ges from the	cation have been tested or ense outfall(s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed
Nor nc or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (<i>type or print</i>) rovide a description of the methe	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	by this appli ges from the g, and the or	cation have been tested or e se outfall(s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	y this appli ges from the g, and the or	cation have been tested or ense outfall(s) are identified in eith in eith insite drainage points that were di	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor nc or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law postormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar Itall. Signature od used, the date of any testing	y this appli ges from the g, and the or	cation have been tested or ense outfall(s) are identified in eith in eith insite drainage points that were di	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor . I nc or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing	y this appli ges from the g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith is in eith is its drainage points that were di	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	y this appli ges from the g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith se outfall(s) are identified in eith se outfall (s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor no or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith se outfall(s) are identified in eith se outfall (s) are identified in eith	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor nc or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	ges from the	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith se outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor nc or e an	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho movide a description of the metho gnificant Leaks or Spills	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater discharg fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin	by this applinges from the	cation have been tested or ense outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di	valuated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Nor rovid Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (<i>type or print</i>) rovide a description of the methe source a description of the methe participant Leaks or Spills be existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater discharg fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing g the history of significant less and location of the spill or leas	g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills ik, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e an Pr Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law postormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (<i>type or print</i>) rovide a description of the methe gnificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing g the history of significant lease and location of the spill or lease	g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills k, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith asite drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor nc or e an . Pr Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law postormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (<i>type or print</i>) rovide a description of the methe postore a description of the methe mificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing and the history of significant lea	g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills k, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith asite drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor nc or Pr Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law postormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (<i>type or print</i>) rovide a description of the methe mificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing g the history of significant lea	g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e and Sig rovidears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the methe methe participant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing g the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills k, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e and B. Pr Sig	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the methe methe participant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing and hocation of the spill or lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills k, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Paluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor no or e and b. Pr Sig	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho gnificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing g the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Paluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e and Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho mificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin od used, the date of any testin g the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor Incor e and Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho mificant Leaks or Spills de existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b hat all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin od used, the date of any testin g the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills ik, and the ty	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith set outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor I nc or Pr Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho notice a description of the metho anificant Leaks or Spills be existing information regardin including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater dischar fall. Signature od used, the date of any testin od used, the date of any testin g the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or	cation have been tested or esse outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.
Nor I nc or Pr Sig rovid ears,	nstormwater Discharges certify under penalty of law onstormwater discharges, and t Form 2E application for the out d Official Title (type or print) rovide a description of the metho rovide a description of the metho anificant Leaks or Spills be existing information regarding including the approximate date	that the outfall(s) covered b that all nonstormwater discharge fall. Signature od used, the date of any testing od used, the date of any testing and the history of significant lea	y this appli ges from the g, and the or g, and the or aks or spills ak, and the ty	cation have been tested or es se outfall(s) are identified in eith site drainage points that were di of toxic or hazardous pollutants pe and amount of material releas	Aluated for the presence of er an accompanying Form 2C Date Signed rectly observed during a test.

۰.

	EPA ID Number (copy from Item I of For	n 1)	
Continued from Page 2			
VII. Discharge Information	Complete and of tables for each out	all. Anostate the sutfall sumb	r in the space provident
Tables VII-A, VII-B, and VII-C are incl	uded on separate sheets numbered VII-1	and VII-2.	a in the space provided.
E: Potential discharges not covered by analys currently use or manufacture as an intermed	is - Is any pollutant listed in Table 2F-2 iate or final product or byproduct?	a substance or a component	of a substance which you
Yes (list all such pollutants below)		No	(go to Section VIII)
		``	
	. •		
VIII Biological Toxicity Testing Data			
The provention reality reality Data			
		· ·	lan ta Cantina IVI
Yes (list results below)		<u> No</u>	(go to Section IX)
	ц.		
IX. Contract Analysis Information			
T Yes		No	(ao to Section X)
A. Name	B. Address	C. Area Code & Phone No.	D. Pollutants Analyzed
X. Certification			
· .			
A. Name & Official Title (type or print)		B. Area C	Code and Phone No.
	•		
C. Signature		D. Date S	Bigned
-			-

EPA Form 3510-2F (12-88)

Page 3 of 3

. .

. .

		1 in		1	1 .	Approvat expires 5/31,
I. Discharge	Information (Co	ontinued from pa	ge 3 of Form 2F)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	L	
Part A - You m	nust provide the re ptions for additional	sults of at least ond details.	analysis for every	pollutant in this ta	ble. Comp	lete one table for each outfall. See
Pollutant	Maximu	m Values	Average	e Values	Number	
and CAS Numbér	rtant (include units) Ind Grab Sample Umber Taken During Flow-weighted		Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Flow-weighted			
(if available)	Minutes	Composite	Minutes	Composite	Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
nd Grease						· · · ·
iological Oxygen emand (BOD5)						
hemical Oxygen	-					
otal Suspended				. 4		
olids (TSS)			···· · ·			
litrogen					<u> </u>	·
itrate plus litrite Nitrogen				· ·		•
otal hosphorus						
H	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum		
Part B - List ea permit See th	ach pollutant that is t for its process was the instructions for ac	limited in an effluer stewater (if the facili	t guideline which th ty is operating unde requirements.	e facility is subject r an existing NPDE	to or any p S permit).	ollutant listed in the facility's NPDES Complete one table for each outfall.
Pollutant	Maximu fincluo	m Values le units)	Average	e Values le units)	Number	
				, -		
and	Grab Sample		Grab Sample	_	Storm	
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number <i>(if available)</i>	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number <i>(if available)</i>	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants
and CAS Number (if available)	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	Flow-weighted Composite	Storm Events Sampled	Sources of Pollutants

;

a that is

.

:

Additional details and requirements. Complete Maximum Values					Average Values			Number		· · · ·		
Pollu an CAS No <i>(if avai</i>	itant nd umber ilable)	Gr Ta	<i>(includ</i> ab Sample ken During First 30 Minutes	e units) Flow Co	welghted	(inc) Grab Sample Taken During First 30 Minutes	elud))	e units) Flow-weighted Composite	of Storm Events Sampled		Sources of Po	ollutants
<u></u>												
							/				·	
							_		5			
							_		\uparrow		······	
									\uparrow			
						$\vdash \sim$	_					<u></u>
							_		1			
					<u></u>							
							$\overline{}$				·····	
		<u>.</u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ļ						·····
											•	
											······	
											·····	
								· ·	·		·	
		•					•					
Part D	- Provid	e dat	a for the storm	event(s) which resu	Ited in the maxin	num	values for the flow	weighted	compos	site sample.	
1. te of orm	2. Duration of Stor	on m	3. Total rain during storm	fall event :	Number of beginning ured and e	4. hours between of storm meas- end of previous	N C (9	5. laximum floe rate luring rain event <i>allons/minute or</i>	6. Total flow rain eve (gallons	from ent s or	7. Season sample was	8. Form of Precipitation (rainfall,
-ont	(m mindu	33)		<u>.</u>	11045018			spouny units	specily u	.		Snowinell)
								•				
						:						
	·						ľ	:				
. Pro	ovide a de	script	tion of the met	hod of f	ow measure	ment or estimate	Е				<u> </u>	
											·····	

EPA Form 3510-2F (12-88)

.

.

-

. .

1.

Instructions - Form 2F Application for Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activity

Who Must File Form 2F

Form 2F must be completed by operators of facilities which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity or by operators of storm water discharges that EPA is evaluating for designation as a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States, or as contributing to a violation of a water quality standard.

Operators of discharges which are composed entirely of storm water must complete Form 2F (EPA Form 3510-2F) in conjunction with Form 1 (EPA Form 3510-1).

Operators of discharges of storm water which are combined with process wastewater (process wastewater is water that comes into direct contact with or results from the production or use of any raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, waste product, or wastewater) must complete and submit Form 2F, Form 1, and Form 2C (EPA Form 3510-2C).

Operators of discharges of storm water which are combined with nonprocess wastewater (nonprocess wastewater includes noncontact cooling water and sanitary wastes which are not regulated by effluent guidelines or a new source performance standard, except discharges by educational, medical, or commercial chemical laboratories) must complete Form 1, Form 2F, and Form 2E (EPA Form 3510-2E).

Operators of new sources or new discharges of storm water associated with industrial activity which will be combined with other nonstormwater new sources or new discharges must submit Form 1, Form 2F, and Form 2D (EPA Form 3510-2D).

Where to File Applications

The application forms should be sent to the EPA Regional Office which covers the State in which the facility is located. Form 2F must be used only when applying for permits in States where the NPDES permits program is administered by EPA. For facilities located in States which are approved to administer the NPDES permits program, the State environmental agency should be contacted for proper permit application forms and instructions.

Information on whether a particular program is administered by EPA or by a State agency can be obtained from your EPA Regional Office. Form 1, Table 1 of the "General Instructions" lists the addresses of EPA Regional Offices and the States within the jurisdiction of each Office.

Completeness

Your application will not be considered complete unless you answer every question on this form and on Form 1. If an item does not apply to you, enter "NA" (for not applicable) to show that you considered the question.

Public Availability of Submitted Information

You may not claim as confidential any information required by this form or Form 1, whether the information is reported on the forms or in an attachment. Section 402(j) of the Clean Water Act requires that all permit applications will be available to the public. This information will be made available to the public upon request.

Any information you submit to EPA which goes beyond that required by this form, Form 1, or Form 2C you may claim as confidential, but claims for information which are effluent data will be denied.

If you do not assert a claim of confidentiality at the time of submitting the information, EPA may make the information public without further notice to you. Claims of confidentiality will be handled in accordance with EPA's business confidentiality regulations at 40 CFR Part 2.

Definitions

All significant terms used in these instructions and in the form are defined in the glossary found in the General Instructions which accompany Form 1.

EPA ID Number

Fill in your EPA Identification Number at the top of each odd-numbered page of Form 2F. You may copy this number directly from item 1 of Form 1.

Item I

You may use the map you provided for item XI of Form 1 to determine the latitude and longitude of each of your outfalls and the name of the receiving water.

Item II-A

If you check "yes" to this question, complete all parts of the chart, or attach a copy of any previous submission you have made to EPA containing the same information.

Item II-B

You are not required to submit a description of future pollution control projects if you do not wish to or if none is planned.

Item III

Attach a site map showing topography (or indicating the outline of drainage areas served by the outfall(s) covered in the application if a topographic map is unavailable) depicting the facility including:

each of its drainage and discharge structures;

the drainage area of each storm water outfall;

paved areas and building within the drainage area of each storm water outfall, each known past or present areas used for outdoor storage or disposal of significant materials, each existing structural control measure to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff, materials loading and access areas, areas where pesticides, herbicides, soil conditioners and fertilizers are applied;

each of its hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facilities (including each area not required to have a RCRA permit which is used for accumulating hazardous waste for less than 90 days under 40 CFR 262.34);

each well where fluids from the facility are injected underground; and

springs, and other surface water bodies which receive storm water discharges from the facility;

Item IV-A

For each outfall, provide an estimate of the area drained by the outfall which is covered by impervious surfaces. For the purpose of this application, impervious surfaces are surfaces where storm water runs off at rates that are significantly higher than background rates (e.g., predevelopment levels) and include paved areas, building roofs, parking lots, and roadways. Include an estimate of the total area (including all impervious and pervious areas) drained by each outfall. The site map required under item III can be used to estimate the total area drained by each outfall.

Item IV-B

Provide a narrative description of significant materials that are currently or in the past three years have been treated, stored, or disposed in a manner to allow exposure to storm water; method of treatment, storage or disposal of these materials; past and present materials management practices employed, in the last three years, to minimize contact by these materials with storm water runoff; materials loading and access areas; and the location, manner, and frequency in which pesticides, herbicides, soil conditioners, and fertilizers are applied. Significant materials should be identified by chemical name, form (e.g., powder, liquid, etc.), and type of container or treatment unit. Indicate any materials treated, stored, or disposed of together. "Significant materials" includes, but is not limited to: raw materials; fuels; materials such as solvents, detergents, and plastic pellets; finished materials such as metallic products; raw materials used in food processing or production; hazardous substances designated under Section 101(14) of CERCLA; any chemical the facility is required to report pursuant to Section 313 of Title III of SARA; fertilizers; pesticides; and waste products such as ashes, slag and sludge that have the potential to be released with storm water discharges.

Item IV-C

For each outfall, structural controls include structures which enclose material handling or storage areas, covering materials, berms, dikes, or diversion ditches around manufacturing, production, storage or treatment units, retention ponds, etc. Nonstructural controls include practices such as spill prevention plans, employee training, visual inspections, preventive maintenance, and housekeeping measures that are used to prevent or minimize the potential for releases of pollutants.

Item V

Provide a certification that all outfalls that should contain storm water discharges associated with industrial activity have been tested or evaluated for the presence of non-storm water discharges which are not covered by an NPDES permit. Tests for such non-storm water discharges may include smoke tests, fluorometric dye tests, analysis of accurate schematics, as well as other appropriate tests. Part B must include a description of the method used, the date of any testing, and the onsite drainage points that were directly observed during a test. All non-storm water discharges must be identified in a Form 2C or Form 2E which must accompany this application (see beginning of instructions under section titled "Who Must File Form 2F" for a description of when Form 2C and Form 2E must be submitted).

Item VI

Provide a description of existing information regarding the history of significant leaks or spills of toxic or hazardous pollutants at the facility in the last three years.

Item VII-A, B, and C

These items require you to collect and report data on the pollutants discharged for each of your outfalls. Each part of this item addresses a different set of pollutants and must be completed in accordance with the specific instructions for that part. The following general instructions apply to the entire item.

General Instructions

Part A requires you to report at least one analysis for each pollutant listed. Parts B and C require you to report analytical data in two ways. For some pollutants addressed in Parts B and C, if you know or have reason to know that the pollutant is present in your discharge, you may be required to list the pollutant and test (sample and analyze) and report the levels of the pollutants in your discharge. For all other pollutants addressed in Parts B and C, you must list the pollutant if you know or have reason to know that the pollutant saddressed in Parts B and C, you must list the pollutant if you know or have reason to know that the pollutant is present in the discharge, and either report quantitative data for the pollutant or briefly describe the reasons the pollutant is expected to be discharged. (See specific instructions on the form and below for Parts A through C.) Base your determination that a pollutant is present in or absent from your discharge on your knowledge of your raw materials, material management practices, maintenance chemicals, history of spills and releases, intermediate and final products and byproducts, and any previous analyses known to you of your effluent or similar effluent.

A. Sampling: The collection of the samples for the reported analyses should be supervised by a person experienced in performing sampling of industrial wastewater or storm water discharges. You may contact EPA or your State permitting authority for detailed guidance on sampling techniques and for answers to specific questions. Any specific requirements contained in the applicable analytical methods should be followed for sample containers, sample preservation, holding times, the collection of duplicate samples, etc. The time when you sample should be representative, to the extent feasible, of your treatment system operating properly with no system upsets. Samples should be collected from the center of the flow channel, where turbulence is at a maximum, at a site specified in your present permit, or at any site adequate for the collection of a representative sample.

For pH, temperature, cyanide, total phenols, residual chlorine, oil and grease, and fecal coliform, grab samples taken during the first 30 minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of the discharge must be used (you are not required to analyze a flow-weighted composite for these parameters). For all other pollutants both a grab sample collected during the first 30 minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of the discharge and a flow-weighted composite sample must be analyzed. However, a minimum of one grab sample may be taken for effluents from holding ponds or other impoundments with a retention period of greater than 24 hours.

All samples shall be collected from the discharge resulting from a storm event that is greater than 0.1 inches and at least 72 hours from the previously measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event. Where feasible, the variance in the duration of the event and the total rainfall of the event should not exceed 50 percent from the average or median rainfall event in that area.

A grab sample shall be taken during the first thirty minutes of the discharge (or as soon thereafter as practicable), and a flow-weighted composite shall be taken for the entire event or for the first three hours of the event.

Grab and composite samples are defined as follows:

Grab sample: An individual sample of at least 100 milliliters collected during the first thirty minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of the discharge. This sample is to be analyzed separately from the composite sample.

Flow-Weighted Composite sample: A flow-weighted composite sample may be taken with a continuous sampler that proportions the amount of sample collected with the flow rate or as a combination of a minimum of three sample aliquots taken in each hour of discharge for the entire event or for the first three hours of the event, with each aliquot being at least 100 milliliters and collected with a minimum period of fifteen minutes between aliquot collections. The composite must be flow proportional; either the time interval between each aliquot or the volume of each aliquot must be proportional to either the stream flow at the time of sampling or the total stream flow since the collection of the previous aliquot. Aliquots may be collected manually or automatically. Where GC/MS Volatile Organic Analysis (VOA) is required, aliquots must be combined in the laboratory immediately before analysis. Only one analysis for the composite sample is required.

Data from samples taken in the past may be used, provided that:

All data requirements are met;

Sampling was done no more than three years before submission; and

All data are representative of the present discharge.

Among the factors which would cause the data to be unrepresentative are significant changes in production level, changes in raw materials, processes, or final products, and changes in storm water treatment. When the Agency promulgates new analytical methods in 40 CFR Part 136, EPA will provide information as to when you should use the new methods to generate data on your discharges. Of course, the Director may request additional information, including current quantitative data, if they determine it to be necessary to assess your discharges. The Director may allow or establish appropriate site-specific sampling procedures or requirements, including sampling locations, the season in which the sampling takes place, the minimum duration between the previous measurable storm event and the storm event sampled, the minimum or maximum level of precipitation required for an appropriate storm event, the form of precipitation sampled (snow melt or rainfall), protocols for collecting samples under 40 CFR Part 136, and additional time for submitting data on a case-by-case basis.

B. Reporting: All levels must be reported as concentration and as total mass. You may report some or all of the required data by attaching separate sheets of paper instead of filling out pages VII-1 and VII-2 if the separate sheets contain all the required information in a format which is consistent with pages VII-1 and VII-2 in spacing and in identification of pollutants and columns. Use the following abbreviations in the columns headed "Units."

	Concentration		Mass		
ppm	parts per million	lbs	pounds		
mg/1	milligrams per liter	ton	tons (English tons)		
ррb	parts per billion	mg	milligrams		
ug/1	micrograms per liter	g	grams		
kg	kilograms	T	tonnes (metric tons)		

All reporting of values for metals must be in terms of "total recoverable metal," unless:

(1) An applicable, promulgated effluent limitation or standard specifies the limitation for the metal in dissolved, valent, or total form; or

(2) All approved analytical methods for the metal inherently measure only its dissolved form (e.g., hexavalent chromium); or

(3) The permitting authority has determined that in establishing case-by-case limitations it is necessary to express the limitations on the metal in dissolved, valent, or total form to carry out the provisions of the CWA. If you measure only one grab sample and one flow-weighted composite sample for a given outfall, complete only the "Maximum Values" columns and insert "1" into the "Number of Storm Events Sampled" column. The permitting authority may require you to conduct additional analyses to further characterize your discharges.

EPA Form 3510-2F (12-88)

- 4

If you measure more than one value for a grab sample or a flow-weighted composite sample for a given outfall and those values are representative of your discharge, you must report them. You must describe your method of testing and data analysis. You also must determine the average of all values within the last year and report the concentration mass under the "Average Values" columns, and the total number of storm events sampled under the "Number of Storm Events Sampled" columns.

C. Analysis: You must use test methods promulgated in 40 CFR Part 136; however, if none has been promulgated for a particular pollutant, you may use any suitable method for measuring the level of the pollutant in your discharge provided that you submit a description of the method or a reference to a published method. Your description should include the sample holding time, preservation techniques, and the quality control measures which you used. If you have two or more substantially identical outfalls, you may request permission from your permitting authority to sample and analyze only one outfall and submit the results of the analysis for other substantially identical outfalls. If your request is granted by the permitting authority, on a separate sheet attached to the application form, identify which outfall you did test, and describe why the outfalls which you did not test are substantially identical to the outfall which you did test.

Part VII-A

Part VII-A must be completed by all applicants for all outfalls who must complete Form 2F.

Analyze a grab sample collected during the first thirty minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of the discharge and flow-weighted composite samples for all pollutants in this Part, and report the results except use only grab samples for pH and oil and grease. See discussion in General Instructions to Item VII for definitions of grab sample collected during the first thirty minutes of discharge and flow-weighted composite sample. The "Average Values" column is not compulsory but should be filled out if data are available.

Part VII-B

List all pollutants that are limited in an effluent guideline which the facility is subject to (see 40 CFR Subchapter N to determine which pollutants are limited in effluent guidelines) or any pollutant listed in the facility's NPDES permit for its process wastewater (if the facility is operating under an existing NPDES permit). Complete one table for each outfall. See discussion in General Instructions to item VII for definitions of grab sample collected during the first thirty minutes (or as soon thereafter as practicable) of discharge and flowweighted composite sample. The "Average Values" column is not compulsory but should be filled out if data are available.

Analyze a grab sample collected during the first thirty minutes of the discharge and flow-weighted composite samples for all pollutants in this Part, and report the results, except as provided in the General Instructions.

. -

Part VII-C

Part VII-C must be completed by all applicants for all outfalls which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity, or that EPA is evaluating for designation as a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States, or as contributing to a violation of a water quality standard. Use both a grab sample and a composite sample for all pollutants you analyze for in this part except use grab samples for residual chlorine and fecal coliform. The "Average Values" column is not compulsory but should be filled out if data are available. Part C requires you to address the pollutants in Table 2F-2, 2F-3, and 2F-4 for each outfall. Pollutants in each of these Tables are addressed differently.

Table 2F-2: For each outfall, list all pollutants in Table 2F-2 that you know or have reason to believe are discharged (except pollutants previously listed in Part VII-B). If a pollutant is limited in an effluent guideline limitation which the facility is subject to (e.g., use of TSS as an indicator to control the discharge of iron and aluminum), the pollutant should be listed in Part VII-B. If a pollutant in table 2F-2 is indirectly limited by an effluent guideline limitation through an indicator, you must analyze for it and report data in Part VII-C. For other pollutants listed in Table 2F-2 (those not limited directly or indirectly by an effluent limitation guideline), that you know or have reason to believe are discharges, you must either report quantitative data or briefly describe the reasons the pollutant is expected to be discharged.

Table 2F-3: For each outfall, list all pollutants in Table 2F-3 that you know or have reason to believe are discharged. For every pollutant in Table 2F-3 expected to be discharged in concentrations of 10 ppb or greater, you must submit quantitative data. For acrolein, acrylonitrile, 2,4 dinitrophenol, and 2-methyl-4,6 dinitrophenol, you must submit quantitative data if any of these four pollutants is expected to be discharged

in concentrations of 100 ppb or greater. For every pollutant expected to be discharged in concentrations less than 10 ppb (or 100 ppb for the four pollutants listed above), then you must either submit quantitative data or briefly describe the reasons the pollutant is expected to be discharged.

Small Business Exemption - If you are a "small business," you are exempt from the reporting requirements for the organic toxic pollutants listed in Table 2F-3. There are two ways in which you can qualify as a "small business". If your facility is a coal mine, and if your probable total annual production is less than 100,000 tons per year, you may submit past production data or estimated future production (such as a schedule of estimated total production under 30 CFR 795.14(c)) instead of conducting analyses for the organic toxic pollutants. If your facility is not a coal mine, and if your gross total annual sales for the most recent three years average less than \$100,000 per year (in second quarter 1980 dollars), you may submit sales data for those years instead of conducting analyses for the organic toxic pollutants. The production or sales data must be for the facility which is the source of the discharge. The data should not be limited to production or sales for the processes or processes which contribute to the discharge, unless those are the only processes at your facility. For sales data, in situations involving intracorporate transfer of goods and services, the transfer price per unit should approximate market prices for those goods and services as closely as possible. Sales figures for years after 1980 should be indexed to the second quarter of 1980 by using the gross national product price deflator (second quarter of 1980=100). This index is available in National Income and Product Accounts of the United States (Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis).

Table 2F-4: For each outfall, list any pollutant in Table 2F-4 that you know or believe to be present in the discharge and explain why you believe it to be present. No analysis is required, but if you have analytical data, you must report them. Note: Under 40 CFR 117.12(a)(2), certain discharges of hazardous substances (listed at 40 CFR 177.21 or 40 CFR 302.4) may be exempted from the requirements of section 311 of CWA, which establishes reporting requirements, civil penalties, and liability for cleanup costs for spills of oil and hazardous substances. A discharge of a particular substance may be exempted if the origin, source, and amount of the discharged substances are identified in the NPDES permit application or in the permit, if the permit contains a requirement for treatment of the discharge, and if the treatment is in place. To apply for an exclusion of the discharge of any hazardous substance from the requirements of section 311, attach additional sheets of paper to your form, setting forth the following information:

- 1. The substance and the amount of each substance which may be discharged.
- 2. The origin and source of the discharge of the substance.
- 3. The treatment which is to be provided for the discharge by:
 - a. An onsite treatment system separate from any treatment system treating your normal discharge;
 - b. A treatment system designed to treat your normal discharge and which is additionally capable of treating the amount of the substance identified under paragraph 1 above; or
 - c. Any combination of the above.

See 40 CFR 117.12(a)(2) and (c), published on August 29, 1979, in 44 FR 50766, or contact your Regional Office (Table 1 on Form 1, Instructions), for further information on exclusions from section 311.

Part VII-D

48086

If sampling is conducted during more than one storm event, you only need to report the information requested in Part VII-D for the storm event(s) which resulted in any maximum pollutant concentration reported in Part VII-A, VII-B, or VII-C.

Provide flow measurements or estimates of the flow rate, and the total amount of discharge for the storm event(s) sampled, the method of flow measurement; or estimation. Provide the data and duration of the storm event(s) sampled, rainfall measurements, or estimates of the storm event which generated the sampled runoff and the duration between the storm event sampled and the end of the previous measurable (greater than 0.1 inch rainfall) storm event.

Part VII-E

List any toxic pollutant listed in Tables 2F-2, 2F-3, or 2F-4 which you currently use or manufacture as an intermediate or final product or byproduct. In addition, if you know or have reason to believe that 2,3,7,8-te-trachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) is discharged or if you use or manufacture 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy acetic

acid (2,4,5,-T); 2-(2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy) propanoic acid (Silvex, 2,4,5,-TP); 2-(2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy) ethyl, 2,2-dichloropropionate (Erbon); O,O-dimethyl O-(2,4,5-trichlorphenyl) phosphorothioate (Ronnel); 2,4,5-trichlorophenol (TCP); or hexachlorophene (HCP); then list TCDD. The Director may waive or modify the requirement if you demonstrate that it would be unduly burdensome to identify each toxic pollutant and the Director has adequate information to issue your permit. You may not claim this information as confidential; however, you do not have to distinguish between use or production of the pollutants or list the amounts.

Item VIII

Self explanatory. The permitting authority may ask you to provide additional details after your application is received.

Item X

The Clean Water Act provides for severe penalties for submitting false information on this application form.

Section 309(c)(4) of the Clean Water Act provides that "Any person who knowingly makes any false material statement, representation, or certification in any application, ... shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both. If a conviction of such person is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than \$20,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than 4 years, or by both." 40 CFR Part 122.22 requires the certification to be signed as follows:

(A) For a corporation: by a responsible corporate official. For purposes of this section, a responsible corporate official means (i) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy- or decision-making functions for the corporation, or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities employing more than 250 persons or having gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding \$25,000,000 (in second-quarter 1980 dollars), if authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures.

Note: EPA does not require specific assignments or delegation of authority to responsible corporate officers identified in 122.22(a)(1)(i). The Agency will presume that these responsible corporate officers have the requisite authority to sign permit applications unless the corporation has notified the Director to the contrary. Corporate procedures governing authority to sign permit applications may provide for assignment or delegation to applicable corporate position under 122.22(a)(1)(ii) rather than to specific individuals.

(B) For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or

(C) For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this section, a principal executive officer of a Federal agency includes (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of EPA).

	1	Table 2F-1				
	Codes 1	or Treatment	Units			•
	Physical	Treatment Proc	, esses			
1-A	Ammonia Stripping	1-M	Grit Removal			
1-B	Dialysis	1-N	Microstraining			
1-C	Diatomaceous Earth Filtration	1-0	Mixing			
1-D	Distillation	1-P	Moving Bed Filters			
1-E -	Electrodialysis	1-Q	Multimedia Filtration			
1-F	Evaporation	1-R	Rapid Sand Filtration			
1-G	Flocculation	1-S	Reverse Osmosis (Hyperfiltration)	· · ·	• .	•
1-H 1	Flotation	1-T	Screening			•
1-1	Foam Fractionation	1-U	Sedimentation (Setting)		•	
1-J	Freezing	1-V	Slow Sand Filtration			
1-K	Gas-Phase Separation	1-W	Solvent Extraction			
1-L	Grinding (Comminutors)	1-X	Sorption			
	Chemica	I Treatment Proc	Cesses			
2-A	Carbon Adsorption	2-G	Disinfection (Ozone)			
2-B	Chemical Oxidation	2-H	Disinfection (Other)			
2-C	Chemical Precipitation	2-1	Electrochemical Treatment			
2-D	Coagulation	2-J	kon Exchange			
2-E	Dechlorination	2-K	Neutralization			
2-F	Disinfection (Chlorine)	2-L	Reduction			
	Biologica	I Treatment Proc	cesses			
3-A	Activated Sludge	3-E	Pre-Aeration	•		
3-B	Aerated Lagoons	3-F	Spray Irrigation/Land Application		,	
3-C	Anaerobic Treatment	3-G	Stabilization Ponds			
3-D	Nitrification-Denitrification	3-H	Trickling Filtration	· .		
	· O	ther Processes	•	-		
4-A	Discharge to Surface Water	4-C -	Reuse/Recycle of Treated Effluent			
4-B	Ocean Discharge Through Outfall	4-D	Underground Injection			
	Sludge Treatm	ent and Disposa	I Processes	•		,
5-A	Aerobic Digestion	5-M	Heat Drying			
5-B	Anaerobic Digestion	5-N	Heat Treatment			
5-C	Belt Filtration	5-0	Incineration			
5-D	Centrifugation	5-P	Land Application			
5-E	Chemical Conditioning	5-Q	Landfill			
5-F	Chlorine Treatment	5-R	Pressure Filtration			
5-G	Composting	5-S	Pyrolysis			
5-H	Drying Beds	5-T	Sludge Lagoons		· .	,
5-1	Elutriation	5-U	Vacuum Filtration			
5-J	Flotation Thickening	5-V	Vibration			
5-K	Freezing	5-W	Wet Oxidation			•
5-L	Gravity Thickening					

48088

1

Table 2F-2

Conventional and Nonconventional Pollutants Required To Be Tested by Existing Discharger if Expected To Be Present

Bromide Chlorine, Total Residual Color Fecal Coliform Fluoride Nitrate-Nitrite Nitrogen, Total Kjedahl Oil and Grease Phosphorus, Total Radioactivity Sulfate Sulfide Sulfite Surfactants Aluminum, Total Barium, Total Boron, Total Boron, Total Iron, Total Magnesium, Total Magnesium, Total Magnesium, Total Magnesium, Total Titanium, Total

EPA Form 3510-2F (12-88)

1-9

Table 2F-3

Toxic pollutants required to be identified by applicant if expected to be preserved.

Toxic Pollutants and Total Phenol

Antimony, Total Arsenic, Total Beryllium, Total Cadmium, Total Chromium Total

Acrolein Acrylonitrile Benzene Bromoform Carbon Tetrachloride Chlorobenzene Chlorodibromomethane Chloroethane 2-Chloroethylvinyl Ether Chloroform

2-Chlorophenol 2,4-Dichlorophenol 2,4-Dimethylphenol 4,6-Dinitro-O-Cresol

Acenaphthene Acenaphthylene Anthracene Benzidine Benzo(a)anthracene Benzo(a)pyrene 3,4-Benzofluoranthene Benzo(ghi)perylene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether Bis(2-ethylyhexyl)phthalate

Aldrin Alpha-BHC Beta-BHC Gamma-BHC Delta-BHC Chlordane 4,4'-DDT 4,4'-DDE 4,4'-DDD GC/MS Fraction Volatiles Compounds Dichlorobromomethane 1.

1,1-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethylene 1,2-Dichloropropane 1,3-Dichloropropylene Ethylbenzene Methyl Bromide Methyl Chloride Methylene Chloride

Copper, Total

Mercury, Total

Selenium, Total

Nickel, Total

Lead, Total

Acid Compounds

2,4-Dinitrophenol 2-Nitrophenol 4-Nitrophenol p-Chloro-M-Cresol

Base/Neutral

2-Chloronaphthalene 4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether Chrysene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1.3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine **Diethyl Phthalate Dimethyl Phthalate Di-N-Butyl Phthalate** 2,4-Dinitrotoluene 2,6-Dinitrotoluene Di-N-Octylphthalate 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine (as Azobenzene)

Pesticides

Dieldrin Alpha-Endosulfan Beta-Endosulfan Endosulfan Sulfate Endrin Endrin Aldehyde Heptachlor Heptachlor Epoxide PCB-1242 Cyanide, Total Phenols, Total 1,1,2,2,-Tetrachloroethane Tetrachloroethylene Toluene 1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene

Silver, Total

Zinc, Total

Thallium, Total

1,1,1-Trichloroethane 1,1,2-Trichloroethane Trichloroethylene Vinyl Chloride

Pentachlorophenol Phenol 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol

Fluroranthene Fluorene Hexachlorobenzene Hexachlorobutadiene Hexachloroethane Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Isophorone Napthalene Nitrobenzene N-Nitrosodimethylamine N-Nitrosodin-N-Propylamine N-Nitrosodiphenylamine Phenanthrene Pyrene 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene

PCB-1254 PCB-1221 PCB-1232 PCB-1248 PCB-1260 PCB-1016 Toxaphene

EPA Form 3510-2F (12-88)

I - 10

Table 2F-4

Hazardous substances required to be identified by applicant if expected to be present

Toxic Pollutant

Hazardous Substances

Acetaldehyde		,
Allyl alcohol	•	
Allyl chloride		
Amyl acetate		
Aniline		
Benzonitrile		
Benzyl chloride		
Butyl acetate		
Butylamine		
Carbaryl	•	
Carbofuran		
Carbon disulfide		
Chlorpyrifos		
Coumaphos		
Cresol		

Asbestos

Crotonaldehyde

Cyclohexane 2,4-D (2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid) Diazinon Dicamba Dichlobenil Dichlone 2,2-Dichloropropionic acid Dichlorvos Diethyl amine Dimethyl amine Dinitrobenzene Diquat Disulfoton Diuron Epichlorohydrin Ethion Ethylene diamine Ethylene dibromide Formaldehyde Furfural Guthion Isoprene Isopropanolamine Kelthane

Kepone Malathion

Mercaptodimethur Methoxychlor

Methyl mercaptan Methyl methacrylate Methyl parathion Mevinphos Mexacarbate Monoethyl amine Nonomethyl amine Naled Napthenic acid Nitrotoluene Parathion Phenolsulfonate Phosaene Propargite Propylene oxide **Pyrethrins** Quinoline Resorcinol Stronthium Strychnine Styrene 2,4,5-T (2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxyacetic acid) TDE (Tetrachlorodiphenyl ethane) 2,4,5-TP [2-(2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy) propanoic acid] Trichlorofan Triethylamine

Trimethylamine Uranium Vanadium Vinyl acetate Xylene Xylenol Zirconium

5-Trichlorophenoxy}

[FR Doc. 90-26315 Filed 11-9-90; 12:17 pm] BILLING CODE 6560-50-C