NPDES PERMIT NO. NM0020133
FACT SHEET

FOR THE DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

APPLICANT

Los Alamos County White Rock WWTP
170 Central Park Square
Los Alamos, NM 87544

ISSUING OFFICE

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

PREPARED BY

Laurence E. Giglio
Environmental Engineer
NPDES Permits & Technical Branch (6WQ-PP)
Water Quality Protection Division
VOICE: 214-665-6639
FAX: 214-665-2191
EMAIL: giglio.larry@epa.gov

DATE PREPARED

March 29, 2011

PERMIT ACTION

Proposed reissuance of the current NPDES permit issued January 30, 2006, with an effective date of March 1, 2006, and an expiration date of February 28, 2011.

RECEIVING WATER – BASIN

Canada del Buey – Rio Grande Basin

DOCUMENT ABBREVIATIONS

In the document that follows, various abbreviations are used. They are as follows:

4Q3	Lowest four-day average flow rate expected to occur once every three-years
BAT	Best available technology economically achievable
BCT	Best conventional pollutant control technology
BPT	Best practicable control technology currently available
BMP	Best management plan
BOD	Biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
BPJ	Best professional judgment
CD	Critical dilution
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
COE	United States Corp of Engineers
CWA	Clean Water Act
DMR	Discharge monitoring report
ELG	Effluent limitation guidelines
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCB	Fecal coliform bacteria
F&WS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
mg/l	Milligrams per liter (one part per million)
ug/l	Micrograms per litter (one part per billion)
MGD	Million gallons per day
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMIP	New Mexico NPDES Permit Implementation Procedures
NMWQS	New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Waters
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
MQL	Minimum quantification level
O&G	Oil and grease
POTW	Publically owned treatment works
RP	Reasonable potential
SIC	Standard industrial classification
s.u.	Standard units (for parameter pH)
SWQB	Surface Water Quality Bureau
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
UAA	Use attainability analysis
UV	Ultraviolet light
USFWS	United States Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Service
WLA	Wasteload allocation
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

I. CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS PERMIT

Changes from the permit previously issued January 30, 2006, with an effective date of March 1, 2006, and an expiration date of February 28, 2011, are:

A. Permit limits for E. coli have been made more stringent.
B. Fecal coliform limits have been eliminated.
C. Limits for pH have been made more stringent.

II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

As described in the application, the facility is located off Overlook Drive at White Rock, Los Alamos County, New Mexico.

Under the Standard Industrial Classification Code 4952, the applicant operates a POTW with a design flow of 0.82 MGD for a population of 5917 residents.

PLAT OF WHITE ROCK WWTP

The collection system transports domestic sewage from residential neighborhoods to the WWTP. The raw sewage enters the WWTP through the Parshall Flume at the head works where a screw pump removes large solids. Those solids are collected in a dumpster and disposed at the county landfill. Wastewater continues to the grit settling channel where grit is removed, collected and also disposed of at the landfill. The wastewater can flow from the head works to parallel

treatment trains of primary clarifiers to trickling filters, to secondary clarifiers. Past the secondary clarifier, a portion of the water is re-circulated back to the end of the head works to insure continuous flow to maintain the trickling filters media. The treated water flows to the chlorine contact chamber for disinfection, followed by dechlorination and passes through final flow measurement devices and is discharge to the Canada Del Buey. The reuse water is drawn off before dechlorination and before the effluent flow meter.

Solids are wasted from the primary and the secondary clarifier/s to an aerobic digester. Recirculated water and solids are sent back to a splitter box following the grit chamber at the headworks. The decant from the digester and drains from the sludge drying beds are also sent to the splitter box, where it mixes with the influent. From the digester, solids are sent to the sludge drying beds. Final disposal of solids are to a composting site at the Los Alamos County Landfill and soon to be a composting site at the Los Alamos Bayo site.

The effluent from the treatment plant is discharged into Canada del Buey, an unclassified water, thence to the Rio Grande in Segment No. 20.6.4.114 of the Rio Grande Basin. The discharge is located on that water at Latitude 35° 49' 39.936" North, Longitude 106° 11' 5.964" West.

III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS

A quantitative description of the discharge(s) described in the EPA Permit Application Form 2A received August 1, 2010, are presented below:

POLLUTANT TABLE - 1

Parameter	Max	Avg
	(mg/l unless noted)	
Flow, million gallons/day (MGD)	0.51	0.32
Temperature, winter, °C	7.8	N/A
Temperature, summer, °C	23.5	N/A
pH, minimum, standard units (su)	6.06	N/A
pH, maximum, standard units (su)	7.82	N/A
Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day (BOD_5)	30	16.97
Fecal Coliform (#bacteria/100 ml)	86	8
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	29	18
Ammonia (NH_3)	11	6.7
Chlorine, Total Residual (TRC)	0.00	0.00
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	4.9	4.4
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	16.3	11.0
Nitrate plus Nitrite Nitrogen	17.5	9.1
Oil & Grease	0.00	0.00
Phosphorus	8.4	6.9
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	410	372

A summary of the last 3-years of pollutant data taken from DMRs indicates only a single daily maximum TSS limit exceedance during March 2010, (125.6 mg/l effluent, 45 mg/l limit).

IV. REGULATORY AUTHORITY/PERMIT ACTION

In November 1972, Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act establishing the NPDES permit program to control water pollution. These amendments established technology-based or end-of-pipe control mechanisms and an interim goal to achieve "water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water"; more commonly known as the "swimmable, fishable" goal. Further amendments in 1977 of the CWA gave EPA the authority to implement pollution control programs such as setting wastewater standards for industry and established the basic structure for regulating pollutants discharges into the waters of the United States. In addition, it made it unlawful for any person to discharge any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters, unless a permit was obtained under its provisions. Regulations governing the EPA administered NPDES permit program are generally found at 40 CFR §122 (program requirements & permit conditions), §124 (procedures for decision making), §125 (technology-based standards) and §136 (analytical procedures). Other parts of 40 CFR provide guidance for specific activities and may be used in this document as required.

It is proposed that the permit be reissued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.46(a). The previous permit expired February 28, 2011. The application was received on August 1, 2010. The existing permit is administratively continued until this permit is issued.

V. DRAFT PERMIT RATIONALE AND PROPOSED PERMIT CONDITIONS

A. OVERVIEW of TECHNOLOGY-BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

Regulations contained in 40 CFR §122.44 require that NPDES permit limits are developed that meet the more stringent of either technology-based effluent limitation guidelines, numerical and/or narrative water quality standard-based effluent limits, or the previous permit.

Technology-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for TSS and BOD_5. Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for E. coli bacteria, TRC and pH.

B. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS/CONDITIONS

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44 (a) require technology-based effluent limitations to be placed in NPDES permits based on ELGs where applicable, on BPJ in the absence of guidelines, or on a combination of the two. In the absence of promulgated guidelines for the discharge, permit conditions may be established using BPJ procedures. EPA establishes limitations based on the following technology-based controls: BPT, BCT, and BAT. These levels of treatment are:

BPT - The first level of technology-based standards generally based on the average of the best existing performance facilities within an industrial category or subcategory.

BCT - Technology-based standard for the discharge from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and O&G.

BAT - The most appropriate means available on a national basis for controlling the direct discharge of toxic and non-conventional pollutants to navigable waters. BAT effluent limits represent the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category or subcategory.

The facility is a POTW's that has technology-based ELG's established at 40 CFR Part 133, Secondary Treatment Regulation. Pollutants with ELG's established in this Chapter are BOD, TSS and pH. BOD limits of 30 mg/l for the 30-day average and 45 mg/l for the 7-day average are found at 40 CFR §133.102(a). TSS limits; also 30 mg/l for the 30-day average and 45 mg/l for the 7-day average, are found at 40 CFR §133.102(b). ELG's for pH are between 6-9 s.u. and are found at 40 CFR §133.102(c). Regulations at 40 CFR §122.45(f)(1) require all pollutants limited in permits to have limits expressed in terms of mass such as pounds per day. When determining mass limits for POTW's, the plant's design flow is used to establish the mass load. Mass limits are determined by the following mathematical relationship:

Loading in lbs/day = pollutant concentration in mg/l * 8.345 lbs/gal * design flow in MGD
30-day average BOD/TSS loading = 30 mg/l * 8.345 lbs/gal * 0.82 MGD
30-day average BOD/TSS loading = 205 lbs

A summary of the technology-based limits for the facility is:

Final Effluent Limits – 0.82 MGD design flow.

EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS	DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS			
	lbs/Day		mg/l (unless noted)	
Parameter	30-Day Avg.	7-Day Avg.	30-Day Avg.	7-Day Avg.
Flow	N/A	N/A	Measure MGD	Measure MGD
BOD_5	205	308	30	45
TSS	205	308	30	45
pH	N/A	N/A	6.0 – 9.0 standard units	

C. WATER QUALITY BASED LIMITATIONS

1. General Comments

Water quality based requirements are necessary where effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits are necessary to maintain or achieve federal or state water quality limits. Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on federal or state WQS. Effluent limitations and/or conditions established in the draft permit are in compliance with applicable State WQS and applicable State water quality management plans to assure that surface WQS of the receiving waters are protected and maintained, or attained.

2. Implementation

The NPDES permits contain technology-based effluent limitations reflecting the best controls available. Where these technology-based permit limits do not protect water quality or the designated uses, additional water quality-based effluent limitations and/or conditions are included in the NPDES permits. State narrative and numerical water quality standards are used in conjunction with EPA criteria and other available toxicity information to determine the adequacy of technology-based permit limits and the need for additional water quality-based controls.

3. State Water Quality Standards

The general and specific stream standards are provided in NMWQS (20.6.4 NMAC, amended through August 1, 2007). The wastewater flows from the outfall to an unclassified arroyo named Canada del Buey in Los Alamos County in State waters, then flows approximately 300 feet where it enters waters of the San Ildefonso Pueblo. After approximately one-mile, the discharge leaves San Ildefonso Pueblo waters and reaches the Rio Grande in State waters. The San Ildefonso Pueblo does not have EPA approved water quality standards, and does not have NPDES authority. Establishment of permit limits that meet State WQS will be protective of Tribal waters.

The CWA sections 101(a)(2) and 303(c) require water quality standards to provide, wherever attainable, water quality for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, wildlife, and recreation in and on the water, functions commonly referred to as “fishable/swimmable” uses. EPA's current water quality regulation effectively establishes a rebuttable presumption that “fishable/swimmable” uses are attainable and therefore should apply to a water body unless it can be demonstrated that such uses are not attainable. EPA does not expect the State to adopt uses for ephemeral waters that cannot be attained, but in those instances, the State must submit a UAA to support an aquatic life designation that does not meet the CWA §101(a)(2) objective as required by 40 CFR 131.10(j)(1).

The designated uses of Canada del Buey under the “fishable/swimmable” requirements of the CWA are aquatic life, livestock watering, wildlife habitat and primary contact. The determination of coldwater or warmwater aquatic uses is based on the first downstream designation from the stream segment. The Rio Grande is the first designated stream, and it is designated as both a warmwater and a marginal coldwater aquatic use. The differences between warmwater and marginal coldwater uses are DO and temperature. The fact sheet below will discuss each as they are required.

4. Permit Action - Water Quality-Based Limits

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44(d) require limits in addition to, or more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines (technology based). State WQS that are more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines are as follows:

a. BACTERIA

Lacking stream segment specific limitations for bacteria, WQS established at 20.6.4.900, "Criteria Applicable to Attainable or Designated Uses Unless Otherwise Specified in 20.6.4.97 through 20.6.4.899 NMAC" apply. WQS for E. coli bacteria is 126 cfu/100 ml daily monthly geometric mean and 410 cfu/100 ml daily maximum. The previous permit limited E. coli to 548 cfu/100 ml daily monthly geometric mean and 2507 cfu/100 ml daily maximum. These limitations are more stringent than the previous permit limits and will be proposed in the draft permit. Since the change in limits requires only changes in bacteria chemical (chlorine) dosing and does not require capital expenditures, a compliance schedule will not be provided in the draft permit. Additionally, the previous permit limited fecal coliform bacteria (FCB). The WQS have been changed to E. coli and will be proposed in the draft permit. Fecal coliform limits will no longer be required. The removal of FCB does not constitute antibacksliding as required in 40 CFR §122.44(l) since FCB has been replaced by E. coli as an indicator pollutant to assess compliance with the swimmable requirements of body contact recreation.

b. pH

Limits for pH are also based on 20.6.4.900 and for primary contact, warmwater aquatic and marginal coldwater aquatic protection the pH shall be 6.6 to 9.0 su. These limits are more restrictive than the previous permit (6.0 to 9.0 su) and are also more restrictive than the technology-based limits presented earlier and the draft permit will propose these water quality limits in the draft permit.

c. TOXICS

i. General Comments

The CWA in Section 301 (b) requires that effluent limitations for point sources include any limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Federal regulations found at 40 CFR §122.44 (d) state that if a discharge poses the reasonable potential to cause an in-stream excursion above a water quality criteria, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant.

All applicable facilities are required to fill out appropriate sections of the Form 2A, 2S or 2E, to apply for an NPDES permit or reissuance of an NPDES permit. The new form is applicable not only to POTWs, but also to facilities that are similar to POTWs, but which do not meet the regulatory definition of "publicly owned treatment works" (like private domestics, or similar facilities on Federal property). The forms were designed and promulgated to "make it easier for permit applicants to provide the necessary information with their applications and minimize the need for additional follow-up requests from permitting authorities," per the summary statement in the preamble to the Rule. These forms became effective December 1, 1999, after publication of the final rule on August 4, 1999, Volume 64, Number 149, pages 42433 through 42527 of the FRL. The facility is designated as a minor, and does not need to fill out the expanded pollutant testing section Part D of Form 2A. There are no toxics that need to be placed in the draft permit except for those presented below.

ii. TRC

The facility uses chlorine to control bacteria. The previous permit had an 11 ug/l TRC limit that will be continued in the draft permit.

D. MONITORING FREQUENCY FOR LIMITED PARAMETERS

Regulations require permits to establish monitoring requirements to yield data representative of the monitored activity, 40 CFR §122.48(b), and to assure compliance with permit limitations, 40 CFR §122.44(i)(1). Sample frequency is based on the NMIP. Technology based pollutants; BOD and TSS are proposed to be monitored three times per month. Flow is proposed to be monitored continuously by totalizing meter. These frequencies are the same as the current permit. Sample type for BOD and TSS are 6-hr composite which is consistent with the previous permit.

Water quality-based pollutant monitoring frequency for E. coli shall be three times per month by grab sample which is the same as the previous permit. TRC and pH shall be monitored daily, which is greater than the previous permit but is consistent with similar sized facilities, using instantaneous grab samples. Regulations at 40 CFR §136 define instantaneous grab as being analyzed within 15-minutes of collection.

E. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY LIMITATIONS

The Canada del Buey is described an ephemeral waterbody; flowing only under periods of rapid snowmelt or when rainfall of long enough duration and/or intensity occur. When a discharge enters into an ephemeral waterbody, the CD is 100%. Appendix 1 of the Fact Sheet is a WET RP analyzer. The recommendation of that document is that no WET RP exists and therefore no WET limits will be established in the proposed permit. Instead, WET monitoring will be required. Based on the nature of the discharge, the design flow; more than 0.1 MGD but less than 1.0 MGD, and the critical dilution, the NMIP directs the WET test to be a 48 hour acute test using Daphnia pulex at a once per two years frequency for the life of the permit. The first test shall be in the first-year of the permit after the permit effective date (PED) and the second test shall be in the third year after the PED. This type of test and frequency is identical to the existing permit. Additional retests after the third year shall be at once/two years until the permit is renewed or other changes required by EPA. The test species shall be *Daphnia pulex* at a 100% CD. Both tests shall occur during the period November 1 and April 30.

The proposed permit requires five (5) dilutions in addition to the control (0% effluent) to be used in the toxicity tests based on a 0.75 dilution series. These additional effluent concentrations shall be 32%, 42%, 56%, 75%, and 100%. The low-flow effluent concentration (critical low-flow dilution) is defined as 100% effluent.

During the period beginning the effective date of the permit and lasting through the expiration date of the permit, the permittee is authorized to discharge from Outfall 001 - the discharge to Canada del Buey of the treatment system aeration basin. The aeration basin receives process

area wastewater, process area stormwater, and treated sanitary wastewater. Discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC	DISCHARGE MONITORING	
	30-DAY AVG MINIMUM	48-HOUR MINIMUM
Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (48-Hour Static Renewal) (*1)		
Daphnia pulex	REPORT	REPORT

EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTIC	MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
	FREQUENCY	TYPE
Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (48-Hour Static Renewal) (*1)		
Daphnia pulex	1/2 years (*2)	24-Hr. Composite

Footnote:

*1 Monitoring and reporting requirements begin on the effective date of this permit. See Part II, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements for additional WET monitoring and reporting conditions.

*2 The first test shall be in the first year after the permit effective date (PED) and the second test shall be taken during the third year after the PED. Each sample shall be taken during the period November 1 and April 30. Thereafter, until the permit is renewed, continued sampling shall be at two (2) year intervals between November 1 and April 30. If any test demonstrates significant toxic effects at the 100% critical dilution, testing for the affected species will continue at once/six (6) months until either the expiration date of the permit, its renewal, or otherwise directed by EPA.

VI. FACILITY OPERATIONAL PRACTICES

A. SEWAGE SLUDGE

The permittee shall use only those sewage sludge disposal or reuse practices that comply with the federal regulations established in 40 CFR Part 503 "Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge." EPA may at a later date issue a sludge-only permit. Until such future issuance of a sludge-only permit, sludge management and disposal at the facility will be subject to Part 503 sewage sludge requirements. Part 503 regulations are self-implementing, which means that facilities must comply with them whether or not a sludge-only permit has been issued. Part IV of the draft permit contains sewage sludge permit requirements.

B. WASTE WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION REQUIREMENTS

The permittee shall institute programs directed towards pollution prevention. The permittee will institute programs to improve the operating efficiency and extend the useful life of the treatment system.

C. INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER CONTRIBUTIONS

The treatment plant has no non-categorical Significant Industrial User's (SIU) and no Categorical Industrial User's (CIU). The EPA has tentatively determined that the permittee will not be required to develop a full pretreatment program. However, general pretreatment provisions have been required. The facility is required to report to EPA, in terms of character and volume of pollutants any significant indirect dischargers into the POTW subject to pretreatment standards under §307(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR Part 403.

D. OPERATION AND REPORTING

The applicant is required to operate the treatment facility at maximum efficiency at all times; to monitor the facility's discharge on a regular basis; and report the results quarterly. The monitoring results will be available to the public.

VII. 303(d) LIST

The unclassified water Canada del Buey is not listed on the 2010 - 2012 State of New Mexico CWA §303(d)/§305(b) Integrated Report. The portion of the Rio Grande that the discharge enters is not listed as impaired and WLAs were not developed for the June 2, 2005, TMDL for the Upper Rio Grande Watershed, Cochiti Reservoir to Pilar NM. Additional permit conditions are not needed at this time to address impaired water issues. The standard reopener language in the permit allows additional permit conditions if warranted by future changes either to State or Tribal waters.

VIII. ANTIDEGRADATION

The NMAC, Section 20.6.4.8 "Antidegradation Policy and Implementation Plan" sets forth the requirements to protect designated uses through implementation of the State water quality standards. The limitations and monitoring requirements set forth in the proposed permit are developed from the State water quality standards and are protective of those designated uses. Furthermore, the policy sets forth the intent to protect the existing quality of those waters, whose quality exceeds their designated use. The permit requirements and the limits are protective of the assimilative capacity of the receiving waters, which is protective of the designated uses of that water, NMAC Section 20.6.4.8.A.2.

IX. ANTIBACKSLIDING

The proposed permit is consistent with the requirements to meet antibacksliding provisions of the Clean Water Act, Section 402(o) and 40 CFR §122.44(l)(i)(A), which state in part that interim or final effluent limitations must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, unless material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation. The proposed permit maintains the mass loading requirements of the previous permit for BOD and TSS. The pollutant pH has been made stricter and E. coli bacteria have been made more stringent than the previously used fecal coliform. The change from fecal coliform bacteria to E. coli does not constitute antibacksliding since only the indicator bacteria have changed.

X. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS

According to the most recent county listing available at USFWS, Southwest Region 2 website, http://ifw2es.fws.gov/EndangeredSpecies/lists/, three species in Los Alamos County are listed as endangered (E) or threatened (T). They are the Black-footed ferret (E) (*Mustela nigripes*), the Southwestern willow flycatcher (E) (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) and the Mexican spotted owl (T) (*Strix occidentalis lucida*). The American bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) was previously listed as endangered; however, the USFWS removed the American bald eagle in the lower 48 states from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife Federal Register, July 9, 2007, (Volume 72, Number 130).

In accordance with requirements under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, EPA has reviewed this permit for its effect on listed threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat. After review, EPA has determined that the reissuance of this permit will have "*no effect*" on listed threatened and endangered species nor will adversely modify designated critical habitat. EPA makes this determination based on the following:

1. In the previous permits issued July 27, 2001, and again January 30, 2006, EPA made a "no effect" determination for federally listed species. EPA has received no additional information since then which would lead to a revision of that "no effect" determination. EPA determines that this reissuance will not change the environmental baseline established by the previous permit, and therefore, EPA concludes that reissuance of this permit will have "no effect" on the listed species and designated critical habitat.

2. No additions have been made to the USFWS list of threatened and endangered species and critical habitat designation in the area of the discharge since prior issuance of the permit.

3. EPA has received no additional information since the previous permit issuance which would lead to revision of its determinations.

4. The draft permit is no less restrictive from the previous permit and in fact the pH and bacteria limitations are more restrictive than the previous permit.

5. EPA determines that Items 1, thru 4 result in no change to the environmental baseline established by the previous permit, therefore, EPA concludes that reissuance of this permit will have "no effect" on listed species and designated critical habitat.

XI. HISTORICAL and ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS

The reissuance of the permit should have no impact on historical and/or archeological sites since no construction activities are planned in the reissuance.

XII. PERMIT REOPENER

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if State Water Quality Standards are promulgated or revised. In addition, if the State amends a TMDL, this permit may be reopened to establish effluent limitations for the parameter(s) to be consistent with that TMDL. Modification of the permit is subject to the provisions of 40 CFR §124.5.

XIII. VARIANCE REQUESTS

No variance requests have been received.

XIV. CERTIFICATION

The permit is in the process of certification by the State Agency following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 124.53. A draft permit and draft public notice will be sent to the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers; to the Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and to the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to the publication of that notice.

XV. FINAL DETERMINATION

The public notice describes the procedures for the formulation of final determinations.

XVI. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

A. APPLICATION(s)

EPA Application Form 2E received August 1, 2010.

B. 40 CFR CITATIONS

Citations to 40 CFR are as of March 18, 2011.
Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, 136

C. STATE OF NEW MEXICO REFERENCES

New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Water, 20.6.4 NMAC, as amended through August 1, 2007.

Procedures for Implementing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits in New Mexico, November 2009.

Statewide Water Quality Management Plan, December 17, 2002.

State of New Mexico 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2010 - 2012.