

# **NPDES PERMIT NO. NM0020681**

## **FACT SHEET**

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

### **APPLICANT**

City of Truth or Consequences  
505 Sims Street  
City of Truth or Consequences, NM 87901

### **ISSUING OFFICE**

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

### **PREPARED BY**

Tung Nguyen  
Environmental Engineer  
NPDES Permits & Technical Branch (6WQ-PP)  
Water Quality Protection Division  
VOICE: 214-665-7153  
FAX: 214-665-2191  
EMAIL: [nguyen.tung@epa.gov](mailto:nguyen.tung@epa.gov)

### **DATE PREPARED**

June 1, 2016

### **PERMIT ACTION**

Renewal of a permit previously issued on February 13, 2009, with an effective date of March 1, 2009, and an expiration date of February 28, 2014.

### **RECEIVING WATER – BASIN**

Rio Grande River – Middle Rio Grande Basin (Segment 20.6.4.103)

**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
CBOD	Carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
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
DO	Dissolved oxygen
ELG	Effluent limitation guidelines
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
mg/l	Milligrams per liter
ug/l	Micrograms per liter
lbs	Pounds
MG	Million gallons
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
ML	Minimum quantification level
O&G	Oil and grease
POTW	Publically owned treatment works
RP	Reasonable potential
SS	Settleable solids
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
USGS	United States Geological Service
WLA	Waste Load allocation
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WWTF	Wastewater treatment plant

## I. CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS PERMIT

Changes from the permit previously issued on February 13, 2009, with an effective date of March 1, 2009, and an expiration date of February 28, 2014, are as follow:

- Removal percentage for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS has been established.
- Limits for cadmium and acrylonitrile have been established.
- Limits for total copper have been removed.
- Pimephales promelas is now limited instead of Ceriodaphnia dubia for WET testing.
- Monitoring frequency and sample type have been changed to reflect the NMIP.
- Reporting for DO, total phosphorus, total nitrogen and O&G have been established.

## II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

As described in the application, the facility (Outfall: Latitude 33° 06' 50" North and Longitude 107° 16' 56" West) is located at 1595 Animal Shelter Road in the City of Truth or Consequences, Sierra County, New Mexico.

Under the SIC code 4952, the applicant operates Truth or Consequences Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF), which has a design flow of 1.06 MGD providing sanitary services for approximately 7,600- population in the City and the City of Williamsburg. The WWTF provides primary and secondary levels of treatment. Effluent is chlorinated before being reused (under a ground water permit) and/or discharged to Rio Grande River via Outfall 001. Sewage sludge is processed and disposed at Corralitos Landfill. A map of the facility is attached.

## III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS

Data submitted in Form 2A for the WWTF is as follows:

Parameter	Max	Avg
	(mg/l unless noted)	
pH, minimum, standard units (su)	6.65	NA
pH, maximum, standard units (su)	7.14	NA
Flow (MGD)	1.07	0.88
Temperature (C), winter	20.1	18
Temperature (C), summer	26.3	24.2
Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	N/A	3.12
E. coli (cfu/100 ml)	56.55	26.2
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	N/A	4.78
Ammonia (as N)	N/A	N/A
TRC	N/A	1.5
DO	6.63	5.68
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	1.0	1.0
Nitrate + Nitrite Nitrogen	24	9.71
Oil & Grease	N/A	N/A
Phosphorus (Total)	N/A	N/A
TDS	1431.00	1353.25
Copper	0.011	0.008
Chloride	578	525.5

Since April 2013, there has been no exceedances according to the DMRs.

#### **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 the 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.

The application was dated December 11, 2013. It is proposed that the permit be reissued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.46(a).

#### **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 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, and percent removal for each. Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for *E. coli* bacteria, pH, TRC and toxic pollutants.

##### **B. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS/CONDITIONS**

###### **1. General Comments**

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, *E. coli* bacteria, 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.

2. Effluent Limitation Guidelines

The facility is a POTW/POTW-like that has technology-based limits established at 40 CFR Part 133, Secondary Treatment Regulation. Pollutants with requirements 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 and 85% percent (minimum) removal 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, average and 85% percent (minimum) removal are found at 40 CFR §133.102(b). However, existing limits for BOD and TSS are more stringent and retained in the permit draft. Limits for pH are between 6-9 s.u. and are found at 40 CFR §133.102(c). The draft permit establishes new limits for percent removal for both BOD and TSS. Since these are technology-based requirements there is no compliance schedule provided to meet these limits. Compliance is required on the permit effective date.

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 POTWs or similar, the plant’s design flow is used to establish the mass load. Mass limits are determined by the following mathematical relationship:

$$\text{Loading in lbs/day} = \text{pollutant concentration in mg/l} * 8.345 \text{ (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG)} * \text{design flow in MGD}$$

- 30-day average BOD loading = 30 mg/l \* 8.345 (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG) \* 1.06 MGD = 265 lbs/day
- 7-day average BOD loading = 45 mg/l \* 8.345 (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG) \* 1.06 MGD = 398 lbs/day
- 30-day average TSS loading = 30 mg/l \* 8.345 (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG) \* 1.06 MGD = 265 lbs/day
- 7-day average TSS loading = 45 mg/l \* 8.345 (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG) \* 1.06 MGD = 398 lbs/day

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

Effluent Characteristic Outfall 001 & 601	Discharge Limitation			
	lbs/day, unless noted		mg/l, unless noted	
Parameter	30-day Avg	7-day Max	30-day Avg	7-day Max
BOD	265	398	30	45
BOD, % removal <sup>1</sup>	≥ 85	---	---	---
TSS	265	398	30	45
TSS, % removal <sup>1</sup>	≥ 85	---	---	---
pH	N/A	N/A	6.0 to 9.0 s.u.	

<sup>1</sup> % removal is calculated using the following equation: [(average monthly influent concentration – average monthly effluent concentration) ÷ average monthly influent concentration] \* 100.

Because the submitted application provided no effluent data for O&G, EPA proposes monitoring of O&G at once/quarter in the permit draft. During the public notice period the permittee can submit the required data for further evaluation.

3. Pretreatment Regulation

The facility is not subject to the full pretreatment program pursuant to 40 CFR 403.8. Previous general practices are retained in the permit draft.

## 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/Tribe WQS. Effluent limitations and/or conditions established in the draft permit are in compliance with applicable State/Tribal WQS and applicable State/Tribe 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/Tribe narrative and numerical water quality standards are used in conjunction with EPA criterion 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 approved on June 5, 2013). The receiving water is Rio Grande River (segment 20.6.4.103 NMAC of the Rio Grande River Basin). The stream designated uses are irrigation, livestock watering, wildlife habitat, marginal coldwater aquatic life, secondary contact and warmwater aquatic life.

### 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. pH

For marginal coldwater aquatic life, criterion for pH is between 6.6 and 9.0 s.u. pursuant to 20.6.4.900.H(3) NMAC.

#### b. Bacteria

For secondary contact, criterion for E. coli bacteria is at 548 cfu/100 ml monthly geometric mean and 2507 cfu/100 ml daily maximum pursuant to 20.6.4.900.E NMAC.

#### c. Toxics

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 criterion, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant.

All applicable facilities are required to fill out appropriate sections of the Form 2A and 2S, 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 4Q3 of 2.61 cfs, harmonic mean flow of 9.85 cfs and other data on the receiving stream was provided by NMED on April 28, 2014. For applicable pollutants with numerical standards in 20.6.4.900.J, submitted analyses (in Part D form 2A and laboratory reports sent via email on May 3, 2016) are scanned for RP. There was discrepancy in reported unit between Form 2A and the reports. For those reported with non-detect, the ML/MDL values are used in the Appendix A. RPs exist and limits are calculated for several toxic pollutants: cadmium, acrylonitrile, hexachlorobenzene and benzidine. Recent issued permits have identified issues with the pollutants below regarding to the Sufficient Sensitive Method requirement:

Pollutants	Tested Result, EPA Method 625	EPA Approved Method with Lowest MDL	Regional Lab Can Run the Test Method Currently
Benzidine	0.5 ug/L	0.08 ug/L (EPA Method 605)	No
Hexachlorobenzene	0.5 ug/L	0.05 ug/L (EPA Method 612)	Yes

The reported effluent concentration, 0.5 ug/L, for these pollutants is the second to the lowest MDL among the EPA approved methods. Benzidine is currently not limited until an analytical laboratory is capable of running EPA Method 605. Because the permittee has not demonstrated compliance with the sufficient sensitive test requirement per 40 CFR 122.21(e)(3) for hexachlorobenzene analysis, which can be currently performed by a lab, EPA proposes monitoring for hexachlorobenzene at once/quarter in this permit draft. During the public comment period, the permittee may submit the analysis result using EPA Method 612 and retest results for cadmium, and acrylonitrile; EPA may reconsider this monitoring requirement upon the result(s). Information on laboratory testing hexachlorobenzene using EPA Method 612 is available upon request. Pollutants applicable to the State WQS that are not listed in Part D of Form 2A will be tested during the permit term pursuant to 40 CFR 122.21(j)(4)(iv).

Copper limit was previously established based on the WQS. DMR averaged value is used in this appendix. There is no RP for copper; EPA removes this limit in compliance with the Antidegradation because the current data of 4Q3 and DMR were not available previously pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(l)(2)(i). Compliance schedule (three years) is provided for the newly established toxic pollutants, cadmium and acrylonitrile.

d. TRC

For wildlife habitat, criteria for TRC is 11 ug/l pursuant to 20.6.4.900.G NMAC. 19 ug/l was limited previously. However, if a test result is less than the MQL specified in Part II.A of the permit it can be reported as zero for compliance purpose.

e. DO

For marginal coldwater aquatic life, criterion for DO is 6.0 mg/L or more pursuant to 20.6.4.900.H(3). EPA uses LA-QUAL version 9.30 to model DO along this receiving stream; some of the factors used are 4Q3, effluent DO and BOD<sub>5</sub> (30 mg/l for monthly average, 45 mg/l for 7-day maxima). The modeled output shows DO stays mostly above 6 mg/L along this 37 mile long stream (see attached graph; other detail information is available upon request). No additional requirement is needed in term of the DO criterion. DO is continued to be monitored for TMDL purpose mentioned below.

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 Table 9 (page 34 of the NMIP) for design flow between 1.0 and 5.0 MGD and based on compliance history.

Parameter	Frequency	Sample Type
Flow	Daily	Totalized
pH	Daily	Instantaneous Grab
BOD <sub>5</sub> /TSS	1/week	6-hr Composite
% Removal	1/week	Calculation
TRC	Daily	Instantaneous Grab
E. coli Bacteria	1/week	Grab
DO	1/quarter	Instantaneous Grab
TP	1/quarter	6-hr Composite
TN	1/quarter	6-hr Composite
O&G	1/quarter	6-hr Composite
Hexachlorobenzene	1/quarter	Grab
Cadmium	3/week	Grab
Acrylonitrile	3/week	Grab

E. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY

Procedures for implementing WET terms and conditions in NPDES permits are contained in the NMIP. Table 11 (page 42) of the NMIP outlines the type of WET testing for different types of discharges. The receiving water (Rio Grande River), a perennial stream has a 4Q3 of 2.61 cfs (1.69 MGD). With the facility design flow rate of 1.06 MGD and mixing fraction of 100%, a CD is calculated about 38%. Testing species for WET are retained from the previous permit: Ceriodaphnia dubia (Cd) and Pimephales promelas (Pp). Submitted WET data show RPs exist for sub-lethal effect of Pp at the proposed CD (see attached RP Analyzer for WET). Therefore, EPA establishes a limit for Pp with the same compliance schedule and removes the previous limit for Cd in the draft permit. This limit removal does not violate the Antibracksliding because the current data of 4Q3 is not available previously pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(l)(2)(i).

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 must be 16%,

21%, 29%, 38% and 51%. The low-flow effluent concentration (critical low-flow dilution) is defined as 38% effluent. The permittee shall limit and monitor discharge(s) as specified below:

Effluent Characteristic	Discharge Limitations		Monitoring Requirements	
	30-day Avg Min.	7-day Min.	Frequency <sup>2</sup>	Type
WET Testing (7-day Static Renewal) <sup>1</sup>	Report	Report	Once/Quarter	24-hr Composite
Ceriodaphnia dubia	Report	Report	Once/Quarter	24-hr Composite
Pimephales promelas	38% <sup>3</sup>	38% <sup>3</sup>	Once/Quarter	24-hr Composite

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

<sup>2</sup> This permit does not establish requirements to automatically increase the WET testing frequency after a test failure, or to begin a toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) in the event of multiple failures. However, upon failure of any WET test, the permittee must report the results to EPA and NMED, Surface Water Quality Bureau, in writing, within 5 business days of notification of the test failure. EPA and NMED will review the test results and determine the appropriate action necessary, if any.

<sup>3</sup> Limit is effective beginning on first day after three (3) years from the permit effective date. Limitation is applicable to sub-lethal toxicity tests. Monitoring and reporting requirements begin on the effective date of this permit.

**VI. TMDL REQUIREMENTS**

The receiving water segment 20.6.4.103 NMAC Rio Grande (Caballo Reservoir to Elephant Butte Reservoir) was listed in 303(d) List in 2006 for DO impairment. Marginal coldwater aquatic life is not supporting. Source for the impairment is unknown; according to NMED the dissolved oxygen impairment may indicate excessive nutrients. Since then there has been no TMDL issued for DO in this receiving stream. EPA proposes additional monitoring for DO and nutrients (total phosphorus & total nitrogen) at the discharge with a frequency of once/quarter; the data would help NMED in development of a TMDL. The permit has a standard reopener clause that would allow the permit to be changed if at a later date additional requirements on new or revised TMDLs are completed.

**VII. 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 water, which is protective of the designated uses of that water, NMAC Section 20.6.4.8.A.2.

**VIII. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS**

According to the list updated on April 14, 2016 for Sierra County, NM obtained from <http://ecos.fws.gov>, there are endangered (E)/threatened (T) species that were listed in the previous permit: Chiricahua leopard frog, Mexican spotted owl, Southwestern willow flycatcher, Gila trout, Rio Grande Silvery Minnow and Todsens’s pennyroyal. These species were determined with “no effect”. Since then, there have been 3 addition threatened/endangered species: Mexican wolf (E), Yellow-billed Cuckoo (T) and Narrow-headed gartersnake (T).

There has been no recovery plan for all these additional species, except the wolf. According to Mexican Wolf Conservation Assessment 2010, the species is endangered because of starvation, disease, human-caused mortality, interactions with other wolves or predators, and human cause related such as illegal

shooting and vehicle collision. Up to date there has been no critical habitat rule published and no implementation information of the recovery effort available for the Mexican wolf. EPA believes the discharge to the receiving water would unlikely affect the wolf's habitat or its mortality. The other threatened species were listed on November 3, 2014 for the cuckoo and July 8, 2014 for the snake according to USFWS. However, no recovery plan or recovery plan action status are currently available for these species; at this time EPA is not able to determine whether or not this permit action will have effect on this proposed threatened species. The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if a determination of this permit action will cause effect on this species.

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

1. EPA has received no additional information since the previous permit issuance which would lead to revision of its determinations.
2. The draft permit is consistent with the States WQS and does not increase pollutant loadings.
3. There is currently no information determining that the reissuance of this permit will have "effect" on the additional listed threatened and endangered species.

#### **IX. 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.

#### **X. PERMIT REOPENER**

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if NMWQS are promulgated or revised. In addition, if the State develops 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.

#### **XI. VARIANCE REQUESTS**

None

#### **XII. 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 of COE, to the Regional Director of FWS and to the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to the publication of that notice.

#### **XIII. FINAL DETERMINATION**

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

#### **XIV. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

##### **A. APPLICATION(s)**

EPA Application Form 2A and Form 2S dated December 11, 2013.  
Laboratory reports dated November 20, 2013

##### **B. 40 CFR CITATIONS**

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 June 5, 2013

State of New Mexico 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2014-2016

##### **D. MISCELLANEOUS**

NMED email dated April 28, 2014, from Daniel Valenta to Monica Burrell, EPA

Permittee's emails dated April 22, 2016; May 3, 2016

USFWS: Mexican Wolf Conservation Assessment, 2010