

# **NPDES PERMIT NO. NM0030155**

## **FACT SHEET**

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

### **APPLICANT**

Rock Lake State Fish Hatchery  
P.O. Box 25112  
Santa Fe, NM 87508

### **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 4, 2013

### **PERMIT ACTION**

Renewal of a permit previously issued on January 31, 2008 with an effective date of February 1, 2008, and an expiration date of November 30, 2011.

### **RECEIVING WATER – BASIN**

Pecos River 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
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
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

## I. CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS PERMIT

Changes from the permit previously issued on January 31, 2008 with an effective date of February 1, 2008, and an expiration date of November 30, 2011 are as follow:

- Toxic limits have been established for boron and heptachlor.
- Monitored parameter, ammonia nitrogen has been changed to total nitrogen.
- TRC parameter has been added.

## II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

As described in the application, the facility (Latitude 35° 55' 35" N and Longitude 106° 42' 19" W) is located at HCR 69 River Road Hatchery Loop, Box 580, City of Santa Rosa, Guadalupe County, New Mexico.

Under the SIC code 921, the facility is to hatch and raise cold and warm water species (rainbow trout, walleye, largemouth bass, channel catfish and tiger, muskie) for stocking in lakes and streams with estimated production maximum of 145,500 lbs annually. The source of water is from Rock Lake. The facility primarily consists of 18 raceways, 11 ponds and 10 circular tanks. Supply water is aerated before entering raceways for warm and cold water productions. Wastewater from the warm water production flows to the smaller settling pond (Outfall 004), and wastewater from the cold production goes into the bigger settling pond (Outfall 003). Wastewater from the settling ponds is discharged to Ortega-Borsich ditch, thence to Pecos River. Estimated flows are 4.85 MGD on long term average for Outfall 003 and 0.052 MGD for Outfall 004. A map of the facility is attached.

As described in the previous permit, Outfall COMB is used when the process flow is diverted from one of the two final settling ponds to the other. This authorization shall only be used when one of the settling ponds is cleaned or repaired, requiring the combined discharge of both the warm water and cold water processes. This combined outfall shall be utilized for no longer than two months at one time. The use of this outfall shall be intermittent, and only for cause, not convenience.

## III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS

Applicable pollutants were sampled on January 31, 2011 and March 21, 2011 and analyzed. Test results and applicant's certification dated May 4, 2011 stated all tested pollutants, except those listed in table below, were not detected at or above the MQLs. TRC was detected at less than 100 ug/L at both outfalls.

Pollutants	Outfall 003 (ug/L)	Outfall 004 (ug/L)	MQL (ug/L)
Boron	6,900	7,7400	100
Nickel	1.54	1.56	0.5
Alpha-BHC	Below MQL	0.0654	0.05
Gamma-BHC	0.0764	0.0722	0.05
Heptachlor	0.0779	0.0768	0.01

During the previous permit term, DMRs for Outfall 003 identified two effluent exceedances for pH (6.5 and 9.2). One effluent exceedance for TSS was reported at 876.6 lbs/day.

#### **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 received on May 18, 2011. 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 SS. Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for pH.

##### **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 TSS and SS.

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

Pursuant to 40 CFR 451, ELGs have been promulgated for this concentrated aquatic animal production facility that produces 100,000 lbs or more annually. BPT is appropriate to flow-through and recirculating systems. BAT and BCT requirements are the same as for BPT. No quantitative requirements for specific pollutants or toxic substances are established. BMP for solid control, materials storage, structural maintenance, recordkeeping and training are required (40 CFR 451.11).

Limitations for TSS were established at 10 mg/l monthly average and 15 mg/l daily max. Limitations for SS were set at 0.1 ml/l monthly average and 0.5 ml/l daily max. The limitations are retained in the draft permit for Outfalls 003, 004.

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, maximum 30-day is used to establish the mass load. Mass limits are determined by the following mathematical relationship:

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

$$\text{Monthly average TSS loading} = 10 \text{ mg/l} * 8.345 \text{ (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG)} * 5.185 \text{ MGD} = 433 \text{ lbs/day}$$

$$\text{Daily max. average TSS loading} = 15 \text{ mg/l} * 8.345 \text{ (lbs)(l)/(mg)(MG)} * 5.185 \text{ MGD} = 649 \text{ lbs/day}$$

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

Effluent Characteristic	Discharge Limitation			
	lbs/day, unless noted		mg/l, unless noted	
Parameter	Monthly Avg	Daily Max	Monthly Avg	Daily Max
TSS	433	649	10	15
SS	N/A	N/A	0.1 ml/l	0.5 ml/l
pH	N/A	N/A	6 to 9 s.u.	

Mass loading for Outfall 004 is not established due to very small and intermittent flow compared to Outfall 003; “Report” is adequate. Report of mass loading at Outfall COMB is retained from previous permit.

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 November 20, 2012). The discharge is to Pecos River, segment 20.6.4.211 NMAC. The designated uses of the receiving water are fish culture, irrigation, marginal warmwater aquatic life, livestock watering, wildlife habitat and primary contact.

## 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 primary contact and marginal warm water aquatic life, criteria for pH is between 6.6 and 9.0 s.u. pursuant to 20.6.4.900.D NMAC

### b. Bacteria

Not applicable since there is no discharge of sanitary waste.

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

Pollutants detected above MQLs in section III and data received from NMED on April 24, 2013 are analyzed for RP that exceed the State WQS. Table below shows toxic pollutants with limits according to Appendix A attached for both outfalls. Since the discharges at both outfalls lead to the same receiving water, EPA proposes same limitations at Outfalls 003 and 004. It's because limits at Outfall 003 are more stringent than at Outfall 004. Reporting for mass loading limits is required at Outfall 004 due to the intermittent flow.

Loading in lbs/day = pollutant concentration in ug/l \* 8.345/1,000 (lbs)(l)/(ug)(MG) \* flow in MGD

Pollutants	Outfall 003 (ug/L)		Outfall 004 (ug/L)		Frequency
	Daily max	Monthly Avg.	Daily max	Monthly Avg.	
Boron	1037 45 lbs/day	750 32 lbs/day	2879 19 lbs/day	1919 11 lbs/day	Weekly
Heptachlor	0.00109276 4.725E-05 lb/day	0.00079 3.416E-05 lb/day	0.00303258	0.002022	Weekly

The applicant believes not to contribute the two pollutants in their hatchery operation and will submit a waiver request pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(a)(2). EPA establishes these pollutant limits in the permit unless proven otherwise.

The previous permit had ammonia as a “Report” requirement for Outfalls 004 and COMB. DMR shows ammonia concentrations were less than 0.7 mg/l during the permit term. EPA establishes reporting for total nitrogen instead at these outfalls due to possible impairment of nutrient mentioned under TMDL below; this total nitrogen parameter is consistent with the State nutrient assessment protocol. The permit has a reopener clause that would allow the permit to be changed if at a later date the segment had a TMDL completed for nutrient. TRC is mentioned in section E below.

d. Temperature

For marginal warmwater aquatic life, criteria for temperature is maximum at 90<sup>0</sup>F pursuant to 20.6.4.900.H(6). The temperature report was set for Outfalls 004 and COMB in the previous permit. EPA retains the temperature reporting for this renewed permit.

5. 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). The monitoring frequencies are retained from the previous permit as follow:

Parameter	Outfall 003	Outfall 004	Outfall COMB	Sample Type
Flow	Daily	Daily	Daily	Measured over weir
pH	2/month	Weekly	Weekly	Grab
TSS	2/month	Weekly	Weekly	Grab
SS	2/month	Weekly	Weekly	Grab
Temperature	N/A	Weekly	Weekly	Grab
Total Nitrogen*	N/A	Quarterly	Quarterly	Grab

\*Defined as the sum of Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (as N), Nitrate (as N), and Nitrite (as N).

D. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY

In the previous permit term, DMRs showed a few required WET tests were invalid using Ceriodaphnia dubia (Cd). The applicant also tested the source water (Rock Lake), effluent and receiving stream for TDS. When performed a WET test by using Daphnia magna (Dm) that is less sensitive to TDS than Cd with the same waters, the result was reported “pass”. Dm is not listed as an approved species for the

chronic test pursuant to 40 CFR 136.3; the only appropriate approved species for this test are Cd and *Daphnia pulex*. The applicant believes Rock Lake has elevated TDS due to ongoing dry condition and the problem would go away with good amounts of rain, which reduces TDS concentration. The permittee will likely request to have Cd dropped for WET testing.

The testing requirements are based on the instream concentration of effluent after complete mixing with 100% of the receiving water of the Pecos River at low-flow conditions, measured at United States Geological Survey (USGS) Station No. 008383000. NMED email dated April 25, 2013 provided the low-flow at the site as 3.08 cfs, its stream mixing fraction of 1. The critical dilution is calculated and rounded off to a nearest number as follow:

$$Cd = Qe \div (F \cdot Qa + Qe) = 72\%$$

Where:  $Qe = 5.185$  MGD (Production flow)  
 $Qa = 3.08$  cfs = 1.99 MGD (Critical low flow)  
 $F = 1$  (Stream mixing fraction)

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. Based on the nature of the discharge: fish hatchery and perennial receiving water with the critical dilution of 72%, the NMIP directs the WET testing to be chronic tests (7-day) using *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Pimephales promelas* once per permit term. Until EPA authorizes Dm can be substituted for Cd, the permittee shall comply with the WET testing species in the table below. A WET limit at 72% is established in the proposed permit because required WET result did not pass in the previous permit. Testing shall be required for BOTH Outfalls 003 and 004.

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 30%, 41%, 54%, 72%, and 96%. The low-flow effluent concentration (critical low-flow dilution) is defined as 72% effluent. The permittee shall limit and monitor discharge(s) as specified below:

Effluent Characteristic	Discharge Limitations		Monitoring Requirements	
	30-day Avg Min. (72%)	7-day Min. (72%)	Frequency <sup>2</sup>	Type
WET Testing (7-day Static Renewal) <sup>1</sup>				
<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>	Report	Report	Once/year	Grab
<i>Pimephales promelas</i>	Report	Report	Once/year	Grab

<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> The test shall take place between April 1 and June 30. 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.

No WET testing is retained from the previous permit for Outfall COMB.

**E. DRUGS MEDICATIONS and/or CHEMICALS (DMC)**

The permittee shall comply with reporting requirements pursuant to 40 CFR 451.3 if investigational new animal drug (INAD) or any extralabel drug is used where such the use may lead to the receiving water. Reporting is not required for an INAD or extralabel drug, previously approved by FDA, if its use is at or

below the approved dosage and involves similar conditions of uses. The permittee shall also notify NMED and EPA of the use of non-FDA (U.S. Food and Drug Administration) approved drug. Notification to NMED shall be by phone within one business day and to EPA within three days of the intention. Written notification shall also be both NMED and EPA within five business days. Notifying information must include name of the DMC, the reason for treatment, date(s) and time(s) of the addition (including duration), method of application and the amount added.

When the DMC used is neither approved by FDA or its use is not consistent with FDA practices, including INAD and extralabel drug with above approved dosage, such that may lead to the receiving water, the permittee shall conduct WET tests. The testing is retained from the previous permit, CD at 100% with additional effluent concentrations at 32%, 42%, 56%, 75%, and 100%, as table below. The permittee shall report WET tests on the DMR as Outfall 01B and mention reporting letter to NMED and EPA.

Effluent Characteristic	Discharge Limitations		Monitoring Requirements	
	30-day Avg Min.	48-Hr. Min.	Frequency	Type
WET Testing (48-hr Static Renewal)	Report	Report	Once/Use <sup>1</sup>	Grab <sup>2</sup>
Daphnia pulex	Report	Report	Once/Use	Grab
Pimephales promelas	Report	Report	Once/Use	Grab

<sup>1</sup> Once/Use is for intermittent use of DMC. For long-term use, only one WET shall be required on the maximum dosage. If any dose is later increased by more than 20% of the maximum dosage, then additional WET tests will be required. 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>2</sup> The sample shall be taken approximately 30 minutes after the expected time of arrival of the treated water has passed through the outfall. The expected time of arrival can be estimated by direct observations with light floatable object.

The permittee shall not use chlorine in the hatchery operation nor discharge any chlorine that may eventually migrate to the outfall(s) at the facility. Because TRC was uncertainly detected below the concerned level at the settling pond, it will be monitored twice per month during facility cleanings, including raceway, troughs, and tanks for Outfalls 003, 004 (settling ponds), COMB (if utilized) and 01B (when DMC is used).

**VI. TMDL REQUIREMENTS**

Pecos River (segment 20.6.4.211 NMAC), from Sumner Reservoir to Santa Rosa Reservoir, is listed in the 303(d) with probable causes of impairment of nutrient/eutrophication biological indicators and bacteria; nutrient listing is marginal. Upper stream from Santa Rosa to El Rito Creek is not in the 303(d) list. Designated use of marginal warmwater aquatic life is not supporting. A TMDL for the causes is not completed. Therefore, no additional permit requirements are needed for the sedimentation.

The permit has a reopener clause that would allow the permit to be changed if at a later date the segment had a TMDL 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(s), 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 USFWS list updated on March 28, 2013 for Guadalupe County, NM, the species are Piping Plover (threatened), Southwestern willow flycatcher (endangered), and Pecos sunflower (threatened). The flycatcher and sunflower were mentioned in the previous permit with determination of “no effect”. Piping Plover had been added after EPA issued the previous permit. According to the recovery plan, “Great Lake & Northern Great Plains Piping Plover” dated May 12, 1988, the inland piping plovers habitat on Great Lake & Northern Great Plains from March to August. In other months they spend time along the Gulf Coast from Florida to northern Mexico. “Threats to the survival of the species include loss of beach habitat, vehicular and human traffic on beach nesting areas, and channelization and modification of river flow that have led to the elimination of sandbar nesting habitat.” Natural increases on the water levels may have had minor impact on the population. The plan did not mention direct impact of the discharge on the piping plover in the wintering habitat.

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. 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. EPA determines that above items 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.

### **IX. HISTORICAL and ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS**

The reissuance of the permit should have no impact on historical and/or archeological sites since no new 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 2B received on May 18, 2011.

**B. 40 CFR CITATIONS**

Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, 136, 451

**C. STATE OF NEW MEXICO REFERENCES**

New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Water, 20.6.4 NMAC, as amended through November 20, 2012.

Procedures for Implementing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits in New Mexico, March 15, 2012.

State of New Mexico 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2012-2014.