

HEINONLINE

Citation: 64 Fed. Reg. 68722 1999



Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Tue Nov 19 16:45:36 2013

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 9, 122, 123, and 124

[FRL-6470-8]

RIN 2040-AC82

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Regulations for Revision of the Water Pollution Control Program Addressing Storm Water Discharges

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Today's regulations (Phase II) expand the existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water program (Phase I) to address storm water discharges from small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) (those serving less than 100,000 persons) and construction sites that disturb one to five acres. Although these sources are automatically designated by today's rule, the rule allows for the exclusion of certain sources from the national program based on a demonstration of the lack of impact on water quality, as well as the inclusion of others based on a higher likelihood of localized adverse impact on water quality. Today's regulations also exclude from the NPDES program storm water discharges from industrial facilities that have "no exposure" of industrial activities or materials to storm water. Finally, today's rule extends from August 7, 2001 until March 10, 2003 the deadline by which certain industrial facilities owned by small MS4s must obtain coverage under an NPDES permit. This rule establishes a cost-effective, flexible approach for reducing environmental harm by storm water discharges from many point sources of storm water that are currently unregulated.

EPA believes that the implementation of the six minimum measures identified for small MS4s should significantly reduce pollutants in urban storm water compared to existing levels in a cost-effective manner. Similarly, EPA believes that implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP) controls at small construction sites will also result in a significant reduction in pollutant discharges and an improvement in surface water quality. EPA believes this rule will result in monetized financial, recreational and health benefits, as well as benefits that EPA has been unable to monetize. Expected benefits include reduced scouring and erosion of streambeds, improved aesthetic quality

of waters, reduced eutrophication of aquatic systems, benefit to wildlife and endangered and threatened species, tourism benefits, biodiversity benefits and reduced costs for siting reservoirs. In addition, the costs of industrial storm water controls will decrease due to the exclusion of storm water discharges from facilities where there is "no exposure" of storm water to industrial activities and materials.

DATES: This regulation is effective on February 7, 2000. The incorporation by reference of the rainfall erosivity factor publication listed in the rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of February 7, 2000. For judicial review purposes, this final rule is promulgated as of 1:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, on December 22, 1999 as provided in 40 CFR 23.2.

ADDRESSES: The complete administrative record for the final rule and the ICR have been established under docket numbers W-97-12 (rule) and W-97-15 (ICR), and includes supporting documentation as well as printed, paper versions of electronic comments. Copies of information in the record are available upon request. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying. The record is available for inspection and copying from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays, at the Water Docket, EPA, East Tower Basement, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC. For access to docket materials, please call 202/260-3027 to schedule an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Utting, Office of Wastewater Management, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 4203, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460; (202) 260-5816; sw2@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Entities potentially regulated by this action include:

Category	Examples of regulated entities
Federal, State, Tribal, and Local Governments.	Operators of small separate storm sewer systems, industrial facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity or construction activity disturbing 1 to 5 acres.
Industry	Operators of industrial facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity.
Construction Activity.	Operators of construction activity disturbing 1 to 5 acres.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide

for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your facility or company is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in §§ 122.26(b), 122.31, 122.32, and 123.35 of the final rule. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Table of Contents:

- I. Background
 - A. Proposed Rule and Pre-proposal Outreach
 - B. Water Quality Concerns/Environmental Impact Studies and Assessments
 - 1. Urban Development
 - a. Large-Scale Studies and Assessments
 - b. Local and Watershed-Based Studies
 - c. Beach Closings/Advisories
 - 2. Non-storm Water Discharges Through Municipal Storm Sewers
 - 3. Construction Site Runoff
 - C. Statutory Background
 - D. EPA's Reports to Congress
 - E. Industrial Facilities Owned or Operated by Small Municipalities
 - F. Related Nonpoint Source Programs
 - II. Description of Program
 - A. Overview
 - 1. Objectives EPA Seeks to Achieve in Today's Rule
 - 2. General Requirements for Regulated Entities Under Today's Rule
 - 3. Integration of Today's Rule With the Existing Storm Water Program
 - 4. General Permits
 - 5. Tool Box
 - 6. Deadlines Established in Today's Action
 - B. Readable Regulations
 - C. Program Framework: NPDES Approach
 - D. Federal Role
 - 1. Develop Overall Framework of the Program
 - 2. Encourage Consideration of "Smart Growth" Approaches
 - 3. Provide Financial Assistance
 - 4. Implement the Program in Jurisdictions not Authorized to Administer the NPDES Program
 - 5. Oversee State and Tribal Programs
 - 6. Comply with Applicable Requirements as a Discharger
 - E. State Role
 - 1. Develop the Program
 - 2. Comply With Applicable Requirements as a Discharger
 - 3. Communicate with EPA
 - F. Tribal Role
 - G. NPDES Permitting Authority's Role for the NPDES Storm Water Small MS4 Program
 - 1. Comply With Implementation Requirements
 - 2. Designate Sources
 - a. Develop Designation Criteria
 - b. Apply Designation Criteria

- c. Designate Physically Interconnected Small MS4s
- d. Respond to Public Petitions for Designation
- 3. Provide Waivers
- 4. Issue Permits
- 5. Support and Oversee the Local Programs
- H. Municipal Role
 - 1. Scope of Today's Rule
 - 2. Municipal Definitions
- a. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)
- b. Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems
 - i. Combined Sewer Systems (CSS)
 - ii. Owners/Operators
 - c. Regulated Small MS4s
 - i. Urbanized Area Description
 - ii. Rationale for Using Urbanized Areas
 - d. Municipal Designation by the Permitting Authority
 - e. Waiving the Requirements for Small MS4s
 - 3. Municipal Permit Requirements
 - a. Overview
 - i. Summary of Permitting Options
 - ii. Water Quality-Based Requirements
 - iii. Maximum Extent Practicable
 - b. Program Requirements—Minimum Control Measures
 - i. Public Education and Outreach on Storm Water Impacts
 - ii. Public Involvement/Participation
 - iii. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
 - iv. Construction Site Storm Water Runoff Control
 - v. Post-Construction Storm Water Management in New Development and Redevelopment
 - vi. Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations
 - c. Application Requirements
 - i. Best Management Practices and Measurable Goals
 - ii. Individual Permit Application for a § 122.34(b) Program
 - iii. Alternative Permit Option/ Tenth Amendment
 - iv. Satisfaction of Minimum Measure Obligations by Another Entity
 - v. Joint Permit Programs
 - d. Evaluation and Assessment
 - i. Recordkeeping
 - ii. Reporting
 - iii. Permit-As-A-Shield
 - e. Other Applicable NPDES Requirements
 - f. Enforceability
 - g. Deadlines
 - h. Reevaluation of Rule
 - I. Other Designated Storm Water Discharges
 - 1. Discharges Associated with Small Construction Activity
 - a. Scope
 - b. Waivers
 - i. Rainfall-Erosivity Waiver
 - ii. Water Quality Waiver
 - c. Permit Process and Administration
 - d. Cross-Referencing State, Tribal, or Local Erosion and Sediment Control Programs
 - e. Alternative Approaches
 - 2. Other Sources
 - 3. ISTEA Sources
 - 4. Residual Designation Authority

- J. Conditional Exclusion for "No Exposure" of Industrial Activities and Materials to Storm Water
 - 1. Background
 - 2. Today's Rule
 - 3. Definition of "No Exposure"
- K. Public Involvement/Public Role
- L. Water Quality Issues
 - 1. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits
 - 2. Total Maximum Daily Loads and Analysis to Determine the Need for Water Quality-Based Limitations
 - 3. Anti-Backsliding
 - 4. Water Quality-Based Waivers and Designations
- III. Cost-Benefit Analysis
 - A. Costs
 - 1. Municipal Costs
 - 2. Construction Costs
 - B. Quantitative Benefits
 - 1. National Water Quality Model
 - 2. National Water Quality Assessment
 - a. Municipal Measures
 - i. Fresh Waters Benefits
 - ii. Marine Waters Benefits
 - b. Construction Benefits
 - c. Summary of Benefits From the National Water Quality Assessment
 - C. Qualitative Benefits
 - D. National Economic Impact
- IV. Regulatory Requirements
 - A. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - B. Executive Order 12866
 - C. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
 - 1. Summary of UMRA Section 202 Written Statement
 - 2. Selection of the Least Costly, Most Cost-Effective or Least Burdensome Alternative That Achieves the Objectives of the Statute
 - 3. Effects on Small Governments
 - D. Executive Order 13132
 - E. Regulatory Flexibility Act
 - F. National Technology Transfer And Advancement Act
 - G. Executive Order 13045
 - H. Executive Order 13084
 - I. Congressional Review Act

I. Background

A. Proposed Rule and Pre-Proposal Outreach

On January 9, 1998 (63 FR 1536), EPA proposed to expand the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water program to include storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and construction sites that were smaller than those previously included in the program. The proposal also addressed industrial sources that have "no exposure" of industrial activities and materials to storm water. Today, EPA is promulgating a final rule to implement most of the proposed revisions with minor changes based on public comments received on the proposal. Today's final rule also extends the deadline by which certain industrial facilities operated by municipalities of less than 100,000 population must be covered by a NPDES permit; the

deadline is changed from August 7, 2001 until March 10, 2003.

In 1972, Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act (CWA)) to prohibit the discharge of any pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. The NPDES program is a program designed to track point sources and require the implementation of the controls necessary to minimize the discharge of pollutants. Initial efforts to improve water quality under the NPDES program primarily focused on reducing pollutants in industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. These discharge sources were easily identified as responsible for poor, often drastically degraded, water quality conditions.

As pollution control measures for industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage were implemented and refined, it became increasingly evident that more diffuse sources of water pollution were also significant causes of water quality impairment. Specifically, storm water runoff draining large surface areas, such as agricultural and urban land, was found to be a major cause of water quality impairment, including the nonattainment of designated beneficial uses.

In 1987, Congress amended the CWA to require implementation, in two phases, of a comprehensive national program for addressing storm water discharges. The first phase of the program, commonly referred to as "Phase I," was promulgated on November 16, 1990 (55 FR 47990). Phase I requires NPDES permits for storm water discharge from a large number of priority sources including municipal separate storm sewer systems ("MS4s") generally serving populations of 100,000 or more and several categories of industrial activity, including construction sites that disturb five or more acres of land.

Today's rule, which is the second phase of the storm water program, expands the existing program to include discharges of storm water from smaller municipalities in urbanized areas and from construction sites that disturb between one and five acres of land. Today's rule allows certain sources to be excluded from the national program based on a demonstrable lack of impact on water quality. The rule also allows other sources not automatically regulated on a national basis to be designated for inclusion based on increased likelihood for localized adverse impact on water quality.

Today's rule also conditionally excludes storm water discharges from industrial facilities that have "no exposure" of industrial activities or materials to storm water. Today's rule and the effort that led to its development are commonly referred to as "Phase II." On August 7, 1995, EPA promulgated a final rule that required facilities to be regulated under Phase II to apply for a NPDES permit by August 7, 2001, unless the NPDES permitting authority designates them as requiring a permit by an earlier date. (60 FR 40230). That rule is referred to as "the Interim Phase II Rule." Today's rule replaces the Interim Phase II rule.

EPA performed extensive outreach and worked with a variety of stakeholders prior to proposing today's rule. On September 9, 1992, EPA published a notice requesting information and public comment on how to prepare regulations under CWA section 402(p)(6) (see 57 FR 41344). The notice identified three sets of issues associated with developing new NPDES storm water regulations: (1) How should EPA identify unregulated sources of storm water to protect water quality, (2) what types of control strategies should EPA develop for these sources, and (3) what are appropriate deadlines for implementing new requirements. The notice recognized that potential sources for coverage under the section 402(p)(6) regulations would fall into two main categories: municipal separate storm sewer systems and individual (commercial and residential) sources. EPA received more than 130 comments on the September 9, 1992, notice. For further discussion of the comments received, see *Storm Water Discharges Potentially Addressed by Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Report to Congress* (EPA, 1995a), pp. 1-21 to 1-22, and Appendix J (which provides a detailed summary of the comments received as they relate to the specific issues raised in the notice).

In early 1993, the Rensselaerville Institute and EPA held public and expert meetings to assist in developing and analyzing options for identifying unregulated sources and possible controls. The report on the 1993 meetings identified two options that were favored by the various groups that participated. One option was a program that allowed States to select sources to be controlled in a manner consistent with criteria developed by EPA. A second option was a tiered approach under which EPA would select high priority sources for control by NPDES permits and States would select other sources for control under a State water

quality program other than the NPDES program. For additional details see the "Report on the EPA Storm Water Management Program (Rensselaerville Study)," Appendix I of *Storm Water Discharges Potentially Addressed by Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Report to Congress* (EPA, 1995a).

EPA also conducted outreach with representatives of small entities in conjunction with the convening of a Small Business Advocacy Review Panel under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). This process is discussed in section IV.E of today's preamble. For additional background see the discussion in the preamble to the proposal for today's rule.

To assist EPA by providing advice and recommendations regarding the urban municipal wet weather water pollution control program, EPA established the Urban Wet Weather Flows Federal Advisory Committee (hereinafter, "FACA Committee") under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). The Office of Management and Budget approved the charter for the FACA Committee on March 10, 1995. The FACA Committee provided a forum for identifying and addressing issues associated with water quality impacts from storm water sources.

The FACA Committee established two subcommittees: the Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee and the Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) FACA Subcommittee. Consistent with the requirements of FACA, the membership of both the FACA Committee and the subcommittees was balanced among EPA's various outside stakeholder interests, including representatives from municipalities, States, Indian Tribes, EPA, industrial and commercial sectors, agriculture, and environmental and public interest groups.

The Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee ("Subcommittee") met fourteen times between September 1995 and June 1998. The 32 Subcommittee members discussed possible regulatory frameworks at these meetings as well as during numerous other meetings and conference calls. Members of the FACA Committee provided views regarding the development of the "no exposure" provision and other provisions in drafts of the Phase II rule. EPA provided Subcommittee members with four successive drafts of the proposed rule and preamble, outlines of the rule, summaries of the written comments received on each draft, and documents identifying the changes made to each draft. In the course of providing input to the Committee, individual

Subcommittee members provided significant input and advice that EPA considered in the context of public comments received. Ultimately, the Subcommittee did not provide a written report back to the FACA Committee, and the FACA Committee did not provide written advice and recommendations to EPA. The Agency, therefore, did not rely on group recommendations in developing today's rule, but does consider the process to have resulted in important public outreach.

B. Water Quality Concerns/ Environmental Impact Studies and Assessments

Storm water runoff from lands modified by human activities can harm surface water resources and, in turn, cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards by changing natural hydrologic patterns, accelerating stream flows, destroying aquatic habitat, and elevating pollutant concentrations and loadings. Such runoff may contain or mobilize high levels of contaminants, such as sediment, suspended solids, nutrients (phosphorous and nitrogen), heavy metals and other toxic pollutants, pathogens, toxins, oxygen-demanding substances (organic material), and floatables (U.S. EPA. 1992.

Environmental Impacts of Storm Water Discharges: A National Profile. EPA 841-R-92-001. Office of Water. Washington, DC). After a rain, storm water runoff carries these pollutants into nearby streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, wetlands, and oceans. The highest concentrations of these contaminants often are contained in "first flush" discharges, which occur during the first major storm after an extended dry period (Schueler, T.R. 1994. "First Flush of Stormwater Pollutants Investigated in Texas." Note 28. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(2)). Individually and combined, these pollutants impair water quality, threatening designated beneficial uses and causing habitat alteration or destruction.

Uncontrolled storm water discharges from areas of urban development and construction activity negatively impact receiving waters by changing the physical, biological, and chemical composition of the water, resulting in an unhealthy environment for aquatic organisms, wildlife, and humans. The following sections discuss the studies and data that address and support this finding.

Although water quality problems also can occur from agricultural storm water discharges and return flows from irrigated agriculture, this area of

concern is statutorily exempted from regulation as a point source under the Clean Water Act and is not discussed here. (See CWA section 502(14)). Other storm water sources not specifically identified in the regulations may be of concern in certain areas and can be addressed on a case-by-case (or category-by-category) basis through the NPDES designation authority preserved by CWA section 402(p)(2)(6), as well as today's rule.

1. Urban Development

Urbanization alters the natural infiltration capability of the land and generates a host of pollutants that are associated with the activities of dense populations, thus causing an increase in storm water runoff volumes and pollutant loadings in storm water discharged to receiving waterbodies (U.S. EPA, 1992). Urban development increases the amount of impervious surface in a watershed as farmland, forests, and meadowlands with natural infiltration characteristics are converted into buildings with rooftops, driveways, sidewalks, roads, and parking lots with virtually no ability to absorb storm water. Storm water and snow-melt runoff wash over these impervious areas, picking up pollutants along the way while gaining speed and volume because of their inability to disperse and filter into the ground. What results are storm water flows that are higher in volume, pollutants, and temperature than the flows in less impervious areas, which have more natural vegetation and soil to filter the runoff (U.S. EPA, 1997. *Urbanization and Streams: Studies of Hydrologic Impacts*. EPA 841-R-97-009. Office of Water, Washington, DC).

Studies reveal that the level of imperviousness in an area strongly correlates with the quality of the nearby receiving waters. For example, a study in the Puget Sound lowland ecoregion found that when the level of basin development exceeded 5 percent of the total impervious area, the biological integrity and physical habitat conditions that are necessary to support natural biological diversity and complexity declined precipitously (May, C.W., E.B. Welch, R.R. Horner, J.R. Karr, and B.W. May, 1997. *Quality Indices for Urbanization Effects in Puget Sound Lowland Streams*, Technical Report No. 154. University of Washington Water Resources Series). Research conducted in numerous geographical areas, concentrating on various variables and employing widely different methods, has revealed a similar conclusion: stream degradation occurs at relatively low levels of imperviousness, such as 10 to 20 percent (even as low as 5 to 10

percent according to the findings of the Washington study referenced above) (Schueler, T.R. 1994. "The Importance of Imperviousness." *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(3); May, C., R.R. Horner, J.R. Karr, B.W. Mar, and E.B. Welch. 1997. "Effects Of Urbanization On Small Streams In The Puget Sound Lowland Ecoregion." *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2(4); Yoder, C.O., R.J. Miltner, and D. White. 1999. "Assessing the Status of Aquatic Life Designated Uses in Urban and Suburban Watersheds." In *Proceedings: National Conference on Retrofits Opportunities in Urban Environments*. EPA 625-R-99-002, Washington, DC; Yoder, C.O. and R.J. Miltner. 1999. "Assessing Biological Quality and Limitations to Biological Potential in Urban and Suburban Watersheds in Ohio." In *Comprehensive Stormwater & Aquatic Ecosystem Management Conference Papers*, Auckland, New Zealand). Furthermore, research has indicated that few, if any, urban streams can support diverse benthic communities at imperviousness levels of 25 percent or more. An area of medium density single family homes can be anywhere from 25 percent to nearly 60 percent impervious, depending on the design of the streets and parking (Schueler, 1994).

In addition to impervious areas, urban development creates new pollution sources as population density increases and brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, pet waste, litter, pesticides, and household hazardous wastes, which may be washed into receiving waters by storm water or dumped directly into storm drains designed to discharge to receiving waters. More people in less space results in a greater concentration of pollutants that can be mobilized by, or disposed into, storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems. A modeling system developed for the Chesapeake Bay indicated that contamination of the Bay and its tributaries from runoff is comparable to, if not greater than, contamination from industrial and sewage sources (Cohn-Lee, R. and D. Cameron. 1992. "Urban Stormwater Runoff Contamination of the Chesapeake Bay: Sources and Mitigation." *The Environmental Professional*, Vol. 14).

a. Large-Scale Studies and Assessments

In support of today's regulatory designation of MS4s in urbanized areas, the Agency relied on broad-based assessments of urban storm water runoff and related water quality impacts, as well as more site-specific studies. The

first national assessment of urban runoff characteristics was completed for the *Nationwide Urban Runoff Program (NURP)* study (U.S. EPA. 1983. *Results of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program, Volume 1—Final Report*. Office of Water, Washington, D.C.). The NURP study is the largest nationwide evaluation of storm water discharges, which includes adverse impacts and sources, undertaken to date.

EPA conducted the NURP study to facilitate understanding of the nature of urban runoff from residential, commercial, and industrial areas. One objective of the study was to characterize the water quality of discharges from separate storm sewer systems that drain residential, commercial, and light industrial (industrial parks) sites. Storm water samples from 81 residential and commercial properties in 22 urban/suburban areas nationwide were collected and analyzed during the 5-year period between 1978 and 1983. The majority of samples collected in the study were analyzed for eight conventional pollutants and three heavy metals.

Data collected under the NURP study indicated that discharges from separate storm sewer systems draining runoff from residential, commercial, and light industrial areas carried more than 10 times the annual loadings of total suspended solids (TSS) than discharges from municipal sewage treatment plants that provide secondary treatment. The NURP study also indicated that runoff from residential and commercial areas carried somewhat higher annual loadings of chemical oxygen demand (COD), total lead, and total copper than effluent from secondary treatment plants. Study findings showed that fecal coliform counts in urban runoff typically range from tens to hundreds of thousands per hundred milliliters of runoff during warm weather conditions, with the median for all sites being around 21,000/100 ml. This is generally consistent with studies that found that fecal coliform mean values range from 1,600 coliform fecal units (CFU)/100 ml to 250,000 cfu/100 ml (Makepeace, D.K., D.W. Smith, and S.J. Stanley. 1995. "Urban Storm Water Quality: Summary of Contaminant Data." *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* 25(2):93-139). Makepeace, et al., summarized ranges of contaminants from storm water, including physical contaminants such as total solids (76—36,200 mg/L) and copper (up to 1.41 mg/L); organic chemicals; organic compounds, such as oil and grease (up to 110 mg/L); and microorganisms.

Monitoring data summarized in the NURP study provided important information about urban runoff from residential, commercial, and light industrial areas. The study concluded that the quality of urban runoff can be affected adversely by several sources of pollution that were not directly evaluated in the study, including illicit discharges, construction site runoff, and illegal dumping. Data from the NURP study were analyzed further in the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Urban Storm Water Data Base for 22 Metropolitan Areas Throughout the United States study (Driver, N.E., M.H. Mustard, R.B. Rhinesmith, and R.F. Middleburg. 1985. *U.S. Geological Survey Urban Storm Water Data Base for 22 Metropolitan Areas Throughout the United States*. Report No. 85-337 USGS. Lakewood, CO). The USGS report summarized additional monitoring data compiled during the mid-1980s, covering 717 storm events at 99 sites in 22 metropolitan areas and documented problems associated with metals and sediment concentrations in urban storm water runoff. More recent reports have confirmed the pollutant concentration data collected in the NURP study (Marsalek, J. 1990. "Evaluation of Pollutant Loads from Urban Nonpoint Sources." *Wat. Sci. Tech.* 22(10/11):23-30; Makepeace, et al., 1995).

Commenters argued that the NURP study does not support EPA's contention that urban activities significantly jeopardize attainment of water quality standards. One commenter argued that the NURP study and the 1985 USGS study are seriously out of date. Because they were issued 10 years or more before the implementation of the current storm water permit program, the data in those reports do not reflect conditions that exist after implementation of permits issued by authorized States and EPA for storm water from construction sites, large municipalities, and industrial activities.

In response, EPA notes that it is not relying solely on the NURP study to describe current water quality impairment. Rather, EPA is citing NURP as a source of data on typical pollutant concentrations in urban runoff. Recent studies have not found significantly different pollutant concentrations in urban runoff when compared to the original NURP data (see Makepeace, et al., 1995; Marsalek, 1990; and Pitt, et al., 1995).

America's Clean Water—the States' Nonpoint Source Assessment (Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators (ASIWPCA). 1985. *America's Clean Water—The States' Nonpoint Source*

Assessment. Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. EPA, Office of Water, Washington, DC), a comprehensive study of diffuse pollution sources conducted under the sponsorship of the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators (ASIWPCA) and EPA revealed that 38 States reported urban runoff as a major cause of designated beneficial use impairment and 21 States reported storm water runoff from construction sites as a major cause of beneficial use impairment. In addition, the 1996 305(b) Report (U.S. EPA. 1998. *The National Water Quality Inventory, 1996 Report to Congress*. EPA 841-R-97-008. Office of Water, Washington, DC), provides a national assessment of water quality based on biennial reports submitted by the States as required under CWA section 305(b) of the CWA. In the CWA 305(b) reports, States, Tribes, and Territories assess their individual water quality control programs by examining the attainment or nonattainment of the designated uses assigned to their rivers, lakes, estuaries, wetlands, and ocean shores. A designated use is the legally applicable use specified in a water quality standard for a watershed, waterbody, or segment of a waterbody. The designated use is the desirable use that the water quality should support. Examples of designated uses include drinking water supply, primary contact recreation (swimming), and aquatic life support. Each CWA 305(b) report indicates the assessed fraction of a State's waters that are fully supporting, partially supporting, or not supporting designated beneficial uses.

In their reports, States, Tribes, and Territories first identified and then assigned the sources of water quality impairment for each impaired waterbody using the following categories: industrial, municipal sewage, combined sewer overflows, urban runoff/storm sewers, agricultural, silvicultural, construction, resource extraction, land disposal, hydrologic modification, and habitat modification. The 1996 Inventory, based on a compilation of 60 individual 305(b) reports submitted by States, Tribes, and Territories, assessed the following percentages of total waters nationwide: 19 percent of river and stream miles; 40 percent of lake, pond, and reservoir acres; 72 percent of estuary square miles; and 6 percent of ocean shoreline waters. The 1996 Inventory indicated that approximately 40 percent of the Nation's assessed rivers, lakes, and estuaries are impaired. Waterbodies deemed as "impaired" are either

partially supporting designated uses or not supporting designated uses.

The 1996 Inventory also found urban runoff/discharges from storm sewers to be a major source of water quality impairment nationwide. Urban runoff/storm sewers were found to be a source of pollution in 13 percent of impaired rivers; 21 percent of impaired lakes, ponds, and reservoirs; and 45 percent of impaired estuaries (second only to industrial discharges). In addition, urban runoff was found to be the leading cause of ocean impairment for those ocean miles surveyed.

In addition, a recent USGS study of urban watersheds across the United States has revealed a link between urban development and contamination of local waterbodies. The study found the highest levels of organic contaminants, known as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) (products of combustion of wood, grass, and fossil fuels), in the reservoirs of urbanized watersheds (U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1998. *Research Reveals Link Between Development and Contamination in Urban Watersheds*. USGS news release. USGS National Water-Quality Assessment Program).

Urban storm water also can contribute significant amounts of toxicants to receiving waters. Pitt, et al. (1993), found heavy metal concentrations in the majority of samples analyzed. Industrial or commercial areas were likely to be the most significant pollutant source areas (Pitt, R., R. Field, M. Lalor, M. Brown 1993. "Urban stormwater toxic pollutants: assessment, sources, and treatability." *Water Environment Research*, 67(3):260-75).

b. Local and Watershed-Based Studies

In addition to the large-scale nationwide studies and assessments, a number of local and watershed-based studies from across the country have documented the detrimental effects of urban storm water runoff on water quality. A study of urban streams in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, found local streams to be highly degraded due primarily to urban runoff, while three studies in the Atlanta, Georgia, region were characterized as being "the first documentation in the Southeast of the strong negative relationship between urbanization and stream quality that has been observed in other ecoregions" (Masterson, J. and R. Bannerman. 1994. "Impacts of Storm Water Runoff on Urban Streams in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin." Paper presented at National Symposium on Water Quality: American Water Resources Association; Schueler, T.R. 1997. "Fish Dynamics in Urban Streams Near Atlanta, Georgia."

Technical Note 94. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2(4)). Several other studies, including those performed in Arizona (Maricopa County), California (San Jose's Coyote Creek), Massachusetts (Green River), Virginia (Tuckahoe Creek), and Washington (Puget Sound lowland ecoregion), all had the same finding: runoff from urban areas greatly impair stream ecology and the health of aquatic life; the more heavily developed the area, the more detrimental the effects (Lopes, T. and K. Fossum. 1995. "Selected Chemical Characteristics and Acute Toxicity of Urban Stormwater, Streamflow, and Bed Material, Maricopa County, Arizona." *Water Resources Investigations Report* 95-4074. USGS; Pitt, R. 1995. "Effects of Urban Runoff on Aquatic Biota." In *Handbook of Ecotoxicology*; Pratt, J. and R. Coler. 1979. "Ecological Effects of Urban Stormwater Runoff on Benthic Macroinvertebrates Inhabiting the Green River, Massachusetts." Completion Report Project No. A-094. Water Resources Research Center. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.; Schueler, T.R. 1997. "Historical Change in a Warmwater Fish Community in an Urbanizing Watershed." Technical Note 93. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2(4); May, C., R. Horner, J. Karr, B. Mar, and E. Welch. 1997. "Effects Of Urbanization On Small Streams In The Puget Sound Lowland Ecoregion." *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2(4)).

Pitt and others also described the receiving water effects on aquatic organisms associated with urban runoff (Pitt, R.E. 1995. "Biological Effects of Urban Runoff Discharges" In *Stormwater Runoff and Receiving Systems: Impact, Monitoring, and Assessment*, ed. E.E. Herricks, Lewis Publishers; Crunkilton, R., J. Kleist, D. Bierman, J. Ramcheck, and W. DeVita. 1999. "Importance of Toxicity as a Factor Controlling the Distribution of Aquatic Organisms in an Urban Stream." In *Comprehensive Stormwater & Aquatic Ecosystem Management Conference Papers*. Auckland, New Zealand).

In Wisconsin, runoff samples were collected from streets, parking lots, roofs, driveways, and lawns. Source areas were broken up into residential, commercial, and industrial. Geometric mean concentration data for residential areas included total solids of about 500-800 mg/L from streets and 600 mg/L from lawns. Fecal coliform data from residential areas ranged from 34,000 to 92,000 cfu/100 mL for streets and driveways. Contaminant concentration data from commercial and industrial source areas were lower for total solids

and fecal coliform, but higher for total zinc (Bannerman, R.T., D.W. Owens, R.B. Dods, and N.J. Hornewer. 1993. "Sources of Pollutants in Wisconsin Stormwater." *Wat. Sci. Tech.* 28(3-5):241-59).

Bannerman, et al. also found that streets contribute higher loads of pollutants to urban storm water than any other residential development source. Two small urban residential watersheds were evaluated to determine that lawns and streets are the largest sources of total and dissolved phosphorus in the basins (Waschbusch, R.J., W.R. Selbig, and R.T. Bannerman. 1999. "Sources of Phosphorus in Stormwater and Street Dirt from Two Urban Residential Basins In Madison, Wisconsin, 1994-95." *Water Resources Investigations Report* 99-4021. U.S. Geological Survey). A number of other studies have indicated that urban roadways often contain significant quantities of metal elements and solids (Sansalone, J.J. and S.G. Buchberger. 1997. "Partitioning and First Flush of Metals in Urban Roadway Storm Water." *ASCE Journal of Environmental Engineering* 123(2); Sansalone, J.J., J.M. Koran, J.A. Smithson, and S.G. Buchberger. 1998. "Physical Characteristics of Urban Roadway Solids Transported During Rain Events" *ASCE Journal of Environmental Engineering* 124(5); Klein, L.A., M. Lang, N. Nash, and S.L. Kirschner. 1974. "Sources of Metals in New York City Wastewater" *J. Water Pollution Control Federation* 46(12):2653-62; Barrett, M.E., R.D. Zuber, E.R. Collins, J.F. Malina, R.J. Charbeneau, and G.H. Ward., 1993. "A Review and Evaluation of Literature Pertaining to the Quantity and Control of Pollution from Highway Runoff and Construction." Research Report 1943-1. Center for Transportation Research, University of Texas, Austin).

c. Beach Closings/Advisories

Urban wet weather flows have been recognized as the primary sources of estuarine pollution in coastal communities. Urban storm water runoff, sanitary sewer overflows, and combined sewer overflows have become the largest causes of beach closings in the United States in the past three years. Storm water discharges from urban areas not only pose a threat to the ecological environment, they also can substantially affect human health. A survey of coastal and Great Lakes communities reports that in 1998, more than 1,500 beach closings and advisories were associated with storm water runoff (Natural Resources Defense Council. 1999. "A Guide to Water Quality at Vacation Beaches" New York, NY). Other reports

also document public health, shellfish bed, and habitat impacts from storm water runoff, including more than 823 beach closings/advisories issued in 1995 and more than 407 beach closing/advisories issued in 1996 due to urban runoff (Natural Resources Defense Council. 1996. *Testing the Waters Volume VI: Who Knows What You're Getting Into*. New York, NY; NRDC. 1997. *Testing the Waters Volume VII: How Does Your Vacation Beach Rate*. New York, NY; Morton, T. 1997. *Draining to the Ocean: The Effects of Stormwater Pollution on Coastal Waters*. American Oceans Campaign, Santa Monica, CA). The Epidemiological Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay (Haile, R.W., et al. 1996. "An Epidemiological Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay." *Final Report prepared for the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project*) concluded that there is a 57 percent higher rate of illness in swimmers who swim adjacent to storm drains than in swimmers who swim more than 400 yards away from storm drains. This and other studies document a relationship between gastrointestinal illness in swimmers and water quality, the latter of which can be heavily compromised by polluted storm water discharges.

2. Non-Storm Water Discharges Through Municipal Storm Sewers

Studies have shown that discharges from MS4s often include wastes and wastewater from non-storm water sources. Federal regulations (§ 122.26(b)(2)) define an illicit discharge as " * * any discharge to an MS4 that is not composed entirely of storm water * * *," with some exceptions. These discharges are "illicit" because municipal storm sewer systems are not designed to accept, process, or discharge such wastes. Sources of illicit discharges include, but are not limited to: sanitary wastewater; effluent from septic tanks; car wash, laundry, and other industrial wastewaters; improper disposal of auto and household toxics, such as used motor oil and pesticides; and spills from roadway and other accidents.

Illicit discharges enter the system through either direct connections (e.g., wastewater piping either mistakenly or deliberately connected to the storm drains) or indirect connections (e.g., infiltration into the MS4 from cracked sanitary systems, spills collected by drain outlets, and paint or used oil dumped directly into a drain). The result is untreated discharges that contribute high levels of pollutants,

including heavy metals, toxics, oil and grease, solvents, nutrients, viruses and bacteria into receiving waterbodies. The NURP study, discussed earlier, found that pollutant levels from illicit discharges were high enough to significantly degrade receiving water quality and threaten aquatic, wildlife, and human health. The study noted particular problems with illicit discharges of sanitary wastes, which can be directly linked to high bacterial counts in receiving waters and can be dangerous to public health.

Because illicit discharges to MS4s can create severe widespread contamination and water quality problems, several municipalities and urban counties performed studies to identify and eliminate such discharges. In Michigan, the Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti water quality projects inspected 660 businesses, homes, and other buildings and identified 14 percent of the buildings as having improper storm sewer drain connections. The program assessment revealed that, on average, 60 percent of automobile-related businesses, including service stations, automobile dealerships, car washes, body shops, and light industrial facilities, had illicit connections to storm sewer drains. The program assessment also showed that a majority of the illicit discharges to the storm sewer system resulted from improper plumbing and connections, which had been approved by the municipality when installed (Washtenaw County Statutory Drainage Board, 1987. Huron River Pollution Abatement Program).

In addition, an inspection of urban storm water outfalls draining into Inner Grays, Washington, indicated that 32 percent of these outfalls had dry weather flows. Of these flows, 21 percent were determined to have pollutant levels higher than the pollutant levels expected in typical urban storm water runoff characterized in the NURP study (U.S. EPA, 1993. *Investigation of Inappropriate Pollutant Entries Into Storm Drainage Systems—A User's Guide*. EPA 600/R-92/238. Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC). That same document reports a study in Toronto, Canada, that found that 59 percent of outfalls from the MS4 had dry-weather flows. Chemical tests revealed that 14 percent of these dry-weather flows were determined to be grossly polluted.

Inflows from aging sanitary sewer collection systems are one of the most serious illicit discharge-related problems. Sanitary sewer systems frequently develop leaks and cracks, resulting in discharges of pollutants to receiving waters through separate storm

sewers. These pollutants include sanitary waste and materials from sewer main construction (e.g., asbestos cement, brick, cast iron, vitrified clay). Municipalities have long recognized the reverse problem of storm water infiltration into sanitary sewer collection systems; this type of infiltration often disrupts the operation of the municipal sewage treatment plant.

The improper disposal of materials is another illicit discharge-related problem that can result in contaminated discharges from separate storm sewer systems in two ways. First, materials may be disposed of directly in a catch basin or other storm water conveyance. Second, materials disposed of on the ground may either drain directly to a storm sewer or be washed into a storm sewer during a storm event. Improper disposal of materials to street catch basins and other storm sewer inlets often occurs when people mistakenly believe that disposal to such areas is an environmentally sound practice. Part of the confusion may occur because some areas are served by combined sewer systems, which are part of the sanitary sewer collection system, and people assume that materials discharged to a catch basin will reach a municipal sewage treatment plant. Materials that are commonly disposed of improperly include used motor oil; household toxic materials; radiator fluids; and litter, such as disposable cups, cans, and fast-food packages. EPA believes that there has been increasing success in addressing these problems through initiatives such as storm drain stenciling and recycling programs, including household hazardous waste special collection days.

Programs that reduce illicit discharges to separate storm sewers have improved water quality in several municipalities. For example, Michigan's Huron River Pollution Abatement Program found the elimination of illicit connections caused a measurable improvement in the water quality of the Washtenaw County storm sewers and the Huron River (Washtenaw County Statutory Drainage Board, 1987). In addition, an illicit detection and remediation program in Houston, Texas, has significantly improved the water quality of Buffalo Bayou. Houston estimated that illicit flows from 132 sources had a flow rate as high as 500 gal/min. Sources of the illicit discharges included broken and plugged sanitary sewer lines, illicit connections from sanitary lines to storm sewer lines, and floor drain connections (Glanton, T., M.T. Garrett, and B. Goloby. 1992. *The Illicit Connection: Is*

It the Problem? Wat. Env. Tech. 4(9):63-8).

3. Construction Site Runoff

Storm water discharges generated during construction activities can cause an array of physical, chemical, and biological water quality impacts. Specifically, the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the waters may become severely compromised. Water quality impairment results, in part, because a number of pollutants are preferentially absorbed onto mineral or organic particles found in fine sediment. The interconnected process of erosion (detachment of the soil particles), sediment transport, and delivery is the primary pathway for introducing key pollutants, such as nutrients (particularly phosphorus), metals, and organic compounds into aquatic systems (Novotny, V. and G. Chesters. 1989. "Delivery of Sediment and Pollutants from Nonpoint Sources: A Water Quality Perspective." *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 44(6):568-76). Estimates indicate that 80 percent of the phosphorus and 73 percent of the Kjeldahl nitrogen in streams is associated with eroded sediment (U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1989. "The Second RCA Appraisal, Soil, Water and Related Resources on Nonfederal Land in the United States, Analysis of Condition and Trends." Cited in Fennessey, L.A.J., and A.R. Jarrett. 1994. "The Dirt in a Hole: a Review of Sedimentation Basins for Urban Areas and Construction Sites." *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 49(4):317-23).

In watersheds experiencing intensive construction activity, the localized impacts of water quality may be severe because of high pollutant loads, primarily sediments. Siltation is the largest cause of impaired water quality in rivers and the third largest cause of impaired water quality in lakes (U.S. EPA, 1998). The 1996 305(b) report also found that construction site discharges were a source of pollution in: 6 percent of impaired rivers; 11 percent of impaired lakes, ponds, and reservoirs; and 11 percent of impaired estuaries. Introduction of coarse sediment (coarse sand or larger) or a large amount of fine sediment is also a concern because of the potential of filling lakes and reservoirs (along with the associated remediation costs for dredging), as well as clogging stream channels (e.g., Paterson, R.G., M.I. Luger, E.J. Burby, E.J. Kaiser, H.R. Malcolm, and A.C. Beard. 1993. "Costs and Benefits of Urban Erosion and Sediment Control: North Carolina Experience." *Environmental Management* 17(2):167-78). Large inputs of coarse sediment into

stream channels initially will reduce stream depth and minimize habitat complexity by filling in pools (U.S. EPA. 1991. *Monitoring Guidelines to Evaluate Effects of Forestry Activities on Streams in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska*. EPA 910/9-91-001. Seattle, WA). In addition, studies have shown that stream reaches affected by construction activities often extend well downstream of the construction site. For example, between 4.8 and 5.6 kilometers of stream below construction sites in the Patuxent River watershed were observed to be impacted by sediment inputs (Fox, H.L. 1974. "Effects of Urbanization on the Patuxent River, with Special Emphasis on Sediment Transport, Storage, and Migration." Ph.D. dissertation. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD. As Cited in Klein, R.D. 1979. "Urbanization and Stream Quality Impairment." *Water Resources Bulletin* 15(4): 948-63).

A primary concern at most construction sites is the erosion and transport process related to fine sediment because rain splash, rills (i.e., a channel small enough to be removed by normal agricultural practices and typically less than 1-foot deep), and sheetwash encourage the detachment and transport of this material to waterbodies (Storm Water Quality Task Force. 1993. *California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks—Construction Activity*. Oakland, CA: Blue Print Service). Construction sites also can generate other pollutants associated with onsite wastes, such as sanitary wastes or concrete truck washout.

Although streams and rivers naturally carry sediment loads, erosion from construction sites and runoff from developed areas can elevate these loads to levels well above those in undisturbed watersheds. It is generally acknowledged that erosion rates from construction sites are much greater than from almost any other land use (Novotny, V. and H. Olem. 1994. *Water Quality: Prevention, Identification, and Management of Diffuse Pollution*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold). Results from both field studies and erosion models indicate that erosion rates from construction sites are typically an order of magnitude larger than row crops and several orders of magnitude greater than rates from well-vegetated areas, such as forests or pastures (USDA. 1970. "Controlling Erosion on Construction Sites." *Agriculture Information Bulletin*, Washington, DC; Meyer, L.D., W.H. Wischmeier, and W.H. Daniel. 1971. "Erosion, Runoff and Revegetation of Denuded Construction Sites." *Transactions of the ASAE* 14(1):138-41;

Owen, O.S. 1975. *Natural Resource Conservation*. New York: MacMillan. As cited in Paterson, et al., 1993).

A recent review of the efficiency of sediment basins indicated that inflows from 12 construction sites had a mean TSS concentration of about 4,500 mg/L (Brown, W.E. 1997. "The Limits of Settling." Technical Note No. 83. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 2(3)). In Virginia, suspended sediment concentrations from housing construction sites were measured at 500-3,000 mg/L, or about 40 times larger than the concentrations from already-developed urban areas (Kuo, C.Y. 1976. "Evaluation of Sediment Yields Due to Urban Development." Bulletin No. 98. Virginia Water Resources Research Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA).

Similar impacts from storm water runoff have been reported in a number of other studies. For example, Daniel, et al., monitored three residential construction sites in southeastern Wisconsin and determined that annual sediment yields were more than 19 times the yields from agricultural areas (Daniel, T.C., D. McGuire, D. Stoffel, and B. Miller. 1979. "Sediment and Nutrient Yield from Residential Construction Sites" *Journal of Environmental Quality* 8(3):304-08). Daniel, et al., identified total storm runoff, followed by peak storm runoff, as the most influential factors controlling the sediment loadings from residential construction sites. Daniel, et al., also found that suspended sediment concentrations were 15,000-20,000 mg/L in moderate events and up to 60,000 mg/L in larger events.

Wolman and Schick (Wolman, M.G. and A.P. Schick. 1967. "Effects of Construction on Fluvial Sediment, Urban and Suburban Areas of Maryland." *Water Resources Research* 3(2): 451-64) studied the impacts of development on fluvial systems in Maryland and determined that sediment yields in areas undergoing construction were 1.5 to 75 times greater than detected in natural or agricultural catchments. The authors summarize the potential impacts of construction on sediment yields by stating that "the equivalent of many decades of natural or even agricultural erosion may take place during a single year from areas cleared for construction" (Wolman and Schick, 1967).

A number of studies have examined the effects of road construction on erosion rates and sediment yields. A highway construction project in West Virginia disturbed only 4.2 percent of a 4.72-square-mile basin, but resulted in a

three-fold increase in suspended sediment yields (Downs, S.C. and D.H. Appel. 1986. *Progress Report on the Effects of Highway Construction on Suspended-Sediment Discharge in the Coal River and Trace Fork, West Virginia, 1975-81*. USGS Water Resources Investigations Report 84-4275. Charlestown, WV). During the largest storm event, it was estimated that 80 percent of the sediment in the stream originated from the construction site. As is often the case, the increase in suspended sediment load could not be detected further downstream, where the drainage area was more than 50 times larger (269 square miles).

Another study evaluated the effect of 290 acres of highway construction on watersheds ranging in size from 5 to 38 square miles. Suspended sediment loads in the smallest watershed increased by 250 percent, and the estimated sediment yield from the construction area was 37 tons/acre during a 2-year period (Hainly, R.A. 1980. *The Effects of Highway Construction on Sediment Discharge into Blockhouse Creek and Stream Valley Run, Pennsylvania*. USGS Water Resources Investigations Report 80-68. Harrisburg, PA). A more recent study in Hawaii showed that highway construction increased suspended sediment loads by 56 to 76 percent in three small (1 to 4 square mile) basins (Hill, B.R. 1996. *Streamflow and Suspended-Sediment Loads Before and During Highway Construction, North Halawa, Haiku, and Kamooalii Drainage Basins, Oahu, Hawaii, 1983-91*. USGS Water Resources Investigations Report 96-4259. Honolulu, HI). A 1970 study determined that sediment yields from construction areas can be as much as 500 times the levels detected in rural areas (National Association of Counties Research Foundation. 1970. *Urban Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*. Water Pollution Control Research Series, Program #15030 DTL. Federal Water Quality Administration, U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, DC)

Yorke and Herb (Yorke, T.H., and W.J. Herb. 1978. *Effects of Urbanization on Streamflow and Sediment Transport in the Rock Creek and Anacostia River Basins, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1962-74*. USGS Professional Paper 1003, Washington, DC) evaluated nine subbasins in the Maryland portion of the Anacostia watershed for more than a decade in an effort to define the impacts of changing land use/land cover on sediment in runoff. Average annual suspended sediment yields for construction sites ranged from 7 to 100 tons/acre. Storm water discharges from construction sites that occur when the land area is disturbed (and prior to

surface stabilization) can significantly impact designated uses. Examples of designated uses include public water supply, recreation, and propagation of fish and wildlife. The siltation process described previously can threaten all three designated uses by (1) depositing high concentrations of pollutants in public water supplies; (2) decreasing the depth of a waterbody, which can reduce the volume of a reservoir or result in limited use of a water body by boaters, swimmers, and other recreational enthusiasts; and (3) directly impairing the habitat of fish and other aquatic species, which can limit their ability to reproduce.

Excess sediment can cause a number of other problems for waterbodies. It is associated with increased turbidity and reduced light penetration in the water column, as well as more long-term effects associated with habitat destruction and increased difficulty in filtering drinking water. Numerous studies have examined the effect that excess sediment has on aquatic ecosystems. For example, sediment from road construction activity in Northern Virginia reduced aquatic insect and fish communities by up to 85 percent and 40 percent, respectively (Reed, J.R. 1997. "Stream Community Responses to Road Construction Sediments." Bulletin No. 97. Virginia Water Resources Research Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA. As cited in Klein, R.D. 1990. *A Survey of Quality of Erosion and Sediment Control and Storm Water Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed*. Annapolis, MD: Chesapeake Bay Foundation). Other studies have shown that fine sediment (fine sand or smaller) adversely affects aquatic ecosystems by reducing light penetration, impeding sight-feeding, smothering benthic organisms, abrading gills and other sensitive structures, reducing habitat by clogging interstitial spaces within a streambed, and reducing the intergravel dissolved oxygen by reducing the permeability of the bed material (Everest, F.H., J.C. Beschta, K.V. Scrivener, J.R. Koski, J.R. Sedell, and C.J. Cederholm. 1987. "Fine Sediment and Salmonid Production: A Paradox." *Streamside Management: Forestry and Fishery Interactions*, Contract No. 57, Institute of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, WA). For example, 4.8 and 5.6 kilometers of stream below construction sites in the Patuxent River watershed in Maryland were found to have fine sediment amounts 15 times greater than normal (Fox, 1974. As cited in Klein, 1979). Benthic organisms in the streambed can be smothered by

sediment deposits, causing changes in aquatic flora and fauna, such as fish species composition (Wolman and Schick, 1967). In addition, the primary cause of coral reef degradation in coastal areas is attributed to land disturbances and dredging activities due to urban development (Rogers, C.S. 1990. "Responses of Coral Reefs and Reef Organizations to Sedimentation." *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 62:185-202).

EPA believes that the water quality impact from small construction sites is as high as or higher than the impact from larger sites on a per acre basis. The concentration of pollutants in the runoff from smaller sites is similar to the concentrations in the runoff from larger sites. The proportion of sediment that makes it from the construction site to surface waters is likely the same for larger and smaller construction sites in urban areas because the runoff from either site is usually delivered directly to the storm drain network where there is no opportunity for the sediment to be filtered out.

The expected contribution of total sediment yields from small sites depends, in part, on the extent to which erosion and sedimentation controls are being applied. Because current storm water regulations are more likely to require erosion and sedimentation controls on larger sites in urban areas, smaller construction sites that lack such programs are likely to contribute a disproportionate amount of the total sediment from construction activities (MacDonald, L.H. 1997. *Technical Justification for Regulating Construction Sites 1-5 Acres in Size*. Unpublished report submitted to U.S. EPA, Washington, DC). Smaller construction sites are less likely to have an effective plan to control erosion and sedimentation, are less likely to properly implement and maintain their plans, and are less likely to be inspected (Brown, W. and D. Caraco. 1997. *Controlling Storm Water Runoff Discharges from Small Construction Sites: A National Review*. Submitted to Office of Wastewater Management, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC., by the Center for Watershed Protection, Silver Spring, MD). The proportion of sediment that makes it from the construction site to surface waters is likely the same for larger and smaller construction sites in urban areas because the runoff from either site is usually delivered directly to the storm drain network, where there is no opportunity for the sediment to be filtered out.

To confirm its belief that sediment yields from small sites are as high as or higher than the 20 to 150 tons/acre/year

measured from larger sites, EPA gave a grant to the Dane County, Wisconsin Land Conservation Department, in cooperation with the USGS, to evaluate sediment runoff from two small construction sites. The first was a 0.34 acre residential lot and the second was a 1.72 acre commercial office development. Runoff from the sites was channeled to a single discharge point for monitoring. Each site was monitored before, during, and after construction.

The Dane County study found that total solids concentrations from these small sites are similar to total solids concentrations from larger construction sites. Results show that for both of the study sites, total solids and suspended solids concentrations were significantly higher during construction than either before or after construction. For example, preconstruction total solids concentrations averaged 642 mg/L during the period when ryegrass was established, active construction total solids concentrations averaged 2,788 mg/L, and post-construction total solids concentrations averaged 132 mg/L (on a pollutant load basis, this equaled 7.4 lbs preconstruction, 35 lbs during construction, and 0.6 lbs post-construction for total solids). While this site was not properly stabilized before construction, after construction was complete and the site was stabilized, post-construction concentrations were more than 20 times less than during construction. The results were even more dramatic for the commercial site. The commercial site had one preconstruction event, which resulted in total solids concentrations of 138 mg/L, while active construction averaged more than 15,000 mg/L and post-construction averaged only 200 mg/L (on a pollutant load basis, this equaled 0.3 lbs preconstruction, 490 lbs during construction, and 13.4 lbs post-construction for total solids). The active construction period resulted in more than 75 times more sediment than either before or after construction (Owens, D.W., P. Jopke, D.W. Hall, J. Balousek and A. Roa. 1999. "Soil Erosion from Small Construction Sites." Draft USGS Fact Sheet. USGS and Dane County Land Conservation Department, WI). The total solids concentrations from these small sites in Wisconsin are similar to total solids concentrations from larger construction sites. For example, a study evaluating the effects of highway construction in West Virginia found that a small storm produced a sediment concentration of 7,520 mg/L (Downs and Appel, 1986).

One important aspect of small construction sites is the number of small sites relative to larger construction sites

and total land area within the watershed. Brown and Caraco surveyed 219 local jurisdictions to assess erosion and sediment control (ESC) programs. Seventy respondents provided data on the number of ESC permits for construction sites smaller than 5 acres. In 27 cases (38 percent of the respondents), more than three-quarters of the permits were for sites smaller than 5 acres; in another 18 cases (26 percent), more than half of the permits were for sites smaller than 5 acres.

In addition, data on the total acreage disturbed by smaller construction sites have been collected recently in two States (MacDonald, 1997). The most recent and complete data set is the listing of the disturbed area for each of the 3,831 construction sites permitted in North Carolina for 1994-1995 and 1995-1996. Nearly 61 percent of the sites that were 1 acre or larger were between 1.0 and 4.9 acres in size. This proportion was consistent between years. Data showed that this range of sites accounted for 18 percent of the total area disturbed by construction. The values showed very little variation between the 2 years of data. The total disturbed area for all sites over this 2-year period was nearly 33,000 acres, or about 0.1 percent of the total area of North Carolina.

EPA estimates that construction sites disturbing greater than 5 acres disturb 2.1-million acres of land (78.1 percent of the total) while sites disturbing between 1 and 5 acres of land disturb 0.5-million acres of land (19.4 percent). The remaining sites on less than 1 acres of land disturb 0.07-million acres of land (only 2.5 percent of the total). Given the high erosion rates associated with most construction sites, small construction sites can be a significant source of water quality impairment, particularly in small watersheds that are undergoing rapid development. Exempting sites under 1 acre will exclude only about 2.5 percent of acreage from program coverage, but will exclude a far higher number of sites, approximately 25 percent.

Several studies have determined that the most effective construction runoff control programs rely on local plan review and field enforcement (Paterson, R. G. 1994. "Construction Practices: the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly." *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(3)). In his review, Paterson suggests that, given the critical importance of field implementation of erosion and sediment control programs and the apparent shortcomings that exist, much more focus should be given to plan implementation.

Several commenters disputed the data presented in the proposed rule for storm water discharges from smaller construction sites. One commenter stated that EPA has not adequately explained the basis for permitting construction activity down to 1 disturbed acre. Another commenter stated that EPA did not present sufficient data on water quality impacts from construction sites disturbing less than 5 acres.

EPA believes that the data presented above sufficiently support nationwide designation of storm water discharges from construction activity disturbing more than 1 acre. Based on total disturbed land area within a watershed, the cumulative effects of numerous small construction sites can have impacts similar to those of larger sites in a particular area. In addition, waivers for storm water discharges from smaller construction activity will exclude sites not expected to impair water quality. EPA will continue to collect water quality data on construction site storm water runoff.

C. Statutory Background

In 1972, Congress enacted the CWA to prohibit the discharge of any pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. Congress added CWA section 402(p) in 1987 to require implementation of a comprehensive program for addressing storm water discharges. Section 402(p)(1) required EPA or NPDES-authorized States or Tribes to issue NPDES permits for the following five classes of storm water discharges composed entirely of storm water ("storm water discharges") specifically listed under section 402(p)(2):

- (A) a discharge subject to an NPDES permit before 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

(E) a discharge that an NPDES permitting authority determines to be contributing to a violation of a water quality standard or a significant contributor of pollutants to the waters of the United States.

Section 402(p)(3)(A) requires storm water discharges associated with industrial activity to meet all applicable provisions of section 402 and section 301 of the CWA, including technology-based requirements and any more

stringent requirements necessary to meet water quality standards. Section 402(p)(3)(B) establishes NPDES permit standards for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems, or MS4s. NPDES permits for discharges from MS4s (1) may be issued on a system or jurisdiction-wide basis, (2) must include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers, and (3) must require controls to reduce pollutant discharges to the maximum extent practicable, including best management practices, and other provisions as the Administrator or the States determine to be appropriate for the control of such pollutants. At this time, EPA determines that water quality-based controls, implemented through the iterative processes described today are appropriate for the control of such pollutants and will result in reasonable further progress towards attainment of water quality standards. See sections II.L and II.H.3 of the preamble.

In CWA section 402(p)(4), Congress established statutory deadlines for the initial steps in implementing the NPDES program for storm water discharges. This section required development of NPDES permit application regulations, submission of NPDES permit applications, issuance of NPDES permits for sources identified in section 402(p)(2), and compliance with NPDES permit conditions. In addition, this section required industrial facilities and large MS4s to submit NPDES permit applications for storm water discharges by February 4, 1990. Medium MS4s were to submit NPDES permit applications by February 4, 1992. EPA and authorized NPDES States were prohibited from requiring an NPDES permit for any other storm water discharges until October 1, 1994.

Section 402(p)(5) required EPA to conduct certain studies and submit a report to Congress. This requirement is discussed in the following section.

Section 402(p)(6) requires EPA, in consultation with States and local officials, to issue regulations for the designation of additional storm water discharges to be regulated to protect water quality. It also requires EPA to extend the existing storm water program to regulate newly designated sources. At a minimum, the extension must establish (1) priorities, (2) requirements for State storm water management programs, and (3) expeditious deadlines. Section 402(p)(6) specifies that the program may include performance standards, guidelines, guidance, and management practices and treatment requirements, as

appropriate. Today's rule implements this section.

D. EPA's Reports to Congress

Under CWA section 402(p)(5), EPA, in consultation with the States, was required to conduct a study. The study was to identify unregulated sources of storm water discharges, determine the nature and extent of pollutants in such discharges, and establish procedures and methods to mitigate the impacts of such discharges on water quality. Section 402(p)(5) also required EPA to report the results of the first two components of that study to Congress by October 1, 1988, and the final report by October 1, 1989.

In March 1995, EPA submitted to Congress a report that reviewed and analyzed the nature of storm water discharges from municipal and industrial facilities that were not already regulated under the initial NPDES regulations for storm water (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, 1995. *Storm Water Discharges Potentially Addressed by Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Program: Report to Congress*. Washington, D.C. EPA 833-K-94-002) ("Report"). The Report also analyzed associated pollutant loadings and water quality impacts from these unregulated sources. Based on identification of unregulated municipal sources and analysis of information on impacts of storm water discharges from municipal sources, the Report recommended that the NPDES program for storm water focus on the 405 "urbanized areas" identified by the Bureau of the Census. The Report further found that a number of discharges from unregulated industrial facilities warranted further investigation to determine the need for regulation. It classified these unregulated industrial discharges in two groups: Group A and Group B. Group A comprised sources that may be considered a high priority for inclusion in the NPDES program for storm water because discharges from these sources are similar or identical to already regulated sources. These "look alike" storm water discharge sources were not covered in the initial NPDES regulations for storm water due to the language used to define "associated with industrial activity." In the initial regulations for storm water, "industrial activity" is identified using Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes. The use of SIC codes led to incomplete categorization of industrial activities with discharges that needed to be regulated to protect water quality. Group B consisted of 18 industrial

sectors, which included sources that EPA expected to contribute to storm water contamination due to the activities conducted and pollutants anticipated onsite (e.g., vehicle maintenance, machinery and electrical repair, and intensive agricultural activities).

EPA reported on the latter component of the section 402(p)(5) study via President Clinton's Clean Water Initiative, which was released on February 1, 1994 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, 1994. *President Clinton's Clean Water Initiative*. Washington, D.C. EPA 800-R-94-001) ("Initiative"). The Initiative addressed a number of issues associated with NPDES requirements for storm water discharges and proposed (1) establishing a phased compliance with a water quality standards approach for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems with priority on controlling discharges from municipal growth and development areas, (2) clarifying that the maximum extent practicable standard should be applied in a site-specific, flexible manner, taking into account cost considerations as well as water quality effects, (3) providing an exemption from the NPDES program for storm water discharges from industrial facilities with no activities or significant materials exposed to storm water, (4) providing extensions to the statutory deadlines to complete implementation of the NPDES program for the storm water program, (5) targeting urbanized areas for the requirements in the NPDES program for storm water, and (6) providing control of discharges from inactive and abandoned mines located on Federal lands in a more targeted, flexible manner. Additionally, prior to promulgation of today's rule, section 431 of the Agency's Appropriation Act for FY 2000 (Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 2000, Public Law 106-74, section 432 (1999)) directed EPA to report on certain matters to be covered in today's rule. That report supplements the study required by CWA Section 402(p)(5). EPA is publishing the availability of that report elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

Several commenters asserted that the Report to Congress is an inadequate basis for the designation and regulation of sources covered under today's final rule, specifically the nationwide designation of small municipal separate storm sewer systems within urbanized areas and construction activities disturbing between one and five acres.

EPA believes that it has developed an adequate record for today's regulation both through the Report to Congress and the Clean Water Initiative and through more recent activities, including the FACA Subcommittee process, regulatory notices and evaluation of comments, and recent research and analysis. EPA does not interpret the congressional reporting requirements of CWA section 402(p)(5) to be the sole basis for determining sources to be regulated under today's final rule.

EPA's decision to designate on a national basis small MS4s in urbanized areas is supported by studies that clearly show a direct correlation between urbanization and adverse water quality impacts from storm water discharges. (Schueler, T. 1987. *Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning & Designing Urban BMPs*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments). "Urbanized areas"—within which all small MS4s would be covered—represent the most intensely developed and dense areas of the Nation. They constitute only two percent of the land area but 63 percent of the total population. See section I.B.1, Urban Development, above, for studies and assessments of the link between urban development and storm water impacts on water resources.

Commenters argued that the Report to Congress does not address storm water discharges from construction sites. They further argued that the designation of small construction sites per today's final rule goes beyond the President's 1994 Initiative because the Initiative only recommends requiring municipalities to implement a storm water management program to control unregulated storm water sources, "including discharges from construction of less than 5 acres, which are part of growth, development and significant redevelopment activities." They point out that the Initiative provides that unregulated storm water discharges not addressed through a municipal program would not be covered by the NPDES program. Commenters assert that EPA has not developed a record independent of its section 402(p)(5) studies that demonstrates the necessity of regulating under a separate NPDES permit storm water discharges from smaller construction sites "to protect water quality." EPA disagrees.

EPA evaluated the nature and extent of pollutants from construction site sources in a process that was separate and distinct from the development of the Report to Congress. Today's decision to regulate certain storm water discharges from construction sites disturbing less than 5 acres arose in part

out of the 9th Circuit remand in *NRDC v. EPA*, 966 F.2d 1292 (9th Cir. 1992). In that case, the court remanded portions of the Phase I storm water regulations related to discharges from construction sites. Those regulations define "storm water discharges associated with industrial activity" to include only those storm water discharges from construction sites disturbing 5 acres or more of total land area (see 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(x)). In its decision, the court concluded that the 5-acre threshold was improper because the Agency had failed to identify information "to support its perception that construction activities on less than 5 acres are non-industrial in nature" (966 F.2d at 1306). The court remanded the below 5 acre exemption to EPA for further proceedings (966 F.2d at 1310).

In a **Federal Register** notice issued on December 18, 1992, EPA noted that it did not believe that the Court's decision had the effect of automatically subjecting small construction sites to the existing application requirements and deadlines. EPA believed that additional notice and comment were necessary to clarify the status of these sites. The information received during the notice and comment process and additional research, as discussed in section I.B.3 Construction Site Runoff, formed the basis for the designation of construction activity disturbing between one and five acres on a nationwide basis. EPA's objectives in today's proposal include an effort to (1) address the 9th Circuit remand, (2) address water quality concerns associated with construction activities that disturb less than 5 acres of land, and (3) balance conflicting recommendations and concerns of stakeholders.

One commenter noted that EPA's proposal would fail to regulate industrial facilities identified as Group A and Group B in the March 1995 *Report to Congress*. EPA is relying on the analysis in the Report, which provided that the recommendation for coverage was meant as guidance and was not intended to be an identification of specific categories that must be regulated under Section 402(p)(6). *Report to Congress*, p. 4-1. The Report recognized the existence of limited data on which to base loadings estimates to support the nationwide designation of individual or categories of sources. *Report to Congress*, p. 4-44. Furthermore, during FACA Subcommittee discussion, EPA continued to urge stakeholders to provide further data relating to industrial and commercial storm water sources, which EPA did not receive. EPA concluded that, due to insufficient

data, these sources were not appropriate for nationwide designation at this time.

E. Industrial Facilities Owned or Operated by Small Municipalities

Congress granted extensions to the NPDES permit application process for selected classes of storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. On December 18, 1991, Congress enacted the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), which postponed NPDES permit application deadlines for most storm water discharges associated with industrial activity at facilities that are owned or operated by small municipalities. EPA and States authorized to administer the NPDES program could not require any municipality with a population of less than 100,000 to apply for or obtain an NPDES permit for any storm water discharge associated with industrial activity prior to October 1, 1992, except for storm water discharges from airports, power plants, or uncontrolled sanitary landfills. See 40 CFR 122.26(e)(1); 57 FR 11524, April 2, 1992 (reservation of NPDES application deadlines for ISTEA facilities).

The facilities exempted by ISTEA discharge storm water in the same manner (and are expected to use identical processes and materials) as the industrial facilities regulated under the 1990 Phase I regulations. Accordingly, these facilities pose similar water quality problems. The extended moratorium for these facilities was necessary to allow municipalities additional time to comply with NPDES requirements. The proposal for today's rule would have maintained the existing deadline for seeking coverage under an NPDES permit (August 7, 2001).

Today's rule changes the permit application deadline for such municipally owned or operated facilities discharging industrial storm water to make it consistent with the application date for small regulated MS4s. Because EPA missed its March 1999 deadline for promulgating today's rule, and the deadline for MS4s to submit permit applications has been extended to three years and 90 days from the date of this notice, the deadline for permitting ISTEA sources has been similarly extended. The permitting of these sources is discussed below in section "II.I.3. ISTEA Sources."

F. Related Nonpoint Source Programs

Today's rule addresses point source discharges of storm water runoff and non-storm water discharges into MS4s. Many of these sources have been addressed by nonpoint source control

programs, which are described briefly below.

In 1987, section 319 was added to the CWA to provide a framework for funding State and local efforts to address pollutants from nonpoint sources not addressed by the NPDES program. To obtain funding, States are required to submit Nonpoint Source Assessment Reports identifying State waters that, without additional control of nonpoint sources of pollution, could not reasonably be expected to attain or maintain applicable water quality standards or other goals and requirements of the CWA. States are also required to prepare and submit for EPA approval a statewide Nonpoint Source Management Program for controlling nonpoint source water pollution to navigable waters within the State and improving the quality of such waters. State program submittals must identify specific best management practices (BMPs) and measures that the State proposes to implement in the first four years after program submission to reduce pollutant loadings from identified nonpoint sources to levels required to achieve the stated water quality objectives.

State nonpoint source programs funded under section 319 can include both regulatory and nonregulatory State and local approaches. Section 319(b)(2)(B) specifies that a combination of "nonregulatory or regulatory programs for enforcement, technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, and demonstration projects" may be used, as necessary, to achieve implementation of the BMPs or measures identified in the section 319 submittals.

Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) of 1990 provides that States with approved coastal zone management programs must develop coastal nonpoint pollution control programs and submit them to EPA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for approval. Failure to submit an approvable program will result in a reduction of Federal grants under both the Coastal Zone Management Act and section 319 of the CWA.

State coastal nonpoint pollution control programs under CZARA must include enforceable policies and mechanisms that ensure implementation of the management measures throughout the coastal management area. *EPA issued Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters* under section 6217(g) in

January 1993. The guidance identifies management measures for five major categories of nonpoint source pollution. The management measures reflect the greatest degree of pollutant reduction that is economically achievable for each of the listed sources. These management measures provide reference standards for the States to use in developing or refining their coastal nonpoint programs. A few management measures, however, contain quantitative standards that specify pollutant loading reductions. For example, the New Development Management Measure, which is applicable to construction in urban areas, requires (1) that by design or performance the average annual total suspended solid loadings be reduced by 80 percent and (2) to the extent practicable, that the pre-development peak runoff rate and average volume be maintained.

EPA and NOAA published *Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program: Program Development and Approval Guidance* (1993). The document clarifies that States generally must implement management measures for each source category identified in the EPA guidance developed under section 6217(g). Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs are not required to address sources that are clearly regulated under the NPDES program as point source discharges. Specifically, such programs would not need to address small MS4s and construction sites covered under NPDES storm water permits (both general and individual).

II. Description of Program

A. Overview

1. Objectives EPA Seeks To Achieve in Today's Rule

EPA seeks to achieve several objectives in today's final rule. First,


EPA is implementing the requirement under CWA section 402(p)(6) to provide a comprehensive storm water program that designates and controls additional sources of storm water discharges to protect water quality. Second, EPA is addressing storm water discharges from the activities exempted under the 1990 storm water permit application regulations that were remanded by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *NRDC v. EPA*, 966 F.2d 1292 (9th Circuit, 1992). These are construction activities disturbing less than 5 acres and so-called "light" industrial activities not exposed to storm water (see discussion of "no exposure" below). Third, EPA is providing coverage for the so-called "donut holes" created by the existing NPDES storm water program. Donut holes are geographic gaps in the NPDES storm water program's regulatory scheme. They are MS4s located within areas covered by the existing NPDES storm water program, but not currently addressed by the storm water program because it is based on political jurisdictions. Finally, EPA also is trying to promote watershed planning as a framework for implementing water quality programs where possible.

Although EPA had options for different approaches (see alternatives discussed in the January 9, 1998, proposed regulation), EPA believes it can best achieve its objectives through flexible innovations within the framework of the NPDES program. Unlike the interim section 402(p)(6) storm water regulations EPA promulgated in 1995, EPA no longer designates all of the unregulated storm water discharges for nationwide coverage under the NPDES program for storm water. The framework for today's final rule is one that balances automatic designation on a nationwide basis and

locally-based designation and waivers. Nationwide designation applies to those classes or categories of storm water discharges that EPA believes present a high likelihood of having adverse water quality impacts, regardless of location. Specifically, today's rule designates discharges from small MS4s located in urbanized areas and storm water discharges from construction activities that result in land disturbance equal to or greater than one and less than five acres. As noted under Section I.B., Water Quality Concerns/Environmental Impact Studies and Assessments, these two categories of storm water sources, when unregulated, tend to cause significant adverse water quality impacts. Additional sources are not covered on a nationwide basis either because EPA currently lacks information indicating a consistent potential for adverse water quality impact or because EPA believes that the likelihood of adverse impacts on water quality is low, with some localized exceptions. Additional individual sources or categories of storm water discharges could, however, be covered under the program through a local designation process. A permitting authority may designate additional small MS4s after developing designation criteria and applying those criteria to small MS4s located outside of an urbanized area, in particular those with a population of 10,000 or more and a population density of at least 1,000. Exhibit 1 illustrates the designation framework for today's final rule.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

EXHIBIT 1.—PHASE II SOURCE DECISIONS



*EPA will continue to require States to comply with their Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) implementation schedules.

The designation framework for today's final rule provides a significant degree of flexibility. The proposed provisions for nationwide designation of storm water discharges from construction and from small MS4s in urbanized areas allowed for a waiver of applicable requirements based on appropriate water quality conditions. Today's final rule expands and simplifies those waivers.

The permitting authority may waive the requirement for a permit for any small MS4 serving a jurisdiction with a population of less than 1,000 unless storm water controls are needed because the MS4 is contributing to a water quality impairment. The permitting authority may also waive permit coverage for MS4s serving a jurisdiction with a population of less than 10,000 if all waters that receive a discharge from the MS4 have been evaluated and discharges from the MS4 do not significantly contribute to a water quality impairment or have the potential to cause an impairment. Today's rule also allows States with a watershed permitting approach to phase in coverage for MS4s in jurisdictions with populations under 10,000.

Water quality conditions are also the basis for a waiver of requirements for storm water discharges from construction activities disturbing between one and five acres. For these small construction sources, the rule provides significant flexibility for waiving otherwise applicable regulatory requirements where a permitting authority determines, based on water quality and watershed considerations, that storm water discharge controls are not needed.

Coverage can be extended to municipal and construction sources outside the nationwide designated classes or categories based on watershed and case-by-case assessments. For the municipal storm water program, today's rule provides broad discretion to NPDES permitting authorities to develop and implement criteria for designating storm water discharges from small MS4s outside of urbanized areas. Other storm water discharges from unregulated industrial, commercial, and residential sources will not be subject to the NPDES permit requirements unless a permitting authority determines on a case-by-case basis (or on a categorical basis within identified geographic areas such as a State or watershed) that regulatory controls are needed to protect water quality. EPA believes that the flexibility provided in today's rule facilitates watershed planning.

2. General Requirements for Regulated Entities Under Today's Rule

As previously noted, today's final rule defines additional classes and categories of storm water discharges for coverage under the NPDES program. These designated dischargers are required to seek coverage under an NPDES permit. Furthermore, all NPDES-authorized States and Tribes are required to implement these provisions and make any necessary amendments to current State and Tribal NPDES regulations to ensure consistency with today's final rule. EPA remains the NPDES permitting authority for jurisdictions without NPDES authorization.

Today's final rule includes some new requirements for NPDES permitting authorities implementing the CWA section 402(p)(6) program. EPA has made a significant effort to build flexibility into the program while attempting to maintain an appropriate level of national consistency. Permitting authorities must ensure that NPDES permits issued to MS4s include the minimum control measures established under the program. Permitting authorities also have the ability to make numerous decisions including who is regulated under the program, i.e., case-by-case designations and waivers, and how responsibilities should be allocated between regulated entities.

Today's final rule extends the NPDES program to include discharges from the following: small MS4s within urbanized areas (with the exception of systems waived from the requirements by the NPDES permitting authority); other small MS4s meeting designation criteria to be established by the permitting authority; and any remaining MS4 that contributes substantially to the storm water pollutant loadings of a physically interconnected MS4 already subject to regulation under the NPDES program. Small MS4s include urban storm sewer systems owned by Tribes, States, political subdivisions of States, as well as the United States, and other systems located within an urbanized area that fall within the definition of an MS4. These include, for example, State departments of transportation (DOTs), public universities, and federal military bases.

Today's final rule requires all regulated small MS4s to develop and implement a storm water management program. Program components include, at a minimum, 6 minimum measures to address: public education and outreach; public involvement; illicit discharge detection and elimination; construction site runoff control; post-construction storm water management in new

development and redevelopment; and pollution prevention and good housekeeping of municipal operations. These program components will be implemented through NPDES permits. A regulated small MS4 is required to submit to the NPDES permitting authority, either in its notice of intent (NOI) or individual permit application, the BMPs to be implemented and the measurable goals for each of the minimum control measures listed above.

The rule addresses all storm water discharges from construction site activities involving clearing, grading and excavating land equal to or greater than 1 acre and less than 5 acres, unless requirements are otherwise waived by the NPDES permitting authority. Discharges from such sites, as well as construction sites disturbing less than 1 acre of land that are designated by the permitting authority, are required to implement requirements set forth in the NPDES permit, which may reference the requirements of a qualifying local program issued to cover such discharges.

The rule also addresses certain other sources regulated under the existing NPDES program for storm water. For municipally-owned industrial sources required to be regulated under the existing NPDES storm water program but exempted from immediate compliance by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (ISTEA), the rule revises the existing deadline for seeking coverage under an NPDES permit (August 7, 2001) to make it consistent with the application date for small regulated MS4s. (See section I.3. below.) The rule also provides relief from NPDES storm water permitting requirements for industrial sources with no exposure of industrial materials and activities to storm water.

3. Integration of Today's Rule With the Existing Storm Water Program

In developing an approach for today's final rule, numerous early interested stakeholders encouraged EPA to seek opportunities to integrate, where possible, the proposed Phase II requirements with existing Phase I requirements, thus facilitating a unified storm water discharge control program. EPA believes that this objective is met by using the NPDES framework. This framework is already applied to regulated storm water discharge sources and is extended to those sources designated under today's rule. This approach facilitates program consistency, public access to information, and program oversight.

EPA believes that today's final rule provides consistency in terms of program coverage and requirements for existing and newly designated sources. For example, the rule includes most of the municipal donut holes, those MS4s located in incorporated places, townships or towns with a population under 100,000 that are within Phase I counties. These MS4s are not addressed by the existing NPDES storm water program while MS4s in the surrounding county are currently addressed. In addition, the minimum control measures required in today's rule for regulated small MS4s are very similar to a number of the permit requirements for medium and large MS4s under the existing storm water program. Following today's rule, permit requirements for all regulated MS4s (both those under the existing program and those under today's rule) will require implementation of BMPs. Furthermore, with regard to the development of NPDES permits to protect water quality, EPA intends to apply the August 1, 1996, *Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits* (hereinafter, "Interim Permitting Approach") (see Section II.L.1. for further description) to all MS4s covered by the NPDES program.

EPA is applying NPDES permit requirements to construction sites below 5 acres that are similar to the existing requirements for those above 5 acres and above. In addition, today's rule allows compliance with qualifying local, Tribal, or State erosion and sediment controls to meet the erosion and sediment control requirements of the general permits for storm water discharges associated with construction, both above and below 5 acres.

4. General Permits

EPA recommends using general permits for all newly regulated storm water sources under today's rule. The use of general permits, instead of individual permits, reduces the administrative burden on permitting authorities, while also limiting the paperwork burden on regulated parties seeking permit authorization. Permitting authorities may, of course, require individual permits in some cases to address specific concerns, including permit non-compliance.

EPA recommends that general permits for MS4s, in particular, be issued on a watershed basis, but recognizes that each permitting authority must decide how to develop its general permit(s). Permit conditions developed to address concerns and conditions of a specific watershed could reflect a watershed

plan; such permit conditions must provide for attainment of applicable water quality standards (including designated uses), allocations of pollutant loads established by a TMDL, and timing requirements for implementation of a TMDL. If the permitting authority issues a State-wide general permit, the permitting authority may include separate conditions tailored to individual watersheds or urbanized areas. Of course, for a newly regulated MS4, modification of an existing individual MS4 permit to include the newly regulated MS4 as a "limited co-permittee" also remains an option.

5. Tool Box

During the FACA process, many Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee representatives expressed an interest, which was endorsed by the full Committee, in having EPA develop a "tool box" to assist States, Tribes, municipalities, and other parties involved in the Phase II program. EPA made a commitment to work with Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee representatives in developing such a tool box, with the expectation that a tool box would facilitate implementation of the storm water program in an effective and cost-efficient manner. EPA has developed a preliminary working tool box (available on EPA's web page at www.epa.gov/owm/sw/toolbox). EPA intends to have the tool box fully developed by the time of the first general permits. EPA also intends to update the tool box as resources and data become available. The tool box will include the following eight main components: fact sheets; guidances; a menu of BMPs for the six MS4 minimum measures; an information clearinghouse; training and outreach efforts; technical research; support for demonstration projects; and compliance monitoring/assistance tools. EPA intends to issue the menu of BMPs, both structural and non-structural, by October 2000. In addition, EPA will issue by October 2000 a "model" permit and will issue by October 2001 guidance materials on the development of measurable goals for municipal programs.

In an attempt to avoid duplication, the Agency has undertaken an effort to identify and coordinate sources of information that relate to the storm water discharge control program from both inside and outside the Agency. Such information includes research and demonstration projects, grants, storm water management-related programs, and compendiums of available documents, including guidances, related

directly or indirectly to the comprehensive NPDES storm water program. Based on this effort, EPA is developing a tool box containing fact sheets and guidance documents pertaining to the overall program and rule requirements (e.g., guidance on municipal and construction programs, and permitting authority guidance on designation and waiver criteria); models of current programs aimed at assisting States, Tribes, municipalities, and others in establishing programs; a comprehensive list of reference documents organized according to subject area (e.g., illicit discharges, watersheds, water quality standards attainment, funding sources, and similar types of references); educational materials; technical research data; and demonstration project results. The information collected by EPA will not only provide the background for tool box materials, but will also be made available through an information clearinghouse on the world wide web.

With assistance from EPA, the American Public Works Association (APWA) developed a workbook and series of workshops on the proposed Phase II rule. Ten workshops were held from September 1998 through May 1999. Depending on available funding, these workshops may continue after publication of today's final rule. EPA also intends to provide training to enable regional offices to educate States, Tribes, and municipalities about the storm water program and the availability of the tool box materials.

The CWA currently provides funding mechanisms to support activities related to storm water. These mechanisms will be described in the tool box. Activities funded under grant and loan programs, which could be used to assist in storm water program development, include programs in the nonpoint source area, storm water demonstration projects, source water protection and wastewater construction projects. EPA has already provided funding for numerous research efforts in these areas, including a database of BMP effectiveness studies (described below), an assessment of technologies for storm water management, a study of the effectiveness of storm water BMPs for controlling the impacts of watershed imperviousness, protocols for wet weather monitoring, development of a dynamic model for wet weather flows, and numerous outreach projects.

EPA has entered into a cooperative agreement with the Urban Water Resources Research Council of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) to develop a scientifically-based management tool for the information

needed to evaluate the effectiveness of urban storm water runoff BMPs nationwide. The long-term goal of the National Stormwater BMP Database project is to promote technical design improvements for BMPs and to better match their selection and design to the local storm water problems being addressed. The project team has collected and evaluated hundreds of existing published BMP performance studies and created a database covering about 75 test sites. The database includes detailed information on the design of each BMP and its watershed characteristics, as well as its performance. Eventually the database will include the nationwide collection of information on the characteristics of structural and non-structural BMPs, data collection efforts (e.g., sampling and flow gaging equipment), climatological characteristics, watershed characteristics, hydrologic data, and constituent data. The database will continue to grow as new BMP data become available. The initial release of

the database, which includes data entry and retrieval software, is available on CD-ROM and operates on Windows®-compatible personal computers. The ASCE project team envisions that periodic updates to the database will be distributed through the Internet. The team is currently developing a system for Internet retrieval of selected database records, and this system is expected to be available in early 2000.

EPA and ASCE invite BMP designers, owners and operators to participate in the continuing database development effort. To make this effort successful, a large database is essential. Interested persons are encouraged to submit their BMP performance evaluation data and associated BMP watershed characteristics for potential entry into the database. The software included in the CD-ROM allows data providers to enter their BMP data locally, retain and edit the data as needed, and submit them to the ASCE Database Clearinghouse when ready.

To obtain a copy of the database, please contact Jane Clary, Database Clearinghouse Manager, Wright Water Engineers, Inc., 2490 W. 26th Ave., Suite 100A, Denver, CO 80211; Phone 303-480-1700; E-mail clary@wrightwater.com.

In addition, EPA requests that researchers planning to conduct BMP performance evaluations compile and collect BMP reporting information according to the standard format developed by ASCE. The format is provided with the database software and is also available on the ASCE website at www.asce.org/peta/tech/nsbd01.html.

6. Deadlines Established in Today's Action

Exhibit 2 outlines the various deadlines established under today's final rule. EPA believes that the dates allow sufficient time for completion of both the NPDES permitting authority's and the permittee's program responsibilities.

EXHIBIT 2—STORM WATER PHASE II ACTIONS DEADLINES

Activity	Deadline date
NPDES-authorized States modify NPDES program if no statutory change is required.	1 year from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register .
NPDES-authorized States modify NPDES program if statutory change is required.	2 years from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register .
EPA issues a menu of BMPs for regulated small MS4s	October 27, 2000
ISTEA sources submit permit application	3 years and 90 days from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register .
Permitting authority issues general permit(s) (if this type of permit coverage is selected).	3 years from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register .
Regulated small MS4s submit permit application:	
a. If designated under § 122.32(a)(1) unless the permitting authority has established a phasing schedule under § 123.35(d)(3).	a. 3 years and 90 days from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register .
b. If designated under § 122.32(a)(2) or §§ 122.26(a)(9)(i) (C) or (D).	b. Within 180 days of notice.
Storm water discharges associated with small construction activity submit permit application:	
a. If designated under § 122.26(b)(15)(i)	a. 3 years and 90 days from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register
b. If designated under § 122.26(b)(15)(ii)	b. Within 180 days of notice.
Permitting authority designates small MS4s under § 123.35(b)(2)	3 years from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register or 5 years from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register if a watershed plan is in place
Regulated small MS4s' program fully developed and implemented	Up to 5 years from date of permit issuance.
Reevaluation of the municipal storm water rules by EPA	13 years from date of publication of today's rule in the Federal Register
Permitting authority determination on a petition	Within 180 days of receipt.
Non-municipal sources designated under § 122.26(a)(9)(i) (C) or (D) submit permit application.	Within 180 days of notice.
Submission of No Exposure Certification	Every 5 years.

B. Readable Regulations

Today, EPA is finalizing new regulations in a "readable regulation" format. This reader-friendly, plain language approach is a departure from traditional regulatory language and should enhance the rule's readability. These plain language regulations use

questions and answers, "you" to identify the person who must comply, and terms like "must" rather than "shall" to identify a mandate. This new format, which minimizes layers of subparagraphs, should also allow the reader to easily locate specific provisions of the regulation.

Some sections of today's final rule are presented in the traditional language and format because these sections amend existing regulations. The readable regulation format was not used in these existing provisions in an attempt to avoid confusion or disruption

of the readability of the existing regulations.

Most commenters supported EPA's use of plain language and agreed with EPA that the question and answer format makes the rule easier to understand. Three commenters thought that EPA should retain the traditional rule format. The June 1, 1998, Presidential memorandum directs all government agencies to write documents in plain language. Based on the majority of the comments, EPA has retained the plain language format used in the January 9, 1998, proposal in today's final rule.

The proposal to today's final rule included guidance as well as legal requirements. The word "must" indicates a requirement. Words like "should," "could," or "encourage" indicate a recommendation or guidance. In addition, the guidance was set off in parentheses to distinguish it from requirements.

EPA received numerous comments supporting the inclusion of guidance in the text of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), as well as comments opposing inclusion of guidance. Supporters stated that preambles and guidance documents are often not accessible when rules are implemented. Any language not included in the CFR is therefore not available when it may be most needed. Commenters that opposed including guidance in the CFR expressed the concern that any language in the rule might be interpreted as a requirement, in spite of any clarifying language. They suggested that guidance be presented in the preamble and additional guidance documents.

The majority of commenters on this issue thought that the guidance should be retained but the distinction between requirements and guidance should be better clarified. Suggestions included clarifying text, symbols, and a change from use of the word "should" to "EPA recommends" or "EPA suggests". EPA believes that it is important to include the guidance in the rule and agrees that the distinction between requirements and EPA recommendations must be very clear. In today's final rule, EPA has put the guidance in paragraphs entitled "Guidance" and replaced the word "should" with "EPA recommends." This is intended to clarify that the recommendations contained in the guidance paragraphs are not legally binding.

C. Program Framework: NPDES Approach

Today's rule regulates Phase II sources using the NPDES permit program. EPA interprets Clean Water

Act section 402(p)(6) as authorizing the Agency to develop a storm water program for Phase II sources either as part of the existing NPDES permit program or as a stand alone non-NPDES program such as a self-implementing rule. Under either approach, EPA interprets section 402(p)(6) as directing EPA to publish regulations that "regulate" the remaining unregulated sources, specifically to establish requirements that are federally enforceable under the CWA. Although EPA believes that it has the discretion to not require sources regulated under CWA section 402(p)(6) to be covered by NPDES permits, the Agency has determined, for the reasons discussed below, that it is most appropriate to use NPDES permits in implementing the program to address the sources designated for regulation in today's rule.

As discussed in Section II.A, Overview, EPA sought to achieve certain goals in today's final rule. EPA believes that the NPDES program best achieves EPA's goals for today's final rule for the reasons discussed below.

Requiring Phase II sources to be covered by NPDES permits helps address the consistency problems currently caused by municipal "donut holes." Donut holes are gaps in program coverage where a small unregulated MS4 is located next to or within a regulated larger MS4 that is subject to an NPDES permit under the Phase I NPDES storm water program. The existence of such "donut holes" creates an equity problem because similar discharges may remain unregulated even though they cause or contribute to the same adverse water quality impacts. Using NPDES permits to regulate the unregulated discharges in these areas is intended to facilitate the development of a seamless regulatory program for the mitigation and control of contaminated storm water discharges in an urbanized area. For example, today's rule allows a newly regulated MS4 to join as a "limited" co-permittee with a regulated MS4 by referencing a common storm water management program. Such cooperation should be further encouraged by the fact that the minimum control measures required in today's rule for regulated small MS4s are very similar to a number of the permit requirements for medium and large MS4s under the Phase I storm water program. The minimum control measures applicable to discharges from smaller MS4s are described with slightly more generality than under the Phase I permit application regulations for larger MS4s, thus enabling maximum flexibility for operators of

smaller MS4s to optimize efforts to protect water quality.

Today's rule also applies NPDES permit requirements to construction sites below 5 acres that are similar to the existing requirements for those 5 acres and above. In addition, the rule would allow compliance with qualifying local, Tribal, or State erosion and sediment controls to meet the erosion and sediment control requirements of the general permits for storm water discharges associated with construction, both above and below 5 acres.

Incorporating the CWA section 402(p)(6) program into the NPDES program capitalizes upon the existing governmental infrastructure for administration of the NPDES program. Moreover, much of the regulated community already understands the NPDES program and the way it works.

Another goal of the NPDES program approach is to provide flexibility in order to facilitate and promote watershed planning and sensitivity to local conditions. NPDES permits promote those goals in several ways. NPDES general permits may be used to cover a category of regulated sources on a watershed basis or within political boundaries. The NPDES permitting process provides a mechanism for storm water controls tailored on a case-by-case basis, where necessary. In addition, the NPDES permit requirements of a permittee may be satisfied by another cooperating entity. Finally, NPDES permits may incorporate the requirements of existing State, Tribal and local programs, thereby accommodating State and Tribes seeking to coordinate the storm water program with other programs, including those that focus on watershed-based nonpoint source regulation.

In promoting the watershed approach to program administration, EPA believes NPDES general permits can cover a category of dischargers within a defined geographic area. Areas can be defined very broadly to include political boundaries (e.g., county), watershed boundaries, or State or Tribal land.

NPDES permits generally require an application or a notice of intent (NOI) to trigger coverage. This information exchange assures communication between the permitting authority and the regulated community. This communication is critical in ensuring that the regulated community is aware of the requirements and the permitting authority is aware of the potential for adverse impacts to water quality from identifiable locations. The NPDES permitting process includes the public as a valuable stakeholder and ensures

that the public is included and information is made publicly available.

Another concern for EPA and several stakeholders was that the program ensure citizen participation. The NPDES approach ensures opportunities for citizen participation throughout the permit issuance process, as well as in enforcement actions. NPDES permits are also federally enforceable under the CWA.

EPA believes that the use of NPDES permits makes a significant difference in the degree of compliance with regulations in the storm water program. The NPDES program provides for public participation in the development, enforcement and revision of storm water management programs. Citizen suit enforcement has assisted in focusing attention on adverse water quality impacts on a localized, public priority basis. Citizens frequently rely on the NPDES permitting process and the availability of NOIs to track program implementation and help them enforce regulatory requirements.

NPDES permits are also advantageous to the permittee. The NPDES permit informs the permittee about the scope of what it is expected to do to be in compliance with the Clean Water Act. As explained more fully in EPA's April 1995 guidance, *Policy Statement on Scope of Discharge Authorization and Shield Associated with NPDES Permits*, compliance with an NPDES permit constitutes compliance with the Clean Water Act (see CWA section 402(k)). In addition, NPDES permittees are excluded from duplicative regulatory regimes under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and the Comprehensive Emergency Response, Compensation and Liability Act under RCRA's exclusions to the definition of "solid waste" and CERCLA's exemption for "federally permitted releases."

EPA considered suggestions that the Agency authorize today's rule to be implemented as a self-implementing rule. This would be a regulation promulgated at the Federal, State, or Tribal level to control some or all of the storm water dischargers regulated under today's rule. Under this approach, a rule would spell out the specific requirements for dischargers and impose the restrictions and conditions that would otherwise be contained in an NPDES permit. It would be effective until modified by EPA, a State, or a Tribe, unlike an NPDES permit which cannot exceed a duration of five years. Some stakeholders believed that this approach would reduce the burden on the regulated community (e.g., by not requiring permit applications), and considerably reduce the amount of

additional paperwork, staff time and accounting required to administer the proposed permit requirements.

EPA is sensitive to the interest of some stakeholders in having a streamlined program that minimizes the burden associated with permit administration and maximizes opportunities for field time spent by regulatory authorities. Key provisions in today's rule address some of these concerns by promoting a streamlined approach to permit issuance by, for example, using general permits and allowing the incorporation of existing programs. By adopting the NPDES approach rather than a self-implementing rule, today's rule also allows for consistent regulation between larger MS4s and construction sites regulated under the existing storm water management rule and smaller sources regulated under today's rule.

EPA believes that it is most appropriate to use NPDES permits to implement a program to address the sources regulated by today's rule. In addition to the reasons discussed above, NPDES permits provide a better mechanism than would a self-implementing rule for tailoring storm water controls on a case-by-case basis, where necessary. One commenter reasoned this concern could be addressed by including provisions in the regulation that allow site-specific BMPs (i.e., case-by-case permits), suggesting storm water discharges that might require site-specific BMPs can be identified during the designation process of the regulatory authority. EPA believes that, in addition to its complexity, the commenter's approach lacks the other advantages of the NPDES permitting process.

A self-implementing rule would not ensure the degree of public participation that the NPDES permit process provides for the development, enforcement and revision of the storm water management program. A self-implementing rule also might not have provided the regulated community the "permit shield" under CWA section 402(k) that is provided by an NPDES permit. Based on all these considerations, EPA declined to adopt a self-implementing rule approach and adopted the NPDES approach.

Some State representatives sought alternative approaches for State implementation of the storm water program for Phase II sources. These State representatives asserted that a non-NPDES alternative approach best facilitated watershed management and avoided duplication and overlapping regulations. These representatives believed the NPDES approach would undercut State programs that had

developed storm water controls tailored to local watershed concerns. Finally, a number of commenters expressed the view that States implement a variety of programs not based on the CWA that are effective in controlling storm water, and that EPA should provide incentives for their implementation and improvement in performance.

Throughout the development of the rule, State representatives sought alternatives to the NPDES approach for State implementation of the storm water program for Phase II sources. Discussions focused on an approach whereby States could develop an alternative program that EPA would approve or disapprove based on identified criteria, including that the alternative non-NPDES program would result in "equivalent or better protection of water quality." The State representatives, however, were unable to propose or recommend criteria for gauging whether a program would provide equivalent protection. EPA also did not receive any suggestions for objective, workable criteria in response to the Agency's explicit request for specific criteria (by which EPA could objectively judge such programs) in the preamble to the proposed rule.

EPA evaluated several existing State initiatives to address storm water and found many cases where standards under State programs may be coordinated with the Federal storm water program. Where the NPDES permit is developed in coordination with State standards, there are opportunities to avoid duplication and overlapping requirements. Under today's rule, an NPDES permitting authority may include conditions in the NPDES permit that direct an MS4 to follow the requirements imposed under State standards, rather than the requirements of § 122.34(b). This is allowed as long as the State program at a minimum imposes the relevant requirements of § 122.34(b). Additional opportunities follow from other provisions in today's rule.

Seeking to further explore the feasibility of a non-NPDES approach, the Agency, after the proposal, had extensive discussions with representatives of a number of States. Discussions related specifically to possible alternatives for regulations of urban storm water discharges and MS4s specifically. The Agency also sought input on these issues from other stakeholders.

As a result of these discussions, many of the commenters provided input on issues such as: whether or not the Agency should require NPDES permits; whether location of MS4s in urbanized

areas should be the basis for designation or whether designation should be based on other determinations relating to water quality; whether States should be allowed to satisfy the conditions of the rule through the use of existing State programs; and issues concerning timing and resources for program implementation.

In response, today's rule still follows the regulatory scheme of the proposed rule, but incorporates additional flexibility to address some of the concerns raised by commenters.

In order to facilitate implementation by States that utilize a watershed permitting approach or similar approach (*i.e.*, based on a State's unified watershed assessments), today's rule allows States to phase in coverage for MS4s in jurisdictions with a population less than 10,000. Under such an approach, States could focus their resources on a rolling basis to assist smaller MS4s in developing storm water programs.

In addition, in response to concerns that the rule should not require permit coverage for MS4s that do not significantly contribute to water quality impairments, today's rule provides options for two waivers for small MS4s. The rule allows permitting authorities to exempt from the requirement for a permit any MS4 serving a jurisdiction with a population less than 1,000, unless the State determines that the MS4 must implement storm water controls because it is significantly contributing to a water quality impairment. A second waiver option applies to MS4s serving a jurisdiction with a population less than 10,000. For those MS4s, the State must determine that discharges from the MS4 do not significantly contribute to a water quality impairment, or have the potential for such an impairment, in order to provide the exemption. The State must review this waiver on a periodic basis no less frequently than once every five years.

Throughout the development of today's rule, commenters questioned whether the Clean Water Act authorized the use of the NPDES permit program, pointing out that the text of CWA 402(p)(6) does not use the word "permit." Based on the absence of the word "permit" and the express mention of State storm water management programs, the commenters asserted that Congress did not intend for Phase II sources to be regulated using NPDES permits.

EPA disagrees with the commenters' interpretation of section 402(p)(6). Section 402(p)(6) does not preclude use of permits as part of the

"comprehensive program" to regulate designated sources. The language provides EPA with broad discretion in the establishment of the "comprehensive program." Absence of the word "permit" (a term that the statute does not otherwise define) does not preclude use of a permit, which is a familiar and reasonably well understood regulatory implementation vehicle. First, section 402(p)(6) says that EPA must establish a comprehensive program that "shall, at a minimum, establish priorities, establish requirements for State stormwater management programs, and establish expeditious deadlines." The "at a minimum" language suggests that the Agency may, and perhaps should, develop a comprehensive program that does more than merely attend to these minimum criteria. Use of the term "at a minimum" preserves for the Agency broad discretion to establish a comprehensive program that includes use of NPDES permits.

Further, in the final sentence of the section, Congress included additional language to affirm the Agency's discretion. The final sentence clarifies that the Phase II program "may include performance standards, guidelines, guidance, and management practices and treatment requirements, as appropriate." Under existing CWA programs, performance standards, (effluent limitations) guidelines, management practices, and treatment requirements are typically implemented through NPDES or dredge and fill permits.

Although EPA believes that it had the discretion to not require permits, the Agency has determined that it is reasonable to interpret section 402(p)(6) to authorize permits. Moreover, for the reasons discussed above, the Agency believes that it is appropriate to use NPDES permits in implementing today's rule.

D. Federal Role

Today's final rule describes EPA's approach to expand the existing storm water program under CWA section 402(p)(6). As in all other Federal programs, the Federal government plays an integral role in complying with, developing, implementing, overseeing, and enforcing the program. This section describes EPA's role in the revised storm water program.

1. Develop Overall Framework of the Program

The storm water discharge control program under CWA section 402(p)(6) consists of the rule, tool box, and permits. EPA's primary role is to ensure

timely development and implementation of all components. Today's rule is a refinement of the first step in developing the program. EPA is fully committed to continuing to work with involved stakeholders on developing the tool box and issuing permits. As noted in today's rule, EPA will assess the municipal storm water program based on (1) evaluations of data from the NPDES municipal storm water program, (2) research concerning water quality impacts on receiving waters from storm water, and (3) research on BMP effectiveness. (Section II.H, Municipal Role, provides a more detailed discussion of this provision.)

EPA is planning to standardize minimum requirements for construction and post-construction BMPs in a new rulemaking under Title III of the CWA. While larger construction sites are already subject to NPDES permits (and smaller sites will be subject to permits pursuant to today's rule), the permits generally do not contain specific requirements for BMP design or performance. The permits require the preparation of storm water pollution prevention plans, but actual BMP selection and design is at the discretion of permittees, in conformance with applicable State and local requirements. Where there are existing State and local requirements specific to BMPs, they vary widely, and many jurisdictions do not have such requirements.

In developing these regulations, EPA intends to evaluate the inclusion of design and maintenance criteria as minimum requirements for a variety of BMPs used for erosion and sediment control at construction sites, as well as for permanent BMPs used to manage post-construction storm water discharges. The Agency plans to consider the merits and performance of all appropriate management practices (both structural and non-structural) that can be used to reduce adverse water quality impacts. EPA does not intend to require the use of particular BMPs at specific sites, but plans to assist builders and developers in BMP selection by publishing data on the performance to be expected by various BMP types. EPA would like to build upon the successes of some of the effective State and local storm water programs currently in place around the country, and to establish nation-wide criteria to support builders and local jurisdictions in appropriate BMP selection.

2. Encourage Consideration of Smart Growth Approaches

In the proposal, EPA invited comment on possible approaches for providing

incentives for local decision making that would limit the adverse impacts of growth and development on water quality. EPA asked for comments on this "smart growth" approach.

EPA received comments on all sides of this issue. A number of commenters supported the idea of "smart growth" incentives but did not present concrete ideas. Several commenters suggested "smart growth" criteria. States that have adopted "smart growth" laws were worried that EPA's focus on urbanized areas for municipal requirements could encourage development outside of designated growth areas. Today's final rule clearly allows States to expand coverage of their municipal storm water program outside of urbanized areas. In addition, the flexibility of the six municipal minimum measures should avoid encouragement of development into rural rather than urban areas. For example, as part of the post-construction minimum measure, EPA recommends that municipalities consider policies and ordinances that encourage infill development in higher density urban areas, and areas with existing infrastructure, in order to meet the measure's intent.

EPA also received several comments expressing concern that incorporating "smart growth" incentives threatened the autonomy of local governments. One commenter was worried that "incentives" could become more onerous than the minimum measures. EPA is very aware of municipal concerns about possible federal interference with local land use planning. EPA is also cognizant of the difficulty surrounding incentives for "smart growth" activities due to these concerns. However, the Agency believes it has addressed these concerns by proposing a flexible approach and will continue to support the concept of "smart growth" by encouraging policies that limit the adverse impacts of growth and development on water quality.

3. Provide Financial Assistance

Although Congress has not established a fund to fully finance implementation of the proposed extension of the existing NPDES storm water program under CWA section 402(p)(6), numerous federal financing programs (administered by EPA and other federal agencies) can provide some financial assistance. The primary funding mechanism is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) program, which provides sources of low-cost financing for a range of water quality infrastructure projects, including storm water. In addition to the SRF, federal financial assistance programs include

the Water Quality Cooperative Agreements under CWA section 104(b)(3), Water Pollution Control Program grants to States under CWA section 106, and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) among others. In addition, Section 319 funds may be used to fund any urban storm water activities that are not specifically required by a draft or final NPDES permit. EPA will develop a list of potential funding sources as part of the tool box implementation effort. EPA anticipates that some of these programs will provide funds to help develop and, in limited circumstances, implement the CWA section 402(p)(6) storm water discharge control program.

EPA received numerous comments that requested additional funding. Congress provided one substantial new source of potential funding for transportation related storm water projects—TEA-21. The Department of Transportation has included a number of water-related provisions in its TEA-21 planning. These include Transportation Enhancements, Environmental Restoration and Pollution Abatement, and Environmental Streamlining. More information on TEA-21 is available at the following internet sites: www.fhwa.dot.gov/tea21/outreach.htm and www.tea21.org.

4. Implement the Program in Jurisdictions Not Authorized To Administer the NPDES Program

Because today's final rule uses the NPDES framework, EPA will be the NPDES permitting authority in several States, Tribal jurisdictions, and Territories. As such, EPA will have the same responsibilities as any other NPDES permitting authority—issuing permits, designating additional sources, and taking appropriate enforcement actions—and will seek to tailor the storm water discharge control program to the specific needs in that State, Tribal jurisdiction, or Territory. EPA also plans to provide support and oversight, including outreach, training, and technical assistance to the regulated communities. Section II.G. of today's preamble provides a separate discussion related to the NPDES permitting authority's responsibilities for today's final rule.

5. Oversee State and Tribal Programs

Under the NPDES program, EPA plays an oversight role for NPDES-approved States and Tribes. In this role, EPA and the State or Tribe work together to implement, enforce, and improve the NPDES program. Part of this oversight role includes working with States and

Tribes to modify their programs where programmatic or implementation concerns impede program effectiveness. This role will be vitally important when States and Tribes make adjustments to develop, implement, and enforce today's extension of the existing NPDES storm water discharge control program. In addition, States maintain a continuing planning process (CPP) under CWA section 303(e), which EPA periodically reviews to assess the program's achievements.

In its oversight role, EPA takes action to address States and Tribes who have obtained NPDES authorization but are not fulfilling their obligations under the NPDES program. If an NPDES-authorized State or Tribe fails to implement an adequate NPDES storm water program, for example, EPA typically enters into extensive discussions to resolve outstanding issues. EPA has the authority to withdraw the entire NPDES program when resolution cannot be reached. Partial program withdrawal is not provided for under the CWA except for partial approvals.

EPA is also working with the States and Tribes to improve nonpoint source management programs and assessments to incorporate key program elements. Key nonpoint source program elements include setting short and long term goals and objectives; establishing public and private partnerships; using a balanced approach incorporating Statewide and watershed-wide abatement of existing impairments; preventing future impairments; developing processes to address both impaired and threatened waters; reviewing and upgrading all program components, including program revisions on a 5-year cycle; addressing federal land management and activities inconsistent with State programs; and managing State nonpoint source management programs effectively.

In particular, EPA works with the States and Tribes to strengthen their nonpoint source pollution programs to address all significant nonpoint sources, including agricultural sources, through the CWA section 319 program. EPA is working with other government agencies, as well as with community groups, to effect voluntary changes regarding watershed protection and reduced nonpoint source pollution.

In addition, EPA and NOAA have published programmatic and technical guidance to address coastal nonpoint source pollution. Under Section 6217 of the CZARA, States are developing and implementing coastal nonpoint pollution control programs approved by EPA and NOAA.

6. Comply With Applicable Requirements as a Discharger

Today's final rule covers federally operated facilities in a variety of ways. These facilities are generally areas where people reside, such as a federal prison, hospital, or military base. It also includes federal parkways and road systems with separate storm sewer systems. Today's rule requires federal MS4s to comply with the same application deadlines that apply to regulated small MS4s generally. EPA believes that all federal MS4s serve populations of less than 100,000.

EPA received several comments that asked if individual buildings like post offices are considered to be small MS4s and thereby regulated in today's rule if they are in an urbanized area. Most of these buildings have at most a parking lot with runoff or a storm sewer that connects with a municipality's MS4. EPA does not intend that individual federal buildings be considered to be small MS4s. This is discussed in section II.H.2.b. of today's preamble.

Federal facilities can also be included under requirements addressing storm water discharges associated with small construction activities. In any case, discharges from these facilities will need to comply with all applicable NPDES requirements and any additional water quality-related requirements imposed by a State, Tribal, or local government. Failure to comply can result in enforcement actions. Federal facilities can act as models for municipal and private sector facilities and implement or test state-of-the-art management practices and control measures.

E. State Role

Today's final rule sets forth an NPDES approach for implementing the extension of the existing storm water discharge control program under CWA section 402(p)(6). State assumption of the NPDES program is voluntary, consistent with the principles of federalism. Because most States are approved to implement the NPDES program, they will tailor their storm water discharge control programs to address their water quality needs and objectives. While today's rule establishes the basic framework for the section 402(p)(6) program, States as well as Tribes (see discussion in section II.F) have an important role in fine-tuning the program to address the water quality issues within their jurisdictions. The basic framework allows for adjustments based on factors that vary geographically, including climate patterns and terrain.

Where States do not have NPDES authority, they are not required to implement the storm water discharge control program, but they may still participate in water quality protection through participation in the CWA section 401 certification process (for any permits) and through development of water quality standards and TMDLs.

1. Develop the Program

In expanding the existing NPDES program for storm water discharges, States must evaluate whether revisions to their NPDES programs are necessary. If so, modifications must be made in accordance with § 123.62. Under § 123.62, States must revise their NPDES programs within 1 year, or within 2 years if statutory changes are necessary.

Some States and departments of transportation (DOTs) commented that this timeframe is too short, anticipating that the State legislative process and the modification of regulations combined would take beyond 2 years. The deadline language in § 123.62 is not new language for the storm water discharge control program; it applies to all NPDES programs. EPA believes the vast majority of States will meet the deadline and will work with States in those cases where there may be difficulty meeting this deadline due to the timing of legislative sessions and the regulatory development process.

An authorized State NPDES program must meet the requirements of CWA section 402(b) and conform to the guidelines issued under CWA section 304(i)(2). Today's final rule under § 123.25 adds specific cross references to the storm water discharge control program components to ensure that States adequately address these requirements.

2. Comply With Applicable Requirements as a Discharger

Today's final rule covers State operated separate storm sewer systems in a variety of ways. These systems generally drain areas where people reside, such as a prison, hospital, or other populated facility. These systems are included under the definition of a regulated small MS4, which specifically identifies systems operated by State departments of transportation. Alternatively, storm water discharges from State activities may be regulated under the section addressing storm water discharges associated with small construction activities. In any case, discharges from these facilities must comply with all applicable NPDES requirements. Failure to comply can result in enforcement actions. State facilities can act as models for

municipal and private sector facilities and implement or test state-of-the-art management practices and control measures.

3. Communicate With EPA

Under approved NPDES programs, States have an ongoing obligation to share information with EPA. This dialogue is particularly important in the CWA section 402(p)(6) storm water program where these governments continue to develop a great deal of the guidance and outreach related to water quality.

F. Tribal Role

The proposal to today's final rule provides background information on EPA's 1984 Indian Policy and the criteria for treatment of an Indian Tribe in the same manner as a State. Today's final rule extends the existing NPDES program for storm water discharges to two types of dischargers located in Indian country. First, the final rule designates storm water discharges from any regulated small MS4, including Tribal systems. Second, the final rule regulates discharges associated with construction activity disturbing between one and five acres of land, including sites located in Indian country. Operators in each of these categories of regulated activity must apply for coverage under an NPDES permit by 3 years and 90 days from the date of publication of today's final rule. Under existing regulations, however, EPA or an authorized NPDES Tribe may require a specified storm water discharger to apply for NPDES permit coverage before this deadline based on a determination that the discharge is contributing to a violation of a water quality standard (including designated uses) or is a significant contributor of pollutants.

Under today's rule, a Tribal governmental entity may regulate storm water discharges on its reservation in two ways—as either an NPDES-authorized Tribe or as a regulated MS4. If a Tribe is authorized to operate the NPDES program, the Tribe must implement today's final rule for the NPDES program for storm water for covered dischargers located within the EPA recognized boundaries. Otherwise, EPA is generally the permitting/program authority within Indian country. Discussions about the State Role in the preceding section also apply to NPDES authorized Tribes. For additional information on the role and responsibilities of the permitting authority in the NPDES storm water program, see § 123.35 (and Section II.G. of today's preamble) and § 123.25(a).

Under today's final rule, if the Indian reservation is located entirely or partially within an "urbanized area," as defined in § 122.32(a)(1), the Tribe must obtain an NPDES permit if it operates a small MS4 within the urbanized area portion. Tribal MS4s located outside an urbanized area are not automatically covered, but may be designated by EPA pursuant to § 122.32(a)(2) of today's rule or may request designation as a regulated small MS4 from EPA. A Tribe that is a regulated MS4 for NPDES program purposes is required to implement the six minimum control measures to the extent allowable under Federal law.

The Tribal representative on the Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee asked EPA to provide a list of the Tribes located in urbanized areas that would fall within the NPDES storm water program under today's final rule. In December 1996, EPA developed a list of federally recognized American Indian Areas located wholly or partially in Bureau of the Census-designated urbanized areas (see Appendix 1). Appendix 1 not only provides a listing of reservations and individual Tribes, but also the name of the particular urbanized area in which the reservation is located and an indication of whether the urbanized area contains a medium or large MS4 that is already covered by the existing Phase I regulations.

Some of the Tribes listed in Appendix 1 are only partially located in an urbanized area. If the Tribe's MS4 serves less than 1,000 people within an urbanized area, the permitting authority may waive the Tribe's MS4 storm water requirements if it meets the conditions of § 122.32(c). EPA does not have information on the Tribal populations within the urbanized areas, so it can not identify the Tribes that are eligible for a waiver. Therefore, a Tribe that believes it qualifies for a waiver should contact its permitting authority.

G. NPDES Permitting Authority's Role for the NPDES Storm Water Small MS4 Program

As noted previously, the NPDES permitting authority can be EPA or an authorized State or an authorized Tribe. The following discussion describes the role of the NPDES permitting authority under today's final rule.

1. Comply With Implementation Requirements

NPDES permitting authorities must perform certain duties to implement the NPDES storm water municipal program. Section 123.35(a) of today's final rule emphasizes that permitting authorities have existing obligations under the

NPDES program. Section 123.35 focuses on specific issues related to the role of the NPDES authority to support administration and implementation of the municipal storm water program under CWA section 402(p)(6).

2. Designate Sources

Section 123.35(b) of today's final rule addresses the requirements for the NPDES permitting authority to designate sources of storm water discharges to be regulated under §§ 122.32 through 122.36. NPDES permitting authorities must develop a process, as well as criteria, to designate small MS4s. They must also have the authority to designate a small MS4 if and when circumstances that support a waiver under § 122.32(c) change. EPA may make designations if an NPDES-approved State or Tribe fails to do so.

NPDES permitting authorities must examine geographic jurisdictions that they believe should be included in the storm water discharge control program but are not located in an "urbanized area". Small MS4s in these areas are not designated automatically. Discharges from such areas should be brought into the program if found to have actual or potential exceedances of water quality standards, including impairment of designated uses, or other adverse impacts on water quality, as determined by local conditions or watershed and TMDL assessments. EPA's aim is to address discharges to impaired waters and to protect waters with the potential for problems. EPA encourages NPDES permitting authorities, local governments, and the interested public to work together in the context of a watershed plan to address water quality issues, including those associated with municipal storm water runoff.

EPA received comments stating that the process of developing criteria and applying it to all MS4s outside an urbanized area serving a population of 10,000 or greater and with a density of 1,000 people per square mile is too time-consuming and resource-intensive. These commenters believe that the permitting authority should decide which MS4s must be brought into the storm water discharge control program and that population and density should not be an overriding criteria. One suggested way of doing so was to only designate MS4s with demonstrated contributions to the impairment of water quality uses as shown by a TMDL. EPA disagrees with this suggestion. The TMDL process is time-consuming. MS4s outside of urbanized areas may cause water quality problems long before a TMDL is completed.

EPA believes that permitting authorities should consider the potential water quality impacts of storm water from all jurisdictions with a population of 10,000 or greater and a density of 1,000 people per square mile. EPA is using data summarized in the NURP study and in the CWA section 305(b) reports to support this approach for targeted designation outside of urbanized areas. EPA is not mandating which criteria are to be used, but has provided examples of criteria that may be useful in evaluating potential water quality impacts. EPA believes that the flexibility provided in this section of today's final rule allows the permitting authority to develop criteria and a designation process that is easy to use and protects water quality. Therefore, the provisions of § 123.35(b) remain as proposed.

a. Develop Designation Criteria

Under § 123.35(b), the NPDES permitting authority must establish designation criteria to evaluate whether a storm water discharge results in or has the potential to result in exceedances of water quality standards, including impairment of designated uses, or other significant water quality impacts, including adverse habitat and biological impacts.

EPA recommends that NPDES permitting authorities consider, in a balanced manner, certain locally-focused criteria for designating any MS4 located outside of an urbanized area on the basis of significant water quality impacts. EPA recommends consideration of criteria such as discharge to sensitive waters, high growth or growth potential, high population density, contiguity to an urbanized area, significant contribution of pollutants to waters of the United States, and ineffective control of water quality concerns by other programs. These suggested designation criteria are intended to help encourage the permitting authority to use an objective method for identifying and designating, on a local basis, sources that adversely impact water quality. More information about these criteria and the reasons why they are suggested by EPA is included in the January 9, 1998, proposal (63 FR 1561) for today's final rule.

The suggested criteria are meant to be taken in the aggregate, with a great deal of flexibility as to how each should be weighed in order to best account for watershed and other local conditions and to allow for a more tailored case-by-case analysis. The application of criteria is meant to be geographically specific. Furthermore, each criterion does not have to be met in order for a small MS4

to qualify for designation, nor should an MS4 necessarily be designated on the basis of one or two criteria alone.

EPA believes that the application of the recommended designation criteria provides an objective indicator of real and potential water quality impacts from urban runoff on both the local and watershed levels. EPA encourages the application of the recommended criteria in a watershed context, thereby allowing for the evaluation of the water quality impacts of the portions of a watershed outside of an urbanized area. For example, situations exist where the urbanized area represents a small portion of a degraded watershed, and the adjacent nonurbanized areas of the watershed have significant cumulative effects on the quality of the receiving waters.

EPA received numerous suggestions of additional criteria that should be added and reasons why some of the criteria in the proposal to today's final rule were not appropriate. EPA developed its suggested designation criteria based on findings of the NURP study and other studies that indicate pollutants of concern, including total suspended solids, chemical oxygen demand, and temperature. These criteria were the subject of considerable discussion by the Storm Water Phase II FACA Subcommittee. EPA developed them in response to recommendations from the subcommittee during development of the proposed rule. The listed criteria are only suggestions. Permitting authorities are required to develop their own criteria. EPA has not found any reason to change its suggested list of criteria and the suggestions remain as proposed.

b. Apply Designation Criteria

After customizing the designation criteria for local conditions, the permitting authority must apply such criteria, at a minimum, to any MS4 located outside of an urbanized area serving a jurisdiction with a population of at least 10,000 and a population density of 1,000 people per square mile or greater (see § 123.35(b)(2)). If the NPDES permitting authority determines that an MS4 meets the criteria, the permitting authority must designate it as a regulated small MS4. This designation must occur within 3 years of publication of today's final rule. Alternatively, the NPDES authority can designate within 5 years from the date of final regulation if the designation criteria are applied on a watershed basis where a comprehensive watershed plan exists (a comprehensive watershed plan is one that includes the equivalents of TMDLs) (see § 123.35(b)(3)). The extended 5 year

deadline is intended to provide incentives for watershed-based designations. If an NPDES-authorized State or Tribe does not develop and apply designation criteria within this timeframe, then EPA has the opportunity to do so in lieu of the authorized State or Tribe.

NPDES permitting authorities can designate any small MS4, including one below 10,000 in population and 1,000 in density. EPA established the 10,000/1,000 threshold based on the likelihood of adverse water quality impacts at these population and density levels. In addition, the 1,000 persons per square mile threshold is consistent with both the Bureau of the Census definition of an "urbanized area" (see Section II.H.2. below) and stakeholder discussions concerning the definition of a regulated small MS4.

One commenter requested that EPA develop interim deadlines for development of designation criteria. EPA believes that the designation deadline identified in today's final rule at § 123.35(b)(3) provides States and Tribes with a flexibility that allows them to develop and apply the criteria locally in a timely fashion, while at the same time establishing an expeditious deadline.

c. Designate Physically Interconnected Small MS4s

In addition to applying criteria on a local basis for potential designation, the NPDES permitting authority must designate any MS4 that contributes substantially to the pollutant loadings of a physically interconnected municipal separate storm sewer that is regulated by the NPDES program for storm water discharges (see § 123.35(b)(4)). To be "physically interconnected," the MS4 of one entity, including roads with drainage systems and municipal streets, is physically connected directly to the municipal separate storm sewer of another entity. This provision applies to all MS4s located outside of an urbanized area. EPA added this section in recognition of the concerns of local government stakeholders that a local government should not have to shoulder total responsibility for a storm water program when storm water discharges from another MS4 are also contributing pollutants or adversely affecting water quality. This provision also helps to provide some consistency among MS4 programs and to facilitate watershed planning in the implementation of the NPDES storm water program. EPA recommended physical interconnectedness in the existing NPDES storm water regulations as a

factor for consideration in the designation of additional sources.

Today's final rule does not include interim deadlines for identifying physically interconnected MS4s. However, consistent with the deadlines identified in § 123.35(b)(3) of today's final rule, EPA encourages the permitting authority to make these determinations within 3 years from the date of publication of the final rule or within 5 years if the permitting authority is implementing a comprehensive watershed plan. Alternatively, the affected jurisdiction could use the petition process under 40 CFR 122.26(f) in seeking to have the permitting authority designate the contributing jurisdiction.

Several commenters expressed concerns about who could be designated under this provision (§ 123.35(b)(4)). One commenter requested that the word "substantially" be deleted from the rule because they believe any MS4 that contributes at all to a physically interconnected municipal separate storm sewer should be regulated. EPA believes that the word "substantially" provides necessary flexibility to the permitting authorities. The permitting authority can decide if an MS4 is contributing discharges to another municipal separate storm sewer in a manner that requires regulation. If the operator of a regulated municipal separate storm sewer believes that some of its pollutant loadings are coming from an unregulated MS4, it can petition the permitting authority to designate the unregulated MS4 for regulation.

d. Respond to Public Petitions for Designation

Today's final rule reiterates the existing opportunity for the public to petition the permitting authority for designation of a point source to be regulated to protect water quality. The petition opportunity also appears in existing NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 122.26(f). Any person may petition the permitting authority to require an NPDES permit for a discharge composed entirely of storm water that contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to the waters of the United States (see § 123.32(b)). The NPDES permitting authority must make a final determination on any petition within 180 days after receiving the petition (see § 123.35(c)). EPA believes that a 180 day limit balances the public's need for a timely final determination with the NPDES permitting authority's need to prioritize its workload. If an NPDES-approved State or Tribe fails to act

within the 180-day timeframe, EPA may make a determination on the petition. EPA believes that public involvement is an important component of the NPDES program for storm water and feels that this provision encourages public participation. Section II.K, Public Involvement/Public Role, further discusses this topic.

3. Provide Waivers

Today's rule provides two opportunities for the NPDES permitting authority to exempt certain small MS4s from the need for a permit based on water quality considerations. See §§ 122.32(d) and (e). The two waiver opportunities have different size thresholds and take different approaches to considering the water quality impacts of discharges from the MS4.

In the proposal, EPA requested comment on the option of waiving coverage for all MS4s with less than 1,000 people unless the permitting authority determined that the small MS4 should be regulated based on significant adverse water quality impacts. A number of commenters supported this option. They expressed concern that compliance with the rule requirements and certification of one of the waiver provisions were both costly for very small communities. They stated that the permitting authority should identify a water quality problem before requiring compliance. Today's rule essentially adopts this alternative approach for MS4s serving a population under 1,000.

The final rule has expanded the waiver provision that EPA proposed for small MS4s with a population less than 1,000. The proposed rule would have required a small MS4 operator to certify that storm water controls are not needed based on either wasteload allocations that are part of TMDLs that address the pollutants of concern, or a comprehensive watershed plan implemented for the waterbody that includes the equivalents of TMDLs and addresses the pollutant(s) of concern. Commenters noted that the proposed waivers would be unattainable if a TMDL or equivalent analysis was required for every pollutant that could possibly be present in any amount in discharges from an MS4 regardless of whether the pollutant is causing water quality impairment. Commenters asked that EPA identify what constitutes the "pollutant(s) of concern" for which a TMDL or its equivalent must be developed. For example, § 122.30(c) indicates that the MS4 program is intended to control "sediment, suspended solids, nutrients, heavy

metals, pathogens, toxins, oxygen-demanding substances, and floatables." Commenters asked whether TMDLs or equivalent analyses have to address all of these.

EPA has revised the proposed waiver in response to these concerns. Under today's rule, NPDES permitting authorities may waive the requirements of today's rule for any small MS4 with a population less than 1,000 that does not contribute substantially to the pollutant loadings of a physically interconnected MS4, unless the small MS4 discharges pollutants that have been identified as a cause of impairment of the waters to which the small MS4 discharges. If the small MS4 does discharge pollutants that have been identified as impairing the water body into which the small MS4 discharges, the NPDES permitting authority may grant a waiver only if it determines that storm water controls are not needed based on an EPA approved or established TMDL that addresses the pollutant(s) of concern.

Unlike the proposed rule, § 122.32(d) does not allow the waiver for MS4s serving a population under 1,000 to be based on "the equivalent of a TMDL." Because § 122.32(d) requires a pollutant specific analysis only for a pollutant that has been identified as a cause of impairment, a TMDL is required for such pollutant before the waiver may be granted. Once a pollutant has been identified as the cause of impairment of a water body, the State should develop a TMDL for that pollutant for that water body. Thus, § 122.32(d) takes a different approach than that taken for the waiver in § 122.32(e) for MS4s serving a population under 10,000, which can be based upon an analysis that is "the equivalent of a TMDL." This is because § 122.32(d) requires an analysis to support the waiver for MS4s under 1,000 only if a waterbody to which the MS4 discharges has been identified as impaired. The § 122.32(e) waiver, on the other hand, would be available for larger MS4s but only after the State affirmatively establishes lack of impairment based upon a comprehensive analysis of smaller urban waters that might not otherwise be evaluated for the purposes of CWA section 303. Since § 122.32(e) requires the analysis of waters that have not been identified as impaired, an actual TMDL is not required and an analysis that is the equivalent of a TMDL can suffice to support the waiver.

Where a State is the NPDES permitting authority, the permitting authority is responsible for the development of the TMDLs as well as the assessment of the extent to which a

small MS4's discharge contributes pollutants to a neighboring regulated system. In States where EPA is the permitting authority, EPA will use a State's TMDLs to determine whether storm water controls are required for the small MS4s.

The proposed rule would have required the operator of the small MS4 serving a population under 1,000 to certify that its discharge was covered under a TMDL that indicated that discharges from its particular system were not having an adverse impact on water quality (i.e., it was either not assigned wasteload allocations under TMDLs or its discharge is within an assigned allocation). Many commenters expressed concerns that MS4 operators serving less than 1,000 persons may lack the technical capacity to certify that their discharges are not contributing to adverse water quality impacts. These commenters thought that the permitting authority should make such a certification. Today's rule provides flexibility as to how the waiver is administered. Permitting authorities are ultimately responsible for granting the waiver, but are free to determine whether or not to require small MS4 operators that are seeking waivers to submit information or a written certification.

Under § 122.32(e) a State may grant a waiver to an MS4 serving a population between 1,000 and 10,000 only if the State has made a comprehensive effort to ensure that the MS4 will not cause or contribute to water quality impairment. To grant a § 122.32(e) waiver, the NPDES permitting authority must evaluate all waters of the U.S. that receive a discharge from the MS4 and determine that storm water controls are not needed. The permitting authority's evaluation must be based on wasteload allocations that are part of an EPA approved or established TMDL or, if a TMDL has not been developed or approved, an equivalent analysis that determines sources and allocations for the pollutant(s) of concern. The pollutants of concern that the permitting authority must evaluate include biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), sediment or a parameter that addresses sediment (such as total suspended solids, turbidity or siltation), pathogens, oil and grease, and any other pollutant that has been identified as a cause of impairment of any water body that will receive a discharge from the MS4. Finally, the permitting authority must have determined that future discharges from the MS4 do not have the potential to result in exceedances of water quality standards, including impairment of designated uses, or other significant

water quality impacts, including habitat and biological impacts.

Although EPA did not propose this specific approach, the Agency did request comment on whether to increase the proposed 1,000 population threshold for a waiver. The § 122.32(e) waiver was developed in response to comments, including States' concerns that they needed greater flexibility to focus their efforts on MS4s that were causing water quality impairment. Several commenters thought that the threshold should be increased from 1,000 to 5,000 or 10,000. Others suggested additional ways of qualifying for a waiver for MS4s that discharge to waters that are not covered by a TMDL or watershed plan. EPA carefully considered all the options for expanding the waiver provisions and has decided to expand the waiver only in the very narrow circumstances described above where a comprehensive analysis has been undertaken to demonstrate that the MS4 is not causing water quality impairment.

The NPDES permitting authority can, at any time, mandate compliance with program requirements from a previously waived small MS4 if circumstances change. For example, a waiver can be withdrawn in circumstances where the permitting authority later determines that a waived small MS4's storm water discharge to a small stream will cause adverse impacts to water quality or significantly interfere with attainment of water quality standards. A "change in circumstances" could involve receipt of new information. Changed circumstances can also allow a regulated small MS4 operator to request a waiver at any time.

Some commenters expressed concerns about allowing any small MS4 waivers. One commenter stated that storm water pollution prevention plans are necessary to control storm water pollution and should be required from all regulated small MS4s. For the reasons stated in the Background section above, EPA agrees that the discharges from most MS4s in urbanized areas should be addressed by a storm water management program outlined in today's rule. For MS4s serving very small areas, however, the TMDL development process provides an opportunity to determine whether an MS4 serving a population less than 1,000 is having a negative impact on any receiving water that is impaired by a pollutant that the MS4 discharges. MS4s serving populations up to 10,000 may receive a waiver only if a comprehensive analysis of its impact on receiving water has been performed.

Other commenters said that waivers should not be allowed for small MS4s that discharge into another regulated MS4. These commenters stated that the word "substantially" should be removed from § 122.32(d)(i) so that a waiver would not be allowed for any system "contributing to the storm water pollutant loadings of a physically interconnected regulated MS4." As previously mentioned under the designation discussion of section II.G.2.c, EPA believes that the word "substantially" provides needed flexibility to the permitting authorities. It is important to note that this is only one aspect that the permitting authority must consider when deciding on the appropriateness of a waiver.

4. Issue Permits

NPDES permitting authorities have a number of responsibilities regarding the permit process. Sections 123.35(d) through (g) ensure a certain level of consistency for permits, yet provide numerous opportunities for flexibility. NPDES permitting authorities must issue NPDES permits to cover municipal sources to be regulated under § 122.32, unless waived under § 122.32(c). EPA encourages permitting authorities to use general permits as the vehicle for permitting and regulating small MS4s. The Agency notes, however, that some operators may wish to take advantage of the option to join as a co-permittee with an MS4 regulated under the existing NPDES storm water program.

Today's final rule includes a provision, § 123.35(f), that requires NPDES permitting authorities to either include the requirements in § 122.34 for NPDES permits issued for regulated small MS4s or to develop permit limits based on a permit application submitted by a small MS4. See Section II.H.3.a, Minimum Control Measures, for more details on the actual § 122.34 requirements. See Section II.H.3.c for alternative and joint permitting options.

In an attempt to avoid duplication of effort, § 122.34(c) allows NPDES permitting authorities to include permit conditions that direct an MS4 to meet the requirements of a qualifying local, Tribal, or State municipal storm water management program. For a local, Tribal, or State program to "qualify," it must impose, at a minimum, the relevant requirements of § 122.34(b). A regulated small MS4 must still follow the procedural requirements for an NPDES permit (i.e., submit an application, either an individual application or an NOI under a general permit) but will instead follow the substantive pollutant control

requirements of the qualifying local, Tribal, or State program.

Under § 122.35(b), NPDES permitting authorities may also recognize existing responsibilities among governmental entities for the minimum control measures in an NPDES small MS4 storm water permit. For example, the permit might acknowledge the existence of a State administered program that addresses construction site runoff and require that the municipalities only develop substantive controls for the remaining minimum control measures. By acknowledging existing programs, this provision is meant to reduce the duplication of efforts and to increase the flexibility of the NPDES storm water program.

Section 123.35(e) of today's final rule requires permitting authorities to specify a time period of up to 5 years from the issuance date of an NPDES permit for regulated small MS4 operators to fully develop and implement their storm water programs. As discussed more fully below, permitting authorities should be providing extensive support to the local governments to assist them in developing and implementing their programs.

In the proposed rule, EPA stated that the permitting authority would develop the menu of BMPs and if they failed to do so, EPA would develop the menu. Commenters felt that EPA should develop a menu of BMPs, rather than just providing guidance. In the settlement agreement for seeking an extension to the deadline for issuing today's rule, EPA committed to developing a menu of BMPs by October 27, 2000. Permitting authorities can adopt EPA's menu or develop their own. The menu itself is not intended to replace more comprehensive BMP guidance materials. As part of the tool box efforts, EPA will provide separate guidance documents that discuss the results from EPA-sponsored nationwide studies on the design, operation and maintenance of BMPs. Additionally, EPA expects that the new rulemaking on construction BMPs may provide more specific design, operation and maintenance criteria.

5. Support and Oversee the Local Programs

NPDES permitting authorities are responsible for supporting and overseeing the local municipal programs. Section 123.35(h) of today's final rule highlights issues associated with these responsibilities.

To the extent possible, NPDES permitting authorities should provide financial assistance to MS4s, which

often have limited resources, for the development and implementation of local programs. EPA recognizes that funding for programs at the State and Tribal levels may also be limited, but strongly encourages States and Tribes to provide whatever assistance is possible. In lieu of actual dollars, NPDES permitting authorities can provide cost-cutting assistance in a number of ways. For example, NPDES permitting authorities can develop outreach materials for MS4s to distribute or the NPDES permitting authority can actually distribute the materials. Another option is to implement an erosion and sediment control program across an entire State (or Tribal land), thus alleviating the need for the MS4 to implement its own program. The NPDES permitting authority must balance the need for site-specific controls, which are best handled by a local MS4, with its ability to offer financial assistance. EPA, States, Tribes, and MS4s should work as a team in making these kinds of decisions.

NPDES permitting authorities are responsible for overseeing the local programs. Permitting authorities should work with the regulated community and other stakeholders to assist in local program development and implementation. This might include sharing information, analyzing reports, and taking enforcement actions, as necessary. NPDES permitting authorities play a vital role in supporting local programs by providing technical and programmatic assistance, conducting research projects, and monitoring watersheds. The NPDES permitting authority can also assist the MS4 permittee in obtaining adequate legal authority at the local level in order to implement the local component of the CWA section 402(p)(6) program.

NPDES permitting authorities are encouraged to coordinate and utilize the data collected under several programs. States and Tribes address point and nonpoint source storm water discharges through a variety of programs. In developing programs to carry out CWA section 402(p)(6), EPA recommends that States and Tribes coordinate all of their water pollution evaluation and control programs, including the continuing planning process under CWA section 303(e), the existing NPDES program, the CZARA program, and nonpoint source pollution control programs.

In addition, NPDES permitting authorities are encouraged to provide a brief (e.g., two-page) reporting format to facilitate compilation and analysis of data from reports submitted under § 122.34(g)(3). EPA intends to develop a model form for this purpose.

H. Municipal Role

1. Scope of Today's Rule

Today's final rule attempts to establish an equitable and comprehensive four-pronged approach for the designation of municipal sources. First, the approach defines for automatic coverage the municipal systems believed to be of highest threat to water quality. Second, the approach designates municipal systems that meet a set of objective criteria used to measure the potential for water quality impacts. Third, the approach designates on a case-by-case basis municipal systems that "contribute substantially to the pollutant loadings of a physically-interconnected [regulated] MS4." Finally, the approach designates on a case-by-case basis, upon petition, municipal systems that "contribute to a violation of a water quality standard or are a significant contributor of pollutants."

Today's final rule automatically designates for regulation small MS4s located in urbanized areas, and requires that NPDES permitting authorities examine for potential designation, at a minimum, a particular subset of small MS4s located outside of urbanized areas. Today's rule also includes provisions that allow for waivers from the otherwise applicable requirements for the smallest MS4s that are not causing impairment of a receiving water body. Qualifications for the waivers vary depending on whether the MS4 serves a population under 1,000 or a population under 10,000. See §§ 122.32(d) and (e). These waivers are discussed further in section II.G.3. Any small MS4 automatically designated by the final rule or designated by the permitting authority under today's final rule is defined as a "regulated" small MS4 unless it receives a waiver.

In today's final rule, all regulated small MS4s must establish a storm water discharge control program that meets the requirements of six minimum control measures. These minimum control measures are public education and outreach on storm water impacts, public involvement participation, illicit discharge detection and elimination, construction site storm water runoff control, post-construction storm water management in new development and redevelopment, and pollution prevention/good housekeeping for municipal operations.

Today's rule allows for a great deal of flexibility in how an operator of a regulated small MS4 is authorized to discharge under an NPDES permit, by providing various options for obtaining permit coverage and satisfying the

required minimum control measures. For example, the NPDES permitting authority can incorporate by reference qualifying State, Tribal, or local programs in an NPDES general permit and can recognize existing responsibilities among different governmental entities for the implementation of minimum control measures. In addition, a regulated small MS4 can participate in the storm water management program of an adjoining regulated MS4 and can arrange to have another governmental entity implement a minimum control measure on their behalf.

2. Municipal Definitions

a. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)

The CWA does not define the term "municipal separate storm sewer." EPA defined municipal separate storm sewer in the existing storm water permit application regulations to mean, in part, a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems and municipal streets) that is "owned or operated by a State, city, town borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body * * * designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water which is not a combined sewer and which is not part of a Publicly Owned Treatment Works as defined at 40 CFR 122.2" (see § 122.26(b)(8)(i)). Section 122.26 contains definitions of medium and large municipal separate storm sewer systems but no definition of a municipal separate storm sewer system, even though the term MS4 is commonly used. In today's rule, EPA is adding a definition of municipal separate storm sewer system and small municipal separate storm sewer system along with the abbreviations MS4 and small MS4.

The existing municipal permit application regulations define "medium" and "large" MS4s as those located in an incorporated place or county with a population of at least 100,000 (medium) or 250,000 (large) as determined by the latest Decennial Census (see §§ 122.26(b)(4) and 122.26(b)(7)). In today's final rule, these regulations have been revised to define all medium and large MS4s as those meeting the above population thresholds according to the 1990 Decennial Census.

Today's rule also corrects the titles and contents of Appendices F, G, H, & I to Part 122. EPA is adding those incorporated places and counties whose 1990 population caused them to be defined as a "medium" or "large" MS4. All of these MS4s have applied for

permit coverage so the effect of this change to the appendices is simply to make them more accurate. They will not need to be revised again because today's rule "freezes" the definition of "medium" and "large" MS4s at those that qualify based on the 1990 census.

EPA received several comments supporting and opposing the proposal to "freeze" the definitions based on the 1990 census. Commenters who disagreed with EPA's position cited the unfairness of municipalities that reach the medium or large threshold at a later date having fewer permitting requirements compared to those that were already at the population thresholds when the existing storm water regulations took effect. EPA recognizes this disparity but does not believe it is unfair, as explained in the proposed rule. The decision was based on the fact that the deadlines from the existing regulations have lapsed, and because the permitting authority can always require more from operators of MS4s serving "newly over 100,000" populations.

b. Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

The proposal to today's final rule added "the United States" as a potential owner or operator of a municipal separate storm sewer. This addition was intended to address an omission from existing regulations and to clarify that federal facilities are, in fact, covered by the NPDES program for municipal storm water discharges when the federal facility is like other regulated MS4s. EPA received a comment that this change would cause federal facilities located in Phase 1 areas to be considered Phase 1 dischargers due to the definition of medium and large MS4s. All MS4s located in Phase 1 cities or counties are defined as Phase 1 medium or large MS4s. EPA believes that all federal facilities serve a population of under 100,000 and should be regulated as small MS4s. Therefore, in § 122.26(a)(16) of today's final rule, EPA is adding federal facilities to the NPDES storm water discharge control program by changing the proposed definition of small municipal separate storm sewer system. Paragraph (i) of this section restates the definition of municipal separate storm sewer with the addition of "the United States" as a owner or operator of a small municipal separate storm sewer. Paragraph (ii) repeats the proposed language that states that a small MS4 is a municipal separate storm sewer that is not medium or large.

Most commenters agreed that federal facilities should be covered in the same

way as other similar MS4s. However, EPA received several comments asking whether individual federal buildings such as post offices or urban offices of the U.S. Park Service must apply for coverage as regulated small MS4s. Most of these buildings have, at most, a parking lot with runoff or a storm sewer that connects with a municipality's MS4. In § 122.26(a)(16)(iii), EPA clarifies that the definition of small MS4 does not include individual buildings. These buildings may have a municipal separate storm sewer but they do not have a "system" of conveyances. The minimum measures for small MS4s were written to apply to storm sewer "systems" providing storm water drainage service to human populations and not to individual buildings. This is true of municipal separate storm sewers from State buildings as well as from federal buildings.

There will likely be situations where the permitting authority must decide if a federal or State complex should be regulated as a small MS4. A federal complex of two or three buildings could be treated as a single building and not be required to apply for coverage. In these situations, permitting authorities will have to use their best judgment as to the nature of the complex and its storm water conveyance system. Permitting authorities should also consider whether the federal or State complex cooperates with its municipality's efforts to implement their storm water management program.

Along with the questions about individual buildings, EPA received many questions about how various provisions of the rule should be interpreted for federal and State facilities. EPA acknowledges that federal and State facilities are different from municipalities. EPA believes, however, that the minimum measures are flexible enough that they can be implemented by these facilities. As an example, DOD commenters asked about how to interpret the term "public" for military installations when implementing the public education measure. EPA agrees with the suggested interpretation of "public" for DOD facilities as "the resident and employee population within the fence line of the facility."

EPA also received many comments from State departments of transportation (DOTs) that suggested the ways in which they are different from municipalities and should therefore be regulated differently. Storm water discharges from State DOTs in Phase 1 areas should already be regulated under Phase I. The preamble to Phase 1 clearly states that "all systems within a

geographical area including highways and flood control districts will be covered." Many permitting authorities regulated State DOTs as co-permittees with the Phase 1 municipality in which the highway is located. State DOTs that are already regulated under Phase I are not required to comply with Phase II. State DOTs that are not already regulated have various options for meeting the requirements of today's rule. These options are discussed in Section II.H.3.c.iv below. Several DOTs commented that some of the minimum measures are outside the scope of their mission or that they do not have the legal authority required for implementation. EPA believes that the flexibility of the minimum measures allows them to be implemented by most MS4s, including DOTs. When a DOT does not have the necessary legal authority, EPA encourages the DOT to coordinate their storm water management efforts with the surrounding municipalities and other State agencies. Under today's rule, DOTs can use any of the options of § 122.35 to share their storm water management responsibilities. DOTs may also want to work with their permitting authority to develop a State-wide DOT storm water permit.

There are many storm water discharges from State DOTs and other State MS4s located in Phase 1 areas that were not regulated under Phase 1. Today's rule adds many more State facilities as well as all federal facilities located in urbanized areas. All of these State and federal facilities that fit the definition of a small MS4 must be covered by a storm water management program. The individual permitting authorities must decide what type of permit is most applicable.

The existing NPDES storm water program already regulates storm water from federally or State-operated industrial sources. Federal or State facilities that are currently regulated due to their industrial discharges may already be implementing some of today's rule requirements.

EPA received comments that questioned the apparent inconsistency between regulating a federal facility such as a hospital and not regulating a similar private facility. Normally, this type of private facility is regulated by the MS4. EPA believes that federal facilities are subject to local water quality regulations, including storm water requirements, by virtue of the waiver of sovereign immunity in CWA section 313. However, there are special problems faced by MS4s in their efforts to regulate federal facilities that have not been encountered in regulating

similar private facilities. To ensure comprehensive coverage, today's rule merely clarifies the need for permit coverage for these federal facilities.

i. Combined Sewer Systems (CSS).

The definition of small MS4s does not include combined sewer systems. A combined sewer system is a wastewater collection system that conveys sanitary wastewater and storm water through a single set of pipes to a publicly-owned treatment works (POTW) for treatment before discharging to a receiving waterbody. During wet weather events when the capacity of the combined sewer system is exceeded, the system is designed to discharge prior to the POTW treatment plant directly into a receiving waterbody. Such an overflow is a combined sewer overflow or CSO. Combined sewer systems are not subject to existing regulations for municipal storm water discharges, nor will they be subject to today's regulations. EPA addresses combined sewer systems and CSOs in the National Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy issued on April 19, 1994 (59 FR 18688). The CSO Control Policy contains provisions for developing appropriate, site-specific NPDES permit requirements for combined sewer systems. CSO discharges are subject to limitations based on the best available technology economically achievable for toxic pollutants and based on the best conventional pollutant control technology for conventional pollutants. MS4s are subject to a different technology standard for all pollutants, specifically to reduce pollutants to the maximum extent practicable.

Some municipalities are served by both separate storm sewer systems and combined sewer systems. If such a municipality is located within an urbanized area, only the separate storm sewer systems within that municipality is included in the NPDES storm water program and subject to today's final rule. If the municipality is not located in an urbanized area, then the NPDES permitting authority has discretion as to whether the discharges from the separate storm sewer system is subject to today's final rule. The NPDES permitting authority will use the same process to designate discharges from portions of an MS4 for permit coverage where the municipality is also served by a combined sewer system.

EPA recognizes that municipalities that have both combined and separate storm sewer systems may wish to find ways to develop a unified program to meet all wet weather water pollution control requirements more efficiently. In the proposal to today's final rule, EPA sought comment on ways to achieve

such a unified program. Many municipalities that are served by CSSs and MS4s commented that it is inequitable to force them to comply with Phase II at this time because implementation of the CSO Control Policy through their NPDES permits already imposes a significant financial burden. They requested an extension of the implementation time frame. They did not provide ideas on how to unify the two programs. EPA encourages permitting authorities to work with these municipalities as they develop and begin implementation of their CSO and storm water management programs. If both sets of requirements are carefully coordinated early, a cost-effective wet weather program can be developed that will address both CSO and storm water requirements.

ii. Owners/Operators. Several commenters mentioned the difference between the existing storm water application requirement for municipal operators and the proposed municipal requirement for owners or operators to apply. They felt that this inconsistency is confusing. The preamble to the existing regulations makes numerous references to owner/operator so there was no intent to make a clear distinction between Phase I and Phase II. Section 122.21(b) states that when the owner and operator are different, the operator must obtain the permit. MS4s often have several operators. The owner may be responsible for one part of the system and a regional authority may be responsible for other aspects. EPA proposed the "owner or operator" language to convey this dual responsibility. However, when the owner is responsible for some part of a storm water management plan, it is also an operator.

EPA has revised the regulation language to clarify that "an operator" must apply for a permit. When responsibilities for the MS4 are shared, all operators must apply.

c. Regulated Small MS4s

In today's final rule, all small MS4s located in an urbanized area are automatically designated as "regulated" small MS4s provided that they were not previously designated into the existing storm water program. Unlike medium and large MS4s under the existing storm water regulations, not all small MS4s are designated under today's final rule. Therefore, today's rule distinguishes between "small" MS4s and "regulated small" MS4s.

EPA's definition of "regulated small MS4s" in the proposal to today's rule included mention of incorporated places and counties. Along with the

definition, EPA included Appendices 6 and 7 to assist in the identification of areas that would probably require coverage as "automatically designated" (Appendix 6) or "potentially designated" (Appendix 7). The definition and the appendices raised many questions about exactly who was required to comply with the proposed requirements. Commenters raised issues about the definition of "incorporated place" and the status of towns, townships, and other places that are not considered incorporated by the Census Bureau. They also asked about special districts, regional authorities, MS4s already regulated, and other questions in order to clarify the rule's coverage.

EPA has revised § 122.32(a) to clarify that discharges are regulated under today's rule if they are from a small MS4 that is in an urbanized area and has not received a waiver or they are designated by the permitting authority. Today's rule does not regulate the county, city, or town. Today's rule regulates the MS4. Therefore, even though a county may be listed in Appendix 6, if that county does not own or operate the municipal storm sewer systems, the county does not have to submit an application or develop a storm water management program. If another entity does own or operate an MS4 within the county, for example, a regional utility district, that other entity needs to submit the application and develop the program.

Some commenters suggested that EPA should change the rule language to specifically allow regional authorities to be the permitted entity and to allow small MS4s to apply as co-permittees. EPA believes that the best way to clarify that regional authorities can be the primary permitted entity is the change to § 122.32(a) and the explanation above. Because EPA assumes that today's regulation will be implemented through general permits, MS4s will not be co-permittees under a general permit in the same manner as under individual permits. EPA has added § 122.33(a)(4) and made a minor change to § 122.35(a) to clarify that small MS4s can work together to share the responsibilities of a storm water management program. This is discussed further in Section II.H.3.c.iv below.

The proposed rule stated that when a county or Federal Indian reservation is only partially included in an urbanized area, only MS4s in the urbanized portion of the county or Federal Indian reservation would be regulated. In the rare cases when an incorporated place is only partially included in the urbanized area, the entire incorporated place would be regulated. EPA received comments asking about towns and

townships, because they were not considered to be incorporated areas according to the Census Bureau's definition. Would the whole town/township be covered or only the part of the town/township in the urbanized area? States use many different types of systems in their geographical divisions. Some towns are similar to incorporated cities and others are large areas that are more similar to counties. Some commenters thought that the urbanized area boundary was arbitrary, and if part of a town or county was covered, it all should be covered. Other commenters noted that some townships and counties encompass very large areas of which only a small portion is urbanized. Due to the great variety of situations, EPA has decided that for all geographical entities, only MS4s in the urbanized area are automatically designated. The population densities associated with the Census Bureau's designation of urbanized areas provide the basis for designation of these areas to protect water quality. This focused designation provides for consistency and allows for flexibility on the part of the MS4 and the permitting authority. In those situations where an incorporated place or a town is not all in an "urbanized area", there is a good possibility that it is served by more than one MS4. In those cases where the area is served by the same MS4, it makes sense to develop a storm water program for the whole area. Permitting authorities may also decide to designate all MS4s within a county or township, if they believe it is necessary to protect water quality.

Most operators of MS4s will not need to independently determine the status of coverage under today's rule. EPA has revised the proposed Appendices 6 and 7 to include towns and townships. Therefore, these appendices will alert most MS4s as to whether they are likely to be covered under today's rule. However, each permitting authority must make the decision as to who requires coverage. Most likely, an illustrative list of the regulated areas will be published with the general permit. If not, the operator can contact its permitting authority or the Bureau of the Census to find out if their separate storm sewer systems are within an urbanized area.

i. Urbanized Area Description. Under the Bureau of the Census definition of "urbanized area," adopted by EPA for

studies to help explain the census category of "urbanized area." Appendix 2 is a simplified urbanized area illustration to help demonstrate the concept of urbanized areas in relation to today's final rule. The "urbanized area" is the shaded area that includes within its boundaries incorporated places, a portion of a Federal Indian reservation, portions of two counties, an entire town, and portions of another town. All small MS4s located in the shaded area are covered by the rule, unless and until waived by the permitting authority. Any small MS4s located outside of the shaded area are subject to potential designation by the permitting authority.

There are 405 urbanized areas in the United States that cover 2 percent of total U.S. land area and contain approximately 63 percent of the nation's population (see Appendix 3 for a listing of urbanized areas of the United States and Puerto Rico). These numbers include U.S. Territories, although Puerto Rico is the only territory to have Census-designated urbanized areas. Urbanized areas constitute the largest and most dense areas of settlement. The purpose of determining an "urbanized area" is to delineate the boundaries of development and map the actual built-up urban area. The Bureau of the Census geographers liken it to flying over an urban area and drawing a line around the boundary of the built-up area as seen from the air.

Using data from the latest decennial census, the Census Bureau applies the urbanized area definition nationwide (including U.S. Tribes and Territories) and determines which places and counties are included within each urbanized area. For each urbanized area, the Bureau provides full listings of who is included, as well as detailed maps and special CD-ROM files for use with computerized mapping systems (such as GIS). Each State's data center receives a copy of the list, and some maps, automatically. The States also have the CD-ROM files and a variety of publications available to them for reference from the Bureau of the Census. In addition, local or regional planning agencies may have urbanized area files already. New listings for urbanized areas based on the 2000 Census will be available by July/August 2001, but the more comprehensive computer files will not be available until late 2001/early 2002.

included within an urbanized area as of the 1990 Census will not later be excluded from the urbanized area as of the 2000 Census. However, it is important to note that even if this situation were to occur, for example, due to a possible change in the Bureau of the Census' urbanized area definition, a small MS4 that is automatically designated into the NPDES program for storm water under an urbanized area calculation for any given Census year will remain regulated regardless of the results of subsequent urbanized area calculations.

ii. Rationale for Using Urbanized Areas. EPA is using urbanized areas to automatically designate regulated small MS4s on a nationwide basis for several reasons: (1) studies and data show a high correlation between degree of development/urbanization and adverse impacts on receiving waters due to storm water (U.S. EPA, 1983; Driver et al., 1985; Pitt, R.E. 1991. "Biological Effects of Urban Runoff Discharges." Presented at the Engineering Foundation Conference: *Urban Runoff and Receiving Systems; An Interdisciplinary Analysis of Impact, Monitoring and Management*, August 1991. Mt. Crested Butte, CO. American Society of Civil Engineers, New York. 1992.; Pitt, R.E. 1995. "Biological Effects of Urban Runoff Discharges," in *Storm water Runoff and Receiving Systems: Impact, Monitoring, and Assessment*. Lewis Publishers, New York.; Galli, J. 1990. *Thermal Impacts Associated with Urbanization and Storm water Management Best Management Practices*. Prepared for the Sediment and Storm water Administration of the Maryland Department of the Environment.; Klein, 1979), (2) the blanket coverage within the urbanized area encourages the watershed approach and addresses the problem of "donut-holes," where unregulated areas are surrounded by areas currently regulated (storm water discharges from donut hole areas present a problem due to their contributing uncontrolled adverse impacts on local waters, as well as by frustrating the attainment of water quality goals of neighboring regulated communities), (3) this approach targets present and future growth areas as a preventative measure to help ensure water quality protection, and (4) the determination of urbanized areas by the Bureau of the Census allows operators