

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

JUL 18 2016

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

FILED

JUL 18 2016

RECEIVED

CLERK

Center for Regulatory Reasonableness,

Petitioner,

v.

United States Environmental
Protection Agency,

Respondent.

Docket: 16-1246

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Pursuant to the grants of original jurisdiction under § 509(b)(1)(E) and § 509(b)(1)(F) of the Clean Water Act (“CWA” or “the Act”), 33 U.S.C. §§ 1369(b)(1)(E) & (F), the Center for Regulatory Reasonableness (“CRR” or “the Center”), on behalf of its members, hereby petitions this Court for review of Respondent’s, United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA” or “the Agency”) actions in (1) approving and/or promulgating effluent limitations or other limitations subject to § 509(b)(1)(E), and (2) issuing a permit subject to § 509(b)(1)(F).


CRR challenges, *inter alia*, the Agency’s approval and/or promulgation of unlawful amendments to existing legislative rules (*e.g.*, 40

C.F.R. § 122.4, 40 C.F.R. § 122.26, § 122.28, 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d), 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.32-36). CRR also challenges the creation of new regulatory requirements that are found nowhere in EPA's existing regulations or in the Act. These new and revised requirements are procedurally unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. §§ 551, exceed EPA's CWA statutory authority, and, in some cases, violate the U.S. Constitution.

These new and revised rules were announced in the April 4, 2016 General Permit for "Stormwater Discharges from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Massachusetts" (*see* Ex. A, MA MS4 General Permit) and the extensive Response to Comments document that accompanied the final permit. *See* Ex. B, EPA's Response to Comments Document available electronically at <https://www3.epa.gov/region1/npdes/stormwater/ma/2016fpd/rtc-2016-ma-sms4-gp.pdf>. (because this document is over 600 pages in length and available electronically, CRR has not appended it to its petition); *see also*, Ex. C, CRR's April 28, 2016 Letter to EPA HQ and Ex. D, EPA HQ's June 8, 2016, Letter to CRR which confirmed that EPA's position regarding unlawful rule amendments identified by CRR would be addressed in the final Response to Comments for the General Permit.

CRR's Petition for Review encompasses (1) a facial challenge to the Agency's promulgations and approvals of effluent limitations and other limitations under CWA § 509(b)(1)(E), (2) an as-applied challenge to the Agency's inclusion of such unlawful limitations and requirements in the General Permit for small Massachusetts stormwater dischargers under CWA § 509(b)(1)(F) and (3) a challenge to the Constitutionality of the federal MS4 program as enacted by Congress and as implemented by EPA.

Respectfully submitted,




John C. Hall, Esq.
Court of Appeals - D.C. Circuit - #44296


Hall & Associates
1620 I St. NW
Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone (202) 463-1166
Facsimile (202) 463-4207
E-mail: jhall@hall-associates.com




Gary B. Cohen, Esq.
Court of Appeals - D.C. Circuit - #49377
Hall & Associates
E-Mail: gcohen@hall-associates.com



Philip D. Rosenman, Esq.
Court of Appeals – D.C. Circuit - #55525
Hall & Associates
E-Mail: prosenman@hall-associates.com



Robert R. Lucic
Application to D.C. Circuit to be submitted
Sheehan Phinney Bass & Green
1000 Elm Street, 17th Floor
Manchester, NH 03101
T 603.627.8188
F 603.641.2381
E-Mail: rlucic@sheehan.com



Lynn J. Preston
Application to D.C. Circuit to be submitted
Sheehan Phinney Bass & Green
E-Mail: lpreston@sheehan.com

Attorneys for Petitioner


Dated: July 18, 2016

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

JUL 18 2016

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

RECEIVED



Center for Regulatory Reasonableness,

Petitioner,

v.

United States Environmental
Protection Agency,

Respondent.

Petition for Review

Docket No. 16-1246


PETITIONER'S RULE 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. and Circuit Rule 26.1, the undersigned, counsel for Petitioner, Center for Regulatory Reasonableness, certifies as follows:

The Center for Regulatory Reasonableness ("CRR") (a domestic for profit corporation established under Title 29 of the D.C. Code) is a multi-sector coalition of municipal and industrial entities from across the United States. CRR was created to address the full range of Clean Water Act compliance, permitting and regulatory issues facing these entities. CRR is dedicated to ensure that regulatory requirements applicable to such entities are based on sound scientific information, allow for flexible implementation,

and provide for attainable, cost-effective compliance options. CRR also makes certain that such requirements are only implemented after full consideration of public comments regarding the need for and efficacy of such requirements. Most, if not all, of CRR's members operate under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.* CRR has no parent companies, and there are no other publicly-held companies that have a 10% or greater ownership interest in CRR. CRR has no outstanding shares or debt securities in the hands of the public.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Hall", is written over a horizontal line.

John C. Hall, Esq.
Court of Appeals - D.C. Circuit - #44296

Hall & Associates
1620 I St. NW
Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone (202) 463-1166
Facsimile (202) 463-4207
E-mail: jhall@hall-associates.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 18 day of July 2016, a copy of the foregoing **Petition for Review** and **Petitioner's Rule 26.1 Statement** was served on each of the following by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested:

Office of the Administrator
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Mail Code I 101A
Washington, D.C. 20460

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of General Counsel
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Mail Code 2310A
Washington, D.C. 20460


Attorney General for the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Room 2141
Washington, D.C. 20530



John C. Hall, Esq.

**Counsel for the Center for
Regulatory Reasonableness**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT



Center for Regulatory Reasonableness,

Petitioner,

v.

United States Environmental
Protection Agency,

Respondent.

Docket: 16-1246

INDEX OF EXHIBITS TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

Ex. A – Massachusetts MS4 General Permit

Ex. B – EPA's Response to Comments Document

Ex. C – CRR's April 28, 2016 Letter to EPA HQ

Ex. D – EPA HQ's June 8, 2016, Letter to CRR

Exhibit A

Massachusetts MS4 General Permit

MA MS4 General Permit

**United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)**

**GENERAL PERMITS FOR STORMWATER DISCHARGES FROM
SMALL MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS
IN MASSACHUSETTS**

**AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE
NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM**

In compliance with the provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA), as amended (33 U.S.C. §1251 *et seq.*), and the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act, as amended (M.G.L. Chap.21 §§ 26-53), any operator of a small municipal separate storm sewer system whose system:

- Is located in the areas described in part 1.1;
- Is eligible for coverage under part 1.2 and part 1.9; and
- Submits a complete and accurate Notice of Intent in accordance with part 1.7 of this permit and EPA issues a written authorization

is authorized to discharge in accordance with the conditions and the requirements set forth herein.


The following appendices are also included as part of these permits:

- Appendix A – Definitions, Abbreviations, and Acronyms;
- Appendix B – Standard permit conditions applicable to all authorized discharges;
- Appendix C – Endangered Species Act Eligibility Guidance;
- Appendix D – National Historic Preservation Act Eligibility Guidance;
- Appendix E – Information required for the Notice of Intent (NOI);
- Appendix F – Requirements for MA Small MS4s Subject to Approved TMDLs;
- Appendix G – Impaired Waters Monitoring Parameter Requirements;
- Appendix H – Requirements related to discharges to certain water quality limited waterbodies;

These permits become effective on **July 1, 2017**.

These permits and the authorization to discharge expire at midnight, **June 30, 2022**.

Signed this 4th day of April, 2016


Ken Moraff, Director
Office of Ecosystem Protection
United States Environmental Protection Agency
5 Post Office Square – Suite 100
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3912

Signed this 4th day of April 2016



Douglas E. Fine
Assistant Commissioner for Water
Resources
Department of Environmental Protection
One Winter Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0.	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1.	AREAS OF COVERAGE	4
1.2.	ELIGIBILITY	4
1.2.1.	Small MS4s Covered	4
1.3.	LIMITATIONS ON COVERAGE	5
1.4.	NON-STORMWATER DISCHARGES.....	6
1.5.	PERMIT COMPLIANCE	6
1.6.	CONTINUATION OF THIS PERMIT	6
1.7.	OBTAINING AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE	7
1.7.1.	How to Obtain Authorization to Discharge.....	7
1.7.2.	Notice of Intent	7
1.7.3.	Submission of Notice of Intent	7
1.7.4.	Public Notice of NOI and Effective Date of Coverage	8
1.8.	INDIVIDUAL PERMITS AND ALTERNATIVE GENERAL PERMITS.....	8
1.9.	SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.....	9
1.9.1.	Documentation Regarding Endangered Species	9
1.9.2.	Documentation Regarding Historic Properties.....	9
1.10.	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (SWMP)	10
1.10.1.	Stormwater Management Program Availability.....	10
1.10.2.	Contents and Timelines of the Stormwater Management Program for 2003 permittees.....	10
part	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
1.10.3.	Contents and Timelines of the Stormwater Management Program for New Permittees.....	12
2.0.	NON-NUMERIC EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS	14
2.1.	WATER QUALITY BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS	14
2.1.1.	Requirement to Meet Water Quality Standards	14
2.1.2.	Increased Discharges.....	15
2.2.	DISCHARGES TO CERTAIN IMPAIRED WATERS	16
2.2.1.	Discharges Subject to Requirements Related to an Approved TMDL.....	16
2.2.2.	Discharges to Certain Water Quality Limited Waters Subject to Additional Requirements	22
2.3.	REQUIREMENTS TO REDUCE POLLUTANTS TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PRACTICABLE (MEP).....	27
2.3.1.	Control Measures	27
2.3.2.	Public Education and Outreach	27
2.3.3.	Public Involvement and participation	29
2.3.4.	Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE) Program	30
2.3.5.	Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control	42
2.3.6.	Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment (Post Construction Stormwater Management).....	43
2.3.7.	Good House Keeping and Pollution Prevention for Permittee Owned Operations	47
3.0.	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES TO SURFACE DRINKING WATER SUPPLIES AND THEIR TRIBUTARIES	54
4.0.	PROGRAM EVALUATION, RECORD KEEPING, AND REPORTING ...	54
4.1.	PROGRAM EVALUATION	54
4.2.	RECORD KEEPING	55
4.3.	OUTFALL MONITORING REPORTING	55
4.4.	ANNUAL REPORTS	56

5.0.	NON-TRADITIONAL MS4S.....	58
5.1.	REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-TRADITIONAL MS4S.....	58
5.1.1.	Public education.....	58
5.1.2.	Ordinances and regulatory mechanisms.....	58
5.1.3.	Assessment of Regulations	58
5.1.4.	New Dischargers	58
6.0	REQUIREMENTS FOR MS4S OWNED OR OPERATED BY	
	TRANSPORTATION AGENCIES	59
6.1	PUBLIC EDUCATION	59
6.2	ORDINANCES AND REGULATORY MECHANISMS	59
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF REGULATIONS.....	59
6.4	NEW DISCHARGERS	59

1.0. Introduction

This document consists of three (3) general permits listed in part 1.1. Each general permit is applicable to a particular type of municipal system within Massachusetts. Many of the permit terms and conditions are applicable across all regulated entities, and therefore are presented just once in parts 1-2, part 4, and Appendices A through E. Other conditions are applicable to a particular set of authorized entities; these terms and conditions are included in parts 3, and 5 and Appendices F through H. Throughout the permit, the terms “this permit” or “the permit” will refer to the three general permits.

1.1. Areas of Coverage

This permit covers small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) located in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

- Traditional Cities and Towns (NPDES Permit No. MAR041000)
- State, federal, county and other publicly owned properties (Non-traditional) (MAR042000)
- State transportation agencies (except for MassDOT- Highway Division) (MAR043000)

1.2. Eligibility

The MS4 shall meet the eligibility provisions described in part 1.2.1 and part 1.9 to be eligible for authorization under this permit.

1.2.1. Small MS4s Covered

This permit authorizes the discharge of stormwater from small MS4s as defined at 40 CFR § 122.26(b) (16). This includes MS4s described in 40 CFR §122.32(a) (1) and (a) (2). An MS4 is eligible for coverage under this permit if it is:

- A small MS4 within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
- Not a large or medium MS4 as defined in 40 CFR §§122.26(b)(4) or (7);
- Located either fully or partially within an urbanized area as determined by the latest Decennial Census by the Bureau of Census as of the effective date of this permit (the 2010 Census); or
- Located in a geographic area designated by EPA as requiring a permit.

If the small MS4 is not located entirely within an urbanized area, only the portion of the MS4 that is located within the urbanized area is regulated under 40 CFR §122.32(a) (1).

A small municipal separate storm sewer system means all separate storm sewers that are:

- Owned or operated by the United States, a state, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to state law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, stormwater, or other wastes, including special districts under state law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under section 208 of the CWA that discharges to waters of the United States.
- Not defined as large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems pursuant to 40 CFR § 122.26(b) (4) and (b) (7) or designated under 40 CFR § 122.26(a) (1) (v).
- This term includes systems similar to separate storm sewer systems in municipalities such as systems at military bases, large hospitals or prison complexes, and highways

and other thoroughfares. The term does not include separate storm sewers in very discrete areas, such as individual buildings.

1.3. Limitations on Coverage

This permit does not authorize the following:

- a. Stormwater discharges mixed with sources of non-stormwater unless such non-stormwater discharges are:
 - Authorized under a separate NPDES permit; or
 - A non-stormwater discharge as listed in part 1.4.
- b. Stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity as defined in 40 CFR §122.26 (b) (14) (i)-(ix) and (xi).
- c. Stormwater discharges associated with construction activity as defined in 40 CFR §122.26(b) (14) (x) or (b) (15).
- d. Stormwater discharges currently authorized under another NPDES permit, including discharges covered under other regionally issued general permits.
- e. Stormwater discharges or discharge related activities that are likely to adversely affect any species that are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) or result in the adverse modification or destruction of habitat that is designated as critical under the ESA. The permittee shall follow the procedures detailed in Appendix C to make a determination regarding eligibility. The permittee shall certify compliance with this provision on the submitted NOI.
- f. Stormwater discharges whose direct or indirect impacts do not prevent or minimize adverse effects on any Essential Fish Habitat.
- g. Stormwater discharges, or implementation of a stormwater management program, which adversely affects properties listed or eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The permittee shall follow the procedures detailed in Appendix D to make a determination regarding eligibility. The permittee shall certify compliance with this provision on the submitted NOI.
- h. Stormwater discharges prohibited under 40 CFR § 122.4.
- i. Stormwater discharges to the subsurface subject to state Underground Injection Control (UIC) regulations. Although the permit includes provisions related to infiltration and groundwater recharge, structural controls that dispose of stormwater into the ground may be subject to UIC regulation requirements. Authorization for such discharges shall be obtained from Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Resource Protection, Drinking Water Program, Underground Injection Control, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108 – phone 617-292-5859.
- j. Any non-traditional MS4 facility that is a “new discharger” as defined in part 5.1.4. and discharges to a waterbody listed in category 5 or 4b on the Massachusetts Integrated Report of waters listed pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d) and 305(b) due to nutrients (Total Nitrogen or (Total Phosphorus), metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride) or oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease), or discharges to a waterbody with an approved TMDL for any of those pollutants.

1.4. Non-Stormwater Discharges

The following categories of non-stormwater discharges are allowed under this permit *unless* the permittee, EPA, or the MassDEP identifies any category or individual discharge of non-stormwater discharge in part 1.4.a-r as a significant contributor of pollutants to the MS4, then that category or individual discharge is not allowed under part 1.4, but rather shall be deemed an “illicit discharge” under part 2.3.4.1, and the permittee shall address that category or individual discharge as part of the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE) Program described in part 2.3.4 of this permit.

- a. Water line flushing
- b. Landscape irrigation
- c. Diverted stream flows
- d. Rising ground water
- e. Uncontaminated ground water infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR § 35.2005(20))
- f. Uncontaminated pumped ground water
- g. Discharge from potable water sources
- h. Foundation drains
- i. Air conditioning condensation
- j. Irrigation water, springs
- k. Water from crawl space pumps
- l. Footing drains
- m. Lawn watering
- n. Individual resident car washing
- o. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands
- p. De-chlorinated swimming pool discharges
- q. Street wash waters
- r. Residential building wash waters without detergents

Discharges or flows from firefighting activities are allowed under this permit need only be addressed where they are identified as significant sources of pollutants to waters of the United States.

1.5. Permit Compliance

Non-compliance with any of the requirements of this permit constitutes a violation of the permit and the CWA and may be grounds for an enforcement action and may result in the imposition of injunctive relief and/or penalties.

1.6. Continuation of this Permit

If this permit is not reissued prior to the expiration date, it will be administratively continued in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act and remain in force and effect for discharges that were authorized prior to expiration. If a small MS4 was granted permit authorization prior to the expiration date of this permit, it will automatically remain authorized by this permit until the earliest of:

- Authorization under a reissued general permit following timely and appropriate submittal of a complete and accurate NOI requesting authorization to discharge under the reissued permit; or
- Issuance or denial of an individual permit for the MS4’s discharges; or
- Authorization or denial under an alternative general permit.

If the MS4 operator does not submit a timely, appropriate, complete, and accurate NOI requesting authorization to discharge under the reissued permit or a timely request for authorization under an individual or alternative general permit, authorization under this permit will terminate on the due date for the NOI under the reissued permit unless otherwise specified in the reissued permit.

1.7. Obtaining Authorization to Discharge

1.7.1. How to Obtain Authorization to Discharge

To obtain authorization under this permit, a small MS4 shall:

- Be located in the areas listed in part 1.1 of this permit;
- Meet the eligibility requirements in part 1.2 and part 1.9;
- Submit a complete and accurate Notice of Intent (NOI) in accordance with the requirements of part 1.7.2; and
- EPA issues a written authorization.

1.7.2. Notice of Intent

- a. Operators of Small MS4s seeking authorization to discharge under the terms and conditions of this permit shall submit a Notice of Intent that contains the information identified in Appendix E. This includes operators of small MS4s that were previously authorized under the May 1, 2003 small MS4 general permit (MS4-2003 permit).
- b. The NOI shall be signed by an appropriate official (see Appendix B, Subparagraph B.11, Standard Conditions).
- c. The NOI shall contain the following certification: I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, I certify that the information submitted is, to best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Print the name and title of the official, followed by signature and date.

- d. The NOI shall be submitted within 90 days of the effective date of the permit. If EPA notifies an MS4 that it is designated under 40 CFR § 122.32(a) (2) or (b), the NOI shall be submitted within 180 days of receipt of notice unless granted a longer period of time by EPA.

1.7.3. Submission of Notice of Intent

- a. All small MS4s shall submit a complete and accurate Notice of Intent (suggested form in Appendix E) to EPA-Region 1 at the following address:

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Stormwater and Construction Permits Section (OEP06-1)
Five Post Office Square, Suite 100
Boston, MA 02109

Or submitted electronically to EPA at the following email address: stormwater.reports@epa.gov

- b. All small MS4s shall also submit a copy of the NOI to the MassDEP at the following address:

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
One Winter Street -5th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
ATTN: Frederick Civian, Stormwater Coordinator

- c. Late notification: A small MS4 is not prohibited from submitting a NOI after the dates provided in part 1.7.2.d. However, if a late NOI is submitted, authorization is only for discharges that occur after permit authorization is granted. EPA and MassDEP reserve the right to take enforcement actions for any unpermitted discharges. All NOIs submitted after December 21, 2020 must be submitted electronically.

1.7.4. Public Notice of NOI and Effective Date of Coverage

- a. EPA will provide a public notice and opportunity for comment on the contents of the submitted NOIs. The public comment period will be a minimum of 30 calendar days.
- b. Based on a review of a small MS4's NOI or other information, EPA may grant authorization, extend the public comment period, or deny authorization under this permit and require submission of an application for an individual or alternative NPDES permit. (See part 1.8) A small MS4 will be authorized to discharge under the terms and conditions of this permit upon receipt of notice of authorization from EPA.
- c. Permittees whose authorization to discharge under the MS4-2003 permit, which expired on May 1, 2008, has been administratively continued in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 558(c) and 40 CFR § 122.6, who wish to obtain coverage under this permit, must submit a new NOI requesting permit coverage in accordance with the requirements of part 1.7 of this permit to EPA within 90 days after the effective date of this permit. Permittees whose authorization to discharge under the expired MS4-2003 permit was administratively continued, who fail to submit a timely, complete and accurate NOI or an application for an individual NPDES permit within 90 after the effective date of this permit will be considered to be discharging without a permit (see 40 CFR § 122.28(b)(3)(iii)).

1.8. Individual Permits and Alternative General Permits

- a. EPA may require a small MS4 to apply for and obtain authorization under either an individual NPDES permit or an alternative NPDES general permit. Any interested person may petition EPA in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR § 122.26(f) to require a small MS4 to apply for and/or obtain authorization under either an individual NPDES permit or an alternative NPDES general permit. If EPA requires a small MS4 to apply for an individual or alternative NPDES permit, EPA will notify the small MS4 in writing that a permit application is required. This notification will include a brief statement of the reasons for this decision and will provide application information and an application deadline. If a small MS4 is authorized under the MS4-2003 permit or this permit and fails to submit an individual NPDES or an alternative general permit NPDES permit application as required by EPA, then the authorization under the MS4-2003 permit or this permit to the small MS4 is automatically terminated at the end of the date specified by EPA as the deadline

for application submittal. EPA reserves the right to take enforcement action for any unpermitted discharge.

- b. A small MS4 may request to be excluded from this general permit by applying for an individual permit or authorization under an alternative general permit. In such a case, a small MS4 shall submit an individual permit application in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR § 122.33(b) (2) (i) or § 122.33(b) (2) (ii), with reasons supporting the request, to EPA at the address listed in part 1.7.3 of this permit. The request may be granted by issuance of an individual permit or authorization under an alternative general permit if EPA determines that the reasons stated by the small MS4 are adequate to support the request. (See 40 CFR § 122.28(b) (3)).
- c. When an individual NPDES permit is issued, or a small MS4 is authorized to discharge under an alternative NPDES general permit, authorization under this permit automatically terminates on the effective date of the individual permit or the date of authorization of coverage under the alternative general permit.

1.9. Special Eligibility Determinations

1.9.1. Documentation Regarding Endangered Species

The small MS4 shall certify eligibility regarding endangered species in the NOI required by part 1.7.2. The Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) shall include documentation supporting the permittee's eligibility determination with regard to federal Endangered and Threatened Species and Critical Habitat Protection, including:

- Results of the Appendix C U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service endangered species screening determination; and
- If applicable, a description of the measures the small MS4 shall implement to protect federally listed endangered or threatened species, or critical habitat, including any conditions imposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. If a permittee fails to document and implement such measures, the permittee's discharges are ineligible for coverage under this permit.

1.9.2. Documentation Regarding Historic Properties

The small MS4 shall certify eligibility regarding historic properties on the NOI required by part 1.7.2. The SWMP shall include documentation supporting the small MS4's eligibility determination with regard to Historic Properties Preservation, including:

- Information on whether the permittee's stormwater discharges, allowable non-stormwater discharges, or stormwater discharge-related activities would have an effect on a property that is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP);
- Where such effects may occur, any documents received by the permittee or any written agreements the permittee has made with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), or other Tribal representative to mitigate those effects;
- Results of the Appendix D historic property screening investigations; and
- If applicable, a description of the measures the permittee shall implement to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on places listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP, including any conditions imposed by the SHPO or THPO. If the permittee fails to

document and implement such measures, those discharges are ineligible for coverage under this permit.

1.10. Stormwater Management Program (SWMP)

- a. The permittee shall develop and implement a written (hardcopy or electronic) SWMP. The SWMP shall be signed in accordance with Appendix B, Subsection 11, including the date of signature. A signature and date is required for initial program preparation and for any significant revision to the program, which shall be in writing. The written SWMP shall be completed within one (1) year of the effective date of the permit.

The SWMP is the document used by the permittee to describe and detail the activities and measures that will be implemented to meet the terms and conditions of the permit. The SWMP shall accurately describe the permittees plans and activities. The document should be updated and/or modified during the permit term as the permittee's activities are modified, changed or updated to meet permit conditions during the permit term.

- b. Permittees authorized by the MS4-2003 permit shall modify or update their existing Best Management Practices (BMPs) and measurable goals to meet the terms and conditions of part 2.3 of this permit within one (1) year of the effective date of the permit. These modifications and updates shall be reflected in the written (hardcopy or electronic) SWMP. Permittees authorized by the MS4-2003 permit shall continue to implement their existing SWMP until the program has been updated.

1.10.1. Stormwater Management Program Availability

- a. The permittee shall retain a copy of the current SWMP required by this permit at the office or facility of the person listed as the program contact on the submitted Notice of Intent (NOI). The SWMP shall be immediately available to representatives from EPA, MassDEP, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) at the time of an onsite inspection or upon request.
- b. The permittee shall make the SWMP available to the public during normal business hours. The permittee shall also post the SWMP online¹ if the permittee has a website on which to post the SWMP.

1.10.2. Contents and Timelines of the Stormwater Management Program for 2003 permittees

The following information must be included in the SWMP within one (1) year of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Identification of names and titles of people responsible for program implementation. If a position is currently unfilled, list the title of the position and modify the SWMP with the name once the position is filled;
- Documentation of compliance with part 1.9.1;

¹ Should a permittee not wish to post mapping information included in the SWMP (see part 1.10.2) on their website for public safety reasons, they must state the reason either with or within the online SWMP and provide how the MS4 mapping information can be obtained. The permittee must retain the entire SWMP, including all completed mapping, at a location where it can be made available to the public during normal business hours.

- Documentation of compliance with part 1.9.2;
- Documentation of authorization of all new or increased discharges granted by MassDEP in compliance with part 2.1.2; part
- Listing of all discharges identified pursuant to part 2.1.1 and description of response;
- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.3 (MEP requirements) identified in the permittee's NOI and any updates to those BMPs within the first year;
For each permit condition in part 2.3 identify:
 - The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal shall have a measure of assessment associated with it;
- Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) inventory including all of the information required in part 2.3.4.4.b;
- Written IDDE Program pursuant to part 2.3.4.6;
- Written procedures for site inspections and enforcement of sediment and erosion control procedures in accordance with part 2.3.5;
- Description of measures to avoid or minimize impacts to surface public drinking water supply sources. The permittee is also encouraged to include provisions to notify public water supplies in the event of an emergency. Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Resource Protection, Drinking Water Program, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108 – phone 617.292.5770.
- Description of activities to achieve compliance with part 3.0;
- Annual program evaluation (part 4.1). Update annually and maintain copies.

The following information must be included in the SWMP within two (2) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Listing of all receiving waterbody segments, their classification under the applicable state water quality standards, any impairment(s) and associated pollutant(s) of concern, applicable TMDLs and WLAs, and number of outfalls from the MS4 that discharge to each waterbody. In addition to the receiving water, the permittee shall document in the SWMP all surface public drinking water sources that may be impacted by MS4 discharges;
- Listing of all interconnected MS4s and other separate storm sewer systems receiving a discharge from the permitted MS4, the receiving waterbody segment(s) ultimately receiving the discharge, their classification under the applicable state water quality standards, any impairment(s) and associated pollutant(s) of concern, applicable TMDLs and WLAs, and the number of interconnections;
- Written procedures to require submission of as-built drawings and ensure long term operation and maintenance in accordance with part 2.3.6.a.iii;
- The map of the separate storm sewer system required by part 2.3.4.5.

The following information must be included in the SWMP within four (4) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Report(s) assessing current street design and parking lot guidelines and other local requirements within the municipality that affect the creation of impervious cover.

The following information must be included in the SWMP concurrent with the applicable deadlines in Appendix F and H and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.2.1 (TMDL requirements) including:
 - The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal must have an associated measure of assessment.
- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.2.2 (discharges to certain water quality limited waters subject to additional requirements) including:
 - The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal must have an associated measure of assessment;

Description of any other practices to achieve compliance with part 2.1 (water quality based requirements);1.10.3. Contents and Timelines of the Stormwater Management Program for New Permittees

a. Permittees seeking authorization for the first time shall meet all deadlines contained in this permit except the following:

- Timelines for public education requirements in part 2.3.2.c shall be extended by one (1) year and need to include one (1) message to each audience over the permit term;
- The ordinances, by-laws, or other regulatory mechanisms required by parts 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than three (3) years from the permit effective date; and
- All other deadlines in part 2.3.4 shall be extended by three (3) years.
- partAll other deadlines in part 2.3.5, 2.3.6 and 2.3.7 shall be extended by two (2) years.
- partpartpartAll deadlines for discharges to water quality limited waters without a TMDL under part 2.2.2 shall be extended by two (2) years.

b. Contents of the Stormwater Management Program for New Permittees

The following information must be included in the SWMP within one (1) year of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Identification of names and titles of people responsible for program implementation. If a position is currently unfilled, list the title of the position and modify the SWMP with the name once the position is filled;
- Documentation of compliance with part 1.9.1;
- Documentation of compliance with part 1.9.2;
- Documentation of authorization of all new or increased discharges granted by MassDEP in compliance with part 2.1.2;
- Listing of all discharges identified pursuant to part 2.1.1 and description of response;
- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.3 (MEP requirements)

identified in the permittee's NOI and any updates to those BMPs within the first year;

For each permit condition in part 2.3 identify:

- The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal shall have a measure of assessment associated with it;
- Description of measures to avoid or minimize impacts to surface public drinking water supply sources. The permittee is also encouraged to include provisions to notify public water supplies in the event of an emergency. Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Resource Protection, Drinking Water Program, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108 – phone 617.292.5770. Description of activities to achieve compliance with part 3.0;
 - Annual program evaluation (part 4.1). Update annually and maintain copies.

The following information must be included in the SWMP within three (3) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Written procedures for site inspections and enforcement of sediment and erosion control procedures in accordance with part 2.3.5;
- Written operation and maintenance procedures for municipal activities in part 2.3.7.a.ii;
- Written program detailing the activities and procedures the permittee will implement so that the MS4 infrastructure is maintained in a timely manner to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 in accordance with part 2.3.7.a.iii.1;
- Written procedures to require submission of as-built drawings and ensure long term operation and maintenance in accordance with part 2.3.6.a.iii;

The following information must be included in the SWMP within four (4) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Outfall and interconnection inventory;
- Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) inventory including all of the information required in part 2.3.4.4.b;
- Written IDDE Program pursuant to part 2.3.4.6.

The following information must be included in the SWMP within four (5) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Phase 1 of the map of the separate storm sewer system required by part 2.3.4.5;
- Listing of all receiving waterbody segments, their classification under the applicable state water quality standards, any impairment(s) and associated pollutant(s) of concern, applicable TMDLs and WLAs, and number of outfalls from the MS4 that discharge to each waterbody. In addition to the receiving water, the permittee shall document in the SWMP all surface public drinking water sources that may be impacted by MS4 discharges;
- Listing of all interconnected MS4s and other separate storm sewer systems receiving a discharge from the permitted MS4, the receiving waterbody segment(s) ultimately receiving the discharge, their classification under the applicable state water quality standards, any impairment(s) and associated pollutant(s) of concern, applicable TMDLs

and WLAs, and the number of interconnections;

The following information must be included in the SWMP within four (4) years of the permit effective date and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Report(s) assessing current street design and parking lot guidelines and other local requirements within the municipality that affect the creation of impervious cover.

The following information must be included in the SWMP concurrent with the applicable deadlines in Appendix F and H (extended by two (2) years) and updated annually thereafter, as necessary:

- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.2.1 (discharges subject to requirements related to approved TMDLs) including:
 - The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal must have an associated measure of assessment.
- Description of practices to achieve compliance with part 2.2.2 (discharges to certain water quality limited waters subject to additional requirements) including:
 - The person(s) or department responsible for the measure;
 - The BMPs for the control measure or permit requirement;
 - The measurable goal(s) for each BMP. Each measurable goal shall include milestones and timeframes for its implementation and have a quantity or quality associated with its endpoint. Each goal must have an associated measure of assessment;
- Description of any other practices to achieve compliance with part 2.1 (water quality based requirements).

2.0. Non-Numeric Effluent Limitations

The permittee shall develop, implement, and enforce a program to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the maximum extent practicable; to protect water quality and to satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Clean Water Act and the Massachusetts Water Quality Standards.

2.1. Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations

Pursuant to Clean Water Act 402(p)(3)(B)(iii), this permit includes provisions to ensure that discharges from the permittee's small MS4 do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, in addition to requirements to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The requirements found in this part and part 2.2 constitute appropriate water quality based effluent limits of this permit. Requirements to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable are set forth in part 2.3.

2.1.1. Requirement to Meet Water Quality Standards

- a. The permittee shall reduce the discharge of pollutants such that the discharges from the MS4 do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards.

- b. If there is a discharge from the MS4 to a waterbody (or its tributaries in some cases) that is subject to an approved TMDL identified in part 2.2.1, the permittee is subject to the requirements of part 2.2.1 and Appendix F of this permit and the permittee shall comply with all applicable schedules and requirements in Appendix F. A permittee's compliance with all applicable requirements and BMP implementation schedules in Appendix F applicable to it will constitute compliance with part 2.1.1.a. of the Permit.
- c. If there is a discharge from the MS4 to a waterbody (or its tributaries in some cases) that is water quality limited (see definition in Appendix A) due to nutrients (Total Nitrogen or Total Phosphorus), metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride) or oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease) and is not subject to an approved TMDL, or the MS4 is located within a municipality listed in part 2.2.2.a.-b., the permittee is subject to the requirements of part 2.2.2 and Appendix H of this permit and the permittee shall comply with all applicable schedules and requirements in Appendix H. A permittee's compliance with all applicable requirements and BMP implementation schedules in Appendix H applicable to it will constitute compliance with part 2.1.1.a. of the Permit.
- d. Except where a pollutant of concern in a discharge is subject to the requirements of part 2.2.1 and/or part 2.2.2 of this permit or is the result of an illicit discharge and subject to part 2.3.4 of this Permit, if a pollutant in a discharge from the MS4 is causing or contributing to a violation of applicable water quality criteria² for the receiving water, the permittee shall, as expeditiously as possible, but no later than 60 days of becoming aware of the situation, reduce or eliminate the pollutant in its discharge such that the discharge meets applicable water quality criteria.

2.1.2. Increased Discharges

- a. Any increased discharge, including increased pollutant loading(s) through the MS4 to waters of the United States is subject to Massachusetts antidegradation regulations at 314 CMR 4.04. The permittee shall comply with the provisions of 314 CMR 4.04 including information submittal requirements and obtaining authorization for increased discharges where appropriate³. Any authorization of an increased discharge by MassDEP shall be incorporated into the permittee's SWMP. If an applicable MassDEP approval specifies additional conditions or requirements, then those requirements are incorporated into this permit by reference. The permittee must comply with all such requirements.
- b. There shall be no increased discharges, including increased pollutant loading(s) from the MS4 to impaired waters listed in categories 5 or 4b on the most recent Massachusetts Integrated Report of waters listed pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d) and 305(b) unless the permittee demonstrates that there is no net increase in loading from the MS4 to the impaired water of the pollutant(s) for which the waterbody is impaired. The permittee may demonstrate compliance with this provision by *either*:

² Applicable water quality criteria are part of the state standards that have been federally approved as of the effective date of this permit and are compiled by EPA at <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/standards/wqslibrary/>

³ Contact MassDEP for guidance on compliance with 314 CMR 4.04

- i. Documenting that the pollutant(s) for which the waterbody is impaired is not present in the MS4's discharge and retaining documentation of this finding with the SWMP; or
 - ii. Documenting that the total load of the pollutant(s) of concern from the MS4 to any impaired portion of the receiving water will not increase as a result of the activity and retaining documentation of this finding in the SWMP. Unless otherwise determined by the Permittee, USEPA or by MassDEP that additional demonstration is necessary, compliance with the requirements of part 2.2.2 and part 2.3.6 of this Permit, including all reporting and documentation requirements, shall be considered as demonstrating no net increase as required by this part.
- c. The requirements of this part are independent of permit conditions requiring reduction in discharges of pollutants as set forth in parts 2.1.1 and 2.2 (water quality based requirements) and 2.3 (requirements to reduce discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable). Permittees remain subject to requirements to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 as set forth in those parts.

2.2. Discharges to Certain Impaired Waters

The permittee shall identify in the SWMP and Annual Reports all MS4 discharges, including both outfalls and interconnections to other MS4s or other separate storm sewer systems, that:

- Are subject to Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) related requirements as identified in part 2.2.1.
- Are subject to additional requirements to protect water quality as identified in part 2.2.2.

The discharge location from an interconnection shall be determined based on the receiving water of the outfall from the interconnected system.

2.2.1. Discharges Subject to Requirements Related to an Approved TMDL

- a. "Approved TMDLs" are those that have been approved by EPA as of the date of issuance of this permit.
- b. The MS4s specified below discharge to waters within Massachusetts that are subject to TMDLs, or in some cases, to tributaries of such waters, and shall comply with the requirements of Appendix F, part A. Appendix F identifies, by section, the provisions the permittee shall implement to be consistent with the terms of the approved TMDL. Alternatively, EPA may notify the permittee that an individual permit application is necessary in accordance with part 1.8.a.

- i. The following is a list of municipalities in the Charles River Watershed:

1.

Arlington	Mendon
Ashland	Milford
Bellingham	Millis
Belmont	Natick
Brookline	Needham

Cambridge	Newton
Dedham	Norfolk
Dover	Sherborn
Foxborough	Walpole
Franklin	Waltham
Holliston	Watertown
Hopedale	Wayland
Hopkinton	Wellesley
Lexington	Weston
Lincoln	Westwood
Medfield	Wrentham
Medway	

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in municipalities listed above that discharge to the Charles River or its Tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F, part A.I with respect to the reduction of phosphorus discharges from their MS4.

- ii. The following is a list of municipalities that contain a lake or pond subject to an approved lake or pond phosphorus TMDL in the Northern Blackstone Basin, Chicopee Basin, Connecticut Basin, French Basin, Millers Basin or in the watershed of Bare Hill Pond, Flint Pond, Indian Lake, Lake Boon, Lake Quinsigamond, Leesville Pond, Salisbury Pond, Quaboag Pond or Quacumquasit Pond.

1.

Auburn	Millbury
Charlton	Oxford
Dudley	Shrewsbury
Gardner	Spencer
Grafton	Springfield
Granby	Stow
Hadley	Templeton
Harvard	Westminster
Hudson	Winchendon
Leicester	Wilbraham
Ludlow	

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s in the above municipalities that discharge to waterbodies listed on Table F-6 in Appendix F or their tributaries, and any other MS4 that discharges to waterbodies listed on Table F-6 in Appendix F or their tributaries,

shall meet the requirements of Appendix F, part A.II with respect to reduction of phosphorus discharges from their MS4.

- iii. The following is a list of municipalities that contain waters subject to an approved TMDL for bacteria or pathogens.

1.

Abington	Marshfield
Acushnet	Mashpee
Andover	Mattapoisett
Avon	Medfield
Barnstable	Medway
Bedford	Melrose
Bellingham	Mendon
Belmont	Milford
Berkley	Millis
Beverly	Milton
Billerica	Nahant
Bourne	Natick
Brewster	Needham
Bridgewater	New Bedford
Brockton	Newton
Brookline	Norfolk
Burlington	North Andover
Cambridge	Norton
Canton	Norwell
Chatham	Norwood
Cohasset	Orleans
Concord	Peabody
Danvers	Pembroke
Dartmouth	Plymouth
Dedham	Raynham
Dennis	Rehoboth
Dighton	Revere
Dover	Rockland
Duxbury	Rockport
East Bridgewater	Salem
Eastham	Sandwich
Essex	Saugus
Everett	Scituate
Fairhaven	Seekonk
Fall River	Sharon

Falmouth	Sherborn
Foxborough	Somerset
Franklin	Stoughton
Freetown	Swampscott
Gloucester	Swansea
Hanover	Taunton
Hanson	Tewksbury
Harwich	Wakefield
Holliston	Walpole
Hopedale	Waltham
Hopkinton	Wareham
Ipswich	Watertown
Kingston	Wellesley
Lawrence	Wellfleet
Lexington	West Bridgewater
Lincoln	Weston
Lynn	Westport
Lynnfield	Westwood
Malden	Whitman
Manchester	Wilmington
Mansfield	Winthrop
Marblehead	Yarmouth
Marion	

The operators of MS4s located in municipalities listed above that discharge to a waterbody segment listed on Table F-8 in Appendix F and any other MS4 that discharges directly to a waterbody segment listed on Table F-8 in Appendix F shall meet the requirements of Appendix F, part A.III with respect to reduction of bacteria/pathogens discharges from their MS4.

- iv. The following is a list of municipalities located on Cape Cod that contain waters subject to an approved TMDL for nitrogen (Total Nitrogen).

1.

Bourne
Barnstable
Chatham
Falmouth
Harwich
Mashpee
Orleans
Yarmouth

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to waterbodies found on Table F-9 in Appendix F or their tributaries and any other MS4 that discharges to waterbodies found on Table F-9 in Appendix F or their tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F, part A.IV with respect to reduction of nitrogen discharges from their MS4.

v. The following is a list of municipalities located in the Assabet River Watershed:

1.

Acton	Hudson
Berlin	Littleton
Bolton	Marlborough
Boxborough	Maynard
Boylston	Northborough
Carlisle	Shrewsbury
Clinton	Stow
Concord	Westborough
Grafton	Westford
Harvard	

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to the Assabet River or its tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F part A.V with respect to reduction of phosphorus discharges from their MS4.

c. The MS4s specified below discharge to waters, or tributaries of waters, that have been identified in an adjacent state's approved TMDL as being impaired due, in part, to MS4 stormwater discharges in Massachusetts, and shall comply with the requirements of Appendix F, part B. Appendix F identifies, by section, the provisions the permittee shall implement to be consistent with the reasonable assumptions related to Massachusetts MS4 discharges. Alternatively, EPA may notify the permittee that an individual permit application is necessary in accordance with part 1.8.a.

i. The following is a list of municipalities in Massachusetts located in the watershed of Long Island Sound, which has an approved TMDL for nitrogen (Total Nitrogen).

1.

Adams	North Adams
Agawam	Northampton
Amherst	Oxford
Ashburnham	Palmer
Ashby	Paxton
Auburn	Pelham
Belchertown	Pittsfield
Charlton	Richmond
Cheshire	Russell

Chicopee	Rutland
Dalton	South Hadley
Douglas	Southampton
Dudley	Southbridge
East Longmeadow	Southwick
Easthampton	Spencer
Gardner	Springfield
Granby	Sturbridge
Hadley	Sutton
Hampden	Templeton
Hatfield	Ware
Hinsdale	Webster
Holyoke	West Springfield
Lanesborough	Westfield
Leicester	Westhampton
Lenox	Westminster
Longmeadow	Wilbraham
Ludlow	Williamsburg
Millbury	Winchendon
Monson	

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to a water within the Connecticut River Watershed, the Housatonic River Watershed, or the Thames River Watershed shall meet the requirements of Appendix F part B. I with respect to nitrogen discharges from their MS4.

- ii. The following is a list of municipalities in Massachusetts identified in a TMDL as containing MS4s contributing phosphorus to waterbody segments that have out of state approved TMDLs for phosphorus:

1.

Attleboro
North Attleborough
Plainville
Rehoboth
Seekonk
Swansea

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to a waterbody found on Table F-12 in Appendix F or its tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F part B. II with respect to phosphorus discharges from their MS4.

- iii. The following is a list of municipalities in Massachusetts identified in a TMDL as containing MS4s contributing bacteria/pathogens to waterbody segments that have out of state approved TMDLs for bacteria/pathogens:

1.

Attleboro
North Attleborough
Plainville
Rehoboth
Seekonk

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to a waterbody found on Table F-13 in Appendix F or its tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F part B. III with respect to bacteria/pathogens discharges from their MS4.

- iv. The following is a list of municipalities in Massachusetts identified in a TMDL as containing MS4s contributing metals (cadmium, lead, aluminum iron) to waterbody segments that have out of state approved TMDLs for metals (cadmium, lead, aluminum, iron):

1.

Attleboro
North Attleborough
Plainville
Seekonk

Permittees that operate regulated MS4s located in the municipalities above that discharge to a waterbody found on Table F-14 in Appendix F or its tributaries shall meet the requirements of Appendix F part B. IV with respect to metals discharges from their MS4.

2.2.2. Discharges to Certain Water Quality Limited Waters Subject to Additional Requirements

For purposes of this permit, a 'water quality limited water body' is any water body that does not meet applicable water quality standards, including but not limited to waters listed in categories 5 or 4b on the Massachusetts Integrated Report of waters listed pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d) and 305(b).

If there is a discharge from the MS4 to a water quality limited waterbody where pollutants typically found in stormwater (specifically nutrients (Total Nitrogen or Total Phosphorus), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride), metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc) and oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease)) are the cause of the impairment and there is not an approved TMDL, or the MS4 is located in a town listed in part 2.2.2.a.-b, the permittee shall comply with the provisions in Appendix H applicable to it.

In the absence of a defined pollutant reduction target and where no approved TMDL has been established, this permit part and Appendix H define an iterative approach addressing pollutant reductions to waterbodies where the permittee's discharge is causing or contributing to an excursion above water quality standards due to nutrients (Total Nitrogen Total Phosphorus), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride), metals

(Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc) or oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease).

- a. Discharges to water quality limited waterbodies where nitrogen (Total Nitrogen) is the cause of the impairment, or their tributaries

i. The requirements of this part are applicable to:

1. Permittees (including traditional and non-traditional MS4s) that own or operate an MS4 in the following municipalities. Discharges from MS4s within these municipalities are to waterbodies that are impaired due to nitrogen (Total Nitrogen), or their tributaries.

Abington	Mattapoisett
Acushnet	Middleborough
Attleboro	New Bedford
Avon	Norton
Barnstable	Peabody
Berkley	Pembroke
Bourne	Plainville
Bridgewater	Plymouth
Brockton	Plympton
Carver	Raynham
Dartmouth	Rehoboth
Dighton	Rochester
East Bridgewater	Salem
Easton	Seekonk
Fairhaven	Sharon
Fall River	Somerset
Foxborough	Stoughton
Freetown	Swansea
Halifax	Taunton
Hanson	Wakefield
Holbrook	Wareham
Kingston	West Bridgewater
Lakeville	Westport
Lynnfield	Whitman
Mansfield	Wrentham
Marion	Yarmouth

2. Any other permittee that, during the permit term, becomes aware that its discharge is to a waterbody that is water quality limited due to nitrogen (Total Nitrogen), or a tributary of such water.

- ii. Permittees subject to part 2.2.2.a.i above shall meet the requirements of Appendix H part I with respect to the control of nitrogen discharges from their MS4;
- iii. During development of their Notice of Intent, the permittee may determine that all discharges from the regulated area through their MS4 are outside of a watershed that contains a nitrogen (Total Nitrogen) impairment in a downstream segment. The permittee shall retain all documentation used in this determination as part of their NOI and are relieved from the requirements of part 2.2.2.a.i and Appendix H part I.
- b. Discharges to water quality limited waterbodies where phosphorus ("Total Phosphorus") is the cause of the impairment, or their tributaries
- i. The requirements of this part are applicable to:
1. Permittees (including traditional and non-traditional MS4s) that own or operate an MS4 in the following municipalities. Discharges from MS4s within these municipalities are to waterbodies that are impaired due to phosphorus (Total Phosphorus), or their tributaries.

Abington	Lynn
Acushnet	Lynnfield
Andover	Malden
Arlington	Mansfield
Ashburnham	Marlborough
Ashland	Mashpee
Auburn	Medfield
Avon	Medford
Ayer	Melrose
Barnstable	Mendon
Bedford	Methuen
Belchertown	Millbury
Belmont	Millville
Billerica	Milton
Blackstone	North Andover
Bolton	Northbridge
Brewster	Norton
Bridgewater	Norwood
Brockton	Oxford
Burlington	Peabody
Cambridge	Pembroke
Canton	Pepperell
Carlisle	Pittsfield

Carver	Quincy
Chelmsford	Randolph
Chelsea	Reading
Clinton	Revere
Concord	Rockland
Dalton	Salem
Dedham	Scituate
Douglas	Seekonk
Dover	Sharon
Dracut	Shirley
Dunstable	Shrewsbury
East Bridgewater	Somerville
Eastham	Southampton
Easthampton	Spencer
Everett	Springfield
Falmouth	Stoneham
Fitchburg	Stoughton
Foxborough	Sudbury
Framingham	Sutton
Gloucester	Taunton
Grafton	Tewksbury
Granby	Townsend
Groton	Tyngsborough
Halifax	Upton
Hanover	Uxbridge
Hanson	Wakefield
Harvard	Walpole
Haverhill	Wareham
Hinsdale	Watertown
Hopkinton	Wayland
Hudson	West Bridgewater
Lancaster	Westfield
Lawrence	Westminster
Leicester	Westwood
Lenox	Whitman
Leominster	Wilmington
Lexington	Winchendon
Littleton	Winchester
Lowell	Winthrop

Lunenburg	Woburn
Lynn	

2. Any other permittee that, during the permit term, becomes aware that its discharge is to a waterbody that is water quality limited due to phosphorus ("Total Phosphorus"), or to a tributary of such water.
- ii. The permittees subject to part 2.2.2.b.i. above shall meet all requirements of Appendix H part II with respect to the control of phosphorus discharges from the MS4.
 - iii. During development of their Notice of Intent, the permittee may determine that all discharges from the regulated area through their MS4 are outside of a watershed that contains a phosphorus ("Total Phosphorus") impairment in a downstream segment. The permittee shall retain all documentation used in this determination as part of their NOI and are relieved from the requirements of part 2.2.2.b.i and Appendix H part II.
- c. Discharges to water quality limited waterbodies where bacteria or pathogens is the cause of the impairment
- i. The requirements of this part are applicable to:
 1. Any MS4 discharge identified by the permittee on their Notice of Intent as discharging directly to an impaired waterbody on the most recent EPA approved Massachusetts 303(d) list where bacteria or pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform) is the cause of the impairment.
 2. Any other MS4 that, during the permit term, becomes aware that its discharge is to a waterbody that is water quality limited due to bacteria or pathogens.
 - ii. The permittees subject to part 2.2.2.c.i. shall meet all requirements of Appendix H part III with respect to reduction of bacteria or pathogens discharges from the MS4.
- d. Discharges to water quality limited waterbodies where chloride (Chloride) is the cause of the impairment
- i. The requirements of this part are applicable to:
 1. Any MS4 discharge identified by the permittee on their Notice of Intent as discharging directly to an impaired waterbody on the most recent EPA approved Massachusetts 303(d) list where chloride (Chloride) is the cause of the impairment.
 2. Any other MS4 that, during the permit term, becomes aware that its discharge is to a waterbody that is water quality limited due to chloride (Chloride).
 - ii. The permittees subject to part 2.2.2.d.i. shall meet all requirements of Appendix H part IV with respect to reduction of chloride discharges from the MS4.
- e. Discharges to water quality limited waterbodies where oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease), solids (TSS or Turbidity) or metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc) is the cause of the impairment

i. The requirements of this part are applicable to:

1. Any MS4 discharge identified by the permittee on their Notice of Intent as discharging directly to an impaired waterbody on the most recent EPA approved Massachusetts 303(d) list where oil and grease, solids or metals (Oil and Grease, Petroleum Hydrocarbons TSS, Turbidity, Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc) is the cause of the impairment.
2. Any other MS4 that, during the permit term, becomes aware that its discharge is to a waterbody that is water quality limited due to oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease), solids (TSS or Turbidity) or metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc).

ii. The permittees subject to part 2.2.2.d.i. shall meet all requirements of Appendix H part V with respect to reduction of solids, oil and grease or metals discharges from the MS4.

2.3. Requirements to Reduce Pollutants to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP)

The permittee shall reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) as detailed in parts 2.3.2 through 2.3.7.

2.3.1. Control Measures

- a. Permittees authorized under the MS4-2003 permit shall continue to implement their existing SWMPs while updating their SWMPs pursuant to this permit. This permit does not extend the compliance deadlines set forth in the MS4-2003 permit.
- b. Implementation of one or more of the minimum control measures described in parts 2.3.2- 2.3.7 or other permit requirements may be shared with another entity (including another interconnected MS4) or the other entity may fully implement the measure or requirement, if the following requirements are satisfied:
 - The other entity, in fact, implements the control measure.
 - The particular control measure or component thereof undertaken by the other entity is at least as stringent as the corresponding permit requirement.
 - The other entity agrees to implement the control measure on the permittee's behalf. The annual reports must specify that the permittee is relying on another entity to satisfy some of its permit obligations and specify what those obligations are.
 - If the permittee is relying on another governmental entity regulated under 40 CFR §122 to satisfy all of its permit obligations, including the obligation to file annual reports, the permittee shall note that fact in its NOI, but is not required to file annual reports.
 - The permittee remains responsible for compliance with all permit obligations if the other entity fails to implement the control measures (or component thereof). The permittee may enter into a legally binding agreement with the other entity regarding the other entity's performance of control measures, but the permittee remains ultimately responsible for permit compliance.

2.3.2. Public Education and Outreach

Objective: The permittee shall implement an education program that includes educational goals based on stormwater issues of significance within the MS4 area. The ultimate objective of a public

education program is to increase knowledge and change behavior of the public so that pollutants in stormwater are reduced.

- a. The permittee shall continue to implement the public education program required by the MS4-2003 permit by distributing educational material to the MS4 community. The educational program shall define educational goals, express specific messages, define the targeted audience for each message, and identify responsible parties for program implementation. If appropriate for the target audience, materials may be developed in a language other than English. At a minimum, the program shall provide information concerning the impact of stormwater discharges on water bodies within the community, especially those waters that are impaired or identified as priority waters. The program shall identify steps and/or activities that the public can take to reduce the pollutants in stormwater runoff and their impacts to the environment.
- b. The educational program shall include education and outreach efforts for the following four audiences: (1) residents, (2) businesses, institutions (churches, hospitals), and commercial facilities, (3) developers (construction), and (4) industrial facilities, unless one of these audiences is not present in the MS4 community. In such a situation, the MS4 must document in both the NOI and SWMP which audience is absent from the community and no educational messages are required to that audience.
- c. The permittee shall distribute a minimum of two (2) educational messages over the permit term to each audience identified in part 2.3.2.b. The distribution of materials to each audience shall be spaced at least a year apart. Educational messages may be printed materials such as brochures or newsletters; electronic materials such as websites; mass media such as newspaper articles or public service announcement (radio or cable); targeted workshops on stormwater management, or displays in a public area such as town/city hall. The permittee may use existing materials if they are appropriate for the message the permittee chooses to deliver or the permittee may develop its own educational materials. The permittee may partner with other MS4s, community groups or watershed associations to implement the education program to meet this permit requirement.

Some EPA educational materials are available at: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npstbx/index.html>.

- d. The permittee shall, at a minimum, consider the topics listed in part 2.3.2.d.i. – iv when developing the outreach/education program. The topics are not exclusive and the permittee shall focus on those topics most relevant to the community.
 - i. Residential program: effects of outdoor activities such as lawn care (use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers and information on Massachusetts Regulation 331 CMR 31 pertaining to proper use of phosphorus containing fertilizers on turf grasses) on water quality; benefits of appropriate on-site infiltration of stormwater; effects of automotive work and car washing on water quality; proper disposal of swimming pool water; proper management of pet waste; maintenance of septic systems. If the small MS4 area has areas serviced by septic systems, the permittee shall consider information pertaining to maintenance of septic systems as part of its education program.
 - ii. Business/Commercial/Institution program: proper lawn maintenance (use of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizer, and information on Massachusetts Regulation 331 CMR 31 pertaining to proper use of phosphorus containing fertilizers on turf grasses); benefits of appropriate on-site infiltration of stormwater; building maintenance (use of detergents); use of salt or other de-icing and anti-icing materials (minimize their use); proper storage

of salt or other de-icing/anti-icing materials (cover/prevent runoff to storm system and contamination to ground water); proper storage of materials (emphasize pollution prevention); proper management of waste materials and dumpsters (cover and pollution prevention); proper management of parking lot surfaces (sweeping); proper car care activities (washing of vehicles and maintenance); and proper disposal of swimming pool water by entities such as motels, hotels, and health and country clubs (discharges must be dechlorinated and otherwise free from pollutants).

- iii. Developers and Construction: proper sediment and erosion control management practices; information about Low Impact Development (LID) principles and technologies; and information about EPA's construction general permit (CGP). This education can also be a part of the Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control measure detailed in part 2.3.5.
- iv. Industrial program: equipment inspection and maintenance; proper storage of industrial materials (emphasize pollution prevention); proper management and disposal of wastes; proper management of dumpsters; minimization of use of salt or other de-icing/anti-icing materials; proper storage of salt or other de-icing/anti-icing materials (cover/prevent runoff to storm system and ground water contamination); benefits of appropriate on-site infiltration of stormwater runoff from areas with low exposure to industrial materials such as roofs or employee parking; proper maintenance of parking lot surfaces (sweeping); and requirements for coverage under EPA's Multi-Sector General Permit.
- e. The program shall show evidence of focused messages for specific audiences as well as evidence that progress toward the defined educational goals of the program has been achieved. The permittee shall identify methods that it will use to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational messages and the overall education program. Any methods used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program shall be tied to the defined goals of the program and the overall objective of changes in behavior and knowledge.
- f. The permittee shall modify any ineffective messages or distribution techniques for an audience prior to the next scheduled message delivery.
- g. The permittee shall document in each annual report the messages for each audience; the method of distribution; the measures/methods used to assess the effectiveness of the messages, and the method/measures used to assess the overall effectiveness of the education program.

2.3.3. Public Involvement and participation

Objective: The permittee shall provide opportunities to engage the public to participate in the review and implementation of the permittee's SWMP.

- a. All public involvement activities shall comply with state public notice requirements (MGL Chapter 30A, Sections 18 – 25 – effective 7/10/2010). The SWMP and all annual reports shall be available to the public.
- b. The permittee shall annually provide the public an opportunity to participate in the review and implementation of the SWMP.

- c. The permittee shall report on the activities undertaken to provide public participation opportunities including compliance with part 2.3.3.a. Public participation opportunities pursuant to part 2.3.3.b may include, but are not limited to, websites; hotlines; clean-up teams; monitoring teams; or an advisory committee.

2.3.4. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE) Program

Objective: The permittee shall implement an IDDE program to systematically find and eliminate sources of non-stormwater discharges to its municipal separate storm sewer system and implement procedures to prevent such discharges.

- a. Legal Authority - The IDDE program shall include adequate legal authority to:: prohibit illicit discharges; investigate suspected illicit discharges; eliminate illicit discharges, including discharges from properties not owned by or controlled by the MS4 that discharge into the MS4 system; and implement appropriate enforcement procedures and actions. Adequate legal authority consists of a currently effective ordinance, by-law, or other regulatory mechanism. For permittees authorized by the MS4-2003 permit, the ordinance, by-law, or other regulatory mechanism was a requirement of the MS4-2003 permit and was required to be effective by May 1, 2008. For new permittees the ordinance, by-law, or other regulatory mechanism shall be in place within 3 years of the permit effective date.
- b. During the development of the new components of the IDDE program required by this permit, permittees authorized by the MS4-2003 permit must continue to implement their existing IDDE program required by the MS4-2003 permit to detect and eliminate illicit discharges to their MS4.

2.3.4.1. Definitions and Prohibitions

The permittee shall prohibit illicit discharges and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) to its MS4 and require removal of such discharges consistent with parts 2.3.4.2 and 2.3.4.4 of this permit.

An SSO is a discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater from a municipal sanitary sewer.

An illicit discharge is any discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer that is not composed entirely of stormwater, except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit (other than the NPDES permit for discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer) and discharges resulting from fire fighting activities.

2.3.4.2. Elimination of Illicit Discharges

- a. Upon detection of an illicit discharge, the permittee shall locate, identify and eliminate the illicit discharge as expeditiously as possible. Upon identification of the illicit source the MS4 notify all responsible parties for any such discharge and require immediate cessation of improper disposal practices in accordance with its legal authorities. Where elimination of an illicit discharge within 60 days of its identification as an illicit discharge is not possible, the permittee shall establish an expeditious schedule for its elimination and report the dates of identification and schedules for removal in the permittee's annual reports. The permittee shall immediately commence actions necessary for elimination. The permittee shall diligently pursue elimination of all illicit discharges. In the interim, the permittee shall take all reasonable and prudent measures to minimize the discharge of pollutants to and from its MS4.
- b. The period between identification and elimination of an illicit discharge is not a grace period. Discharges from an MS4 that are mixed with an illicit discharge are not authorized by this Permit (part 1.3.a) and remain unlawful until eliminated.

2.3.4.3. Non-Stormwater Discharges

The permittee may presume that the sources of non-stormwater listed in part 1.4 of this permit need not be addressed. However, if the permittee identifies any of these sources as significant contributors of pollutants to the MS4, then the permittee shall implement measures to control these sources so they are no longer significant contributors of pollutants, and/or eliminate them entirely, consistent with part 2.3.4.

2.3.4.4. Sanitary Sewer Overflows

- a. Upon detection of an SSO the permittee shall eliminate it as expeditiously as possible and take interim mitigation measures to minimize the discharge of pollutants to and from its MS4 until elimination is completed.
- b. The permittee shall identify all known locations where SSOs have discharged to the MS4 within the previous five (5) years. This shall include SSOs resulting, during dry or wet weather, from inadequate conveyance capacities, or where interconnectivity of the storm and sanitary sewer infrastructure allows for communication of flow between the systems. Within one (1) year of the effective date of the permit, the permittee shall develop an inventory of all identified SSOs indicating the following information, if available:
 1. Location (approximate street crossing/address and receiving water, if any);
 2. A clear statement of whether the discharge entered a surface water directly or entered the MS4;
 3. Date(s) and time(s) of each known SSO occurrence (i.e., beginning and end of any known discharge);
 4. Estimated volume(s) of the occurrence;
 5. Description of the occurrence indicating known or suspected cause(s);
 6. Mitigation and corrective measures completed with dates implemented; and
 7. Mitigation and corrective measures planned with implementation schedules.

The permittee shall maintain the inventory as a part of the SWMP and update the inventory annually, all updates shall include the information in part 2.3.4.4.b.1-7.

- c. In accordance with Paragraph B.12 of Appendix B of this permit, upon becoming aware of an SSO to the MS4, the permittee shall provide oral notice to EPA within 24 hours. Additionally, the permittee shall provide written notice to EPA and MassDEP within five (5) days of becoming aware of the SSO occurrence and shall include the information in the updated inventory. The notice shall contain all of the information listed in part 2.3.4.4.b. Where common notification requirements for SSOs are included in multiple NPDES permits issued to a permittee, a single notification may be made to EPA as directed in the permittee's wastewater or CSO NPDES permit and constitutes compliance with this part.
- d. The permittee shall include and update the SSO inventory in its annual report, including the status of mitigation and corrective measures implemented by the permittee to address each SSO identified pursuant to this part.
- e. The period between detection and elimination of a discharge from the SSO to the MS4 is not a grace period. Discharges from an MS4 that are mixed with an SSO are not authorized by this Permit (part 1.3.a) and remain unlawful until eliminated.

2.3.4.5. System mapping

The permittee shall develop a revised and more detailed map than was required by the MS4-2003 permit. This revised map of the MS4 shall be completed in two phases as outlined below. The mapping shall include a depiction of the permittee's separate storm sewer system in the permit area. The mapping is intended to facilitate the identification of key infrastructure and factors influencing proper system operation, and the potential for illicit sanitary sewer discharges.

- a. Phase I: The system map shall be updated within two (2) years of the permit effective date to include the following information:
 - Outfalls and receiving waters (required by MS4-2003 permit)
 - Open channel conveyances (swales, ditches, etc.)
 - Interconnections with other MS4s and other storm sewer systems
 - Municipally-owned stormwater treatment structures (e.g., detention and retention basins, infiltration systems, bioretention areas, water quality swales, gross particle separators, oil/water separators, or other proprietary systems)
 - Waterbodies identified by name and indication of all use impairments as identified on the most recent EPA approved Massachusetts Integrated List of waters report pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d) and 305(b)
 - Initial catchment delineations. Any available system data and topographic information may be used to produce initial catchment delineations. For the purpose of this permit, a catchment is the area that drains to an individual outfall or interconnection.
- b. Phase II: The system map shall be updated annually as the following information becomes available during implementation of catchment investigation procedures in part 2.3.4.8. This information must be included in the map for all outfalls within ten (10) years of the permit effective date:
 - Outfall spatial location (latitude and longitude with a minimum accuracy of +/-30 feet)
 - Pipes
 - Manholes
 - Catch basins
 - Refined catchment delineations. Catchment delineations shall be updated to reflect information collected during catchment investigations
 - Municipal sanitary sewer system (if available)
 - Municipal combined sewer system (if applicable).
- c. Recommended elements to be included in the system map as information becomes available:
 - Storm sewer material, size (pipe diameter) and age
 - Sanitary sewer system material, size (pipe diameter) and age
 - Privately-owned stormwater treatment structures
 - Where a municipal sanitary sewer system exists, properties known or suspected to be served by a septic system, especially in high-density urban areas
 - Area where the permittee's MS4 has received or could receive flow from septic system discharges (e.g., areas with poor soils, or high ground water elevations unsuitable for conventional subsurface disposal systems)
 - Seasonal high water table elevations impacting sanitary alignments
 - Topography
 - Orthophotography

- Alignments, dates and representation of work completed (with legend) of past illicit discharge investigations (e.g., flow isolation, dye testing, CCTV)
 - Locations of suspected, confirmed and corrected illicit discharges (with dates and flow estimates).
- d. The mapping may be produced by hand or through computer-aided methods (e.g. GIS). The required scale and detail of the map shall be appropriate to facilitate a rapid understanding of the system by the permittee, EPA and the state. In addition, the mapping shall serve as a planning tool for the implementation and phasing of the IDDE program and demonstration of the extent of complete and planned investigations and corrections. The permittee shall update the mapping as necessary to reflect newly discovered information and required corrections or modifications.
- e. The permittee shall report on the progress towards the completion of the system map in each annual report.

2.3.4.6. Written Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program

The IDDE program shall be recorded in a written (hardcopy or electronic) document. The IDDE program shall include each of the elements described in parts 2.3.4.7 and part 2.3.4.8, unless the permittee provides a written explanation within the IDDE program as to why a particular element is not applicable to the permittee.

Notwithstanding the permittee's explanation, EPA may at any time determine that a particular element is in fact applicable to the permittee and require the permittee to add it to the IDDE program. The written (hardcopy or electronic) IDDE program shall be completed within one (1) year of the effective date of the permit and updated in accordance with the milestones of this part. The permittee shall implement the IDDE program in accordance with the goals and milestones contained in this part.

- a. The written (hardcopy or electronic) IDDE program shall include a reference or citation of the authority the permittee will use to implement all aspects of the IDDE program.
- b. Statement of IDDE Program Responsibilities - The permittee shall establish a written (hardcopy or electronic) statement that clearly identifies responsibilities with regard to eliminating illicit discharges. The statement shall identify the lead municipal agency(ies) or department(s) responsible for implementing the IDDE Program as well as any other agencies or departments that may have responsibilities for aspects of the program (e.g., board of health responsibilities for overseeing septic system construction; sanitary sewer system staff; inspectional services for enforcing plumbing codes; town counsel responsibilities in enforcement actions, etc.). Where multiple departments and agencies have responsibilities with respect to the IDDE program specific areas of responsibility shall be defined and processes for coordination and data sharing shall be established and documented.
- c. Program Procedures – The permittee shall include in the written IDDE program all written procedures developed in accordance with the requirements and timelines in parts 2.3.4.7 and 2.3.4.8 below. At a minimum this shall include the written procedures for dry weather outfall screening and sampling and for catchment investigations.

2.3.4.7. Assessment and Priority Ranking of Outfalls/Interconnections

The permittee shall assess and priority rank the outfalls in terms of their potential to have illicit discharges and SSOs and the related public health significance. This ranking will determine the priority order for

screening of outfalls and interconnections pursuant to part 2.3.4.7.b, catchment investigations for evidence of illicit discharges and SSOs pursuant to part 2.3.4.8, and provides the basis for determining permit milestones of this part.

a. Outfall/Interconnection Inventory and Initial Ranking:

An initial outfall and interconnection inventory and priority ranking to assess illicit discharge potential based on existing information shall be completed within one (1) year from the effective date of the permit; an updated inventory and ranking will be provided in each annual report thereafter. The inventory shall be updated annually to include data collected in connection with the dry weather screening and other relevant inspections conducted by the permittee.

- i. The outfall and interconnection inventory will identify each outfall and interconnection discharging from the MS4, record its location and condition, and provide a framework for tracking inspections, screenings and other activities under the permittee's IDDE program.
 - An outfall means a point source as defined by 40 CFR § 122.2 as the point where the municipal separate storm sewer discharges to waters of the United States. An outfall does not include open conveyances connecting two municipal separate storm sewers or pipes, tunnels or other conveyances that connect segments of the same stream or other waters of the United States and that are used to convey waters of the United States. (40 CFR § 122.26(b)(9)). However, it is strongly recommended that a permittee inspect all accessible portions of the system as part of this process. Culverts longer than a simple road crossing shall be included in the inventory unless the permittee can confirm that they are free of any connections and simply convey waters of the United States.
 - An interconnection means the point (excluding sheet flow over impervious surfaces) where the permittee's MS4 discharges to another MS4 or other storm sewer system, through which the discharge is conveyed to waters of the United States or to another storm sewer system and eventually to a water of the United States.
- ii. The permittee shall classify each of the permittee's outfalls and interconnections into one of the following categories:
 - Problem Outfalls: outfalls/interconnections with known or suspected contributions of illicit discharges based on existing information shall be designated as Problem Outfalls. This shall include any outfalls/interconnections where previous screening indicates likely sewer input.⁴ Problem Outfalls need not be screened pursuant to part 2.3.4.7.b.
 - High Priority Outfalls: Outfalls/interconnections that have not been classified as Problem Outfalls and that are:
 - discharging to an area of concern to public health due to proximity of public beaches, recreational areas, drinking water supplies or shellfish beds;
 - determined by the permittee as high priority based on the characteristics listed below or other available information;
 - Low Priority Outfalls: Outfalls/interconnections determined by the permittee as low priority based on the characteristics listed below or other available information.

⁴ Likely sewer input indicators are any of the following:

- Olfactory or visual evidence of sewage,
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and bacteria levels greater than the water quality criteria applicable to the receiving water, or
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and detectable levels of chlorine.

- Excluded outfalls: outfalls/interconnections with no potential for illicit discharges may be excluded from the IDDE program. This category is limited to roadway drainage in undeveloped areas with no dwellings and no sanitary sewers; drainage for athletic fields, parks or undeveloped green space and associated parking without services; cross-country drainage alignments (that neither cross nor are in proximity to sanitary sewer alignments) through undeveloped land.
- iii. The permittee shall priority rank outfalls into the categories above (except for excluded outfalls), based on the following characteristics of the defined initial catchment area where information is available:
- Past discharge complaints and reports.
 - Poor receiving water quality- the following guidelines are recommended to identify waters as having a high illicit discharge potential: exceeding water quality standards for bacteria; ammonia levels above 0.5 mg/l; surfactants levels greater than or equal to 0.25 mg/l.
 - Density of generating sites- Generating sites are those places, including institutional, municipal, commercial, or industrial sites, with a potential to generate pollutants that could contribute to illicit discharges. Examples of these sites include, but are not limited to, car dealers; car washes; gas stations; garden centers; and industrial manufacturing areas.
 - Age of development and infrastructure – Industrial areas greater than 40 years old and areas where the sanitary sewer system is more than 40 years old will probably have a high illicit discharge potential. Developments 20 years or younger will probably have a low illicit discharge potential.
 - Sewer conversion – contributing catchment areas that were once serviced by septic systems, but have been converted to sewer connections may have a high illicit discharge potential.
 - Historic combined sewer systems – contributing areas that were once serviced by a combined sewer system, but have been separated may have a high illicit discharge potential.
 - Surrounding density of aging septic systems – Septic systems thirty years or older in residential land use areas are prone to have failures and may have a high illicit discharge potential.
 - Culverted streams – any river or stream that is culverted for distances greater than a simple roadway crossing may have a high illicit discharge potential.
 - Water quality limited waterbodies that receive a discharge from the MS4 or waters with approved TMDLs applicable to the permittee, where illicit discharges have the potential to contain the pollutant identified as the cause of the water quality impairment.
 - The permittee may also consider additional relevant characteristics, including location-specific characteristics; if so, the permittee shall include the additional characteristics in its written (hardcopy or electronic) IDDE program.
- b. Dry Weather Outfall and Interconnection Screening and Sampling
All outfalls/interconnections (excluding Problem and excluded Outfalls) shall be inspected for the presence of dry weather flow within three (3) years of the permit effective date. The permittee shall screen all High and Low Priority Outfalls in accordance with their initial ranking developed at part 2.3.4.7.a.
- i. Written procedure: The permittee shall develop an outfall and interconnection screening and sampling procedure to be included in the IDDE program within one (1) year of the permit effective date. This procedure shall include the following procedures for:
- sample collection,
 - use of field kits,

- storage and conveyance of samples (including relevant hold times), and
- field data collection and storage.

An example screening and sampling protocol (*EPA New England Bacterial Source Tracking Protocol*) can be found on EPA's website.

- ii. Weather conditions: Dry weather screening and sampling shall proceed only when no more than 0.1 inches of rainfall has occurred in the previous 24-hour period and no significant snow melt is occurring.
- iii. Screening requirements: For each outfall/interconnection:
 1. The permittee shall record all of the following information and include it in the outfall/interconnection inventory and priority ranking:
 - unique identifier,
 - receiving water,
 - date of most recent inspection,
 - dimensions,
 - shape,
 - material (concrete, PVC),
 - spatial location (latitude and longitude with a minimum accuracy of +/-30 feet,
 - physical condition,
 - indicators of potential non-stormwater discharges (including presence or evidence of suspect flow and sensory observations such as odor, color, turbidity, floatables, or oil sheen).
 2. If an outfall/interconnection is inaccessible or submerged, the permittee shall proceed to the first accessible upstream manhole or structure for the observation and sampling and report the location with the screening results.
 3. If no flow is observed, but evidence of illicit flow exists, the permittee shall revisit the outfall during dry weather within one week of the initial observation, if practicable, to perform a second dry weather screening and sample any observed flow (proceed as in iv. below).
 4. Where dry weather flow is found at an outfall/interconnection, at least one (1) sample shall be collected, and:
 - a) Samples shall be analyzed at a minimum for:
 - ammonia,
 - chlorine,
 - conductivity,
 - salinity,
 - *E. coli* (freshwater receiving water) or enterococcus (saline or brackish receiving water),
 - surfactants (such as MBAS),
 - temperature, and
 - pollutants of concern⁵
 - b) All analyses with the exception of indicator bacteria and pollutants of concern can be performed with field test kits or field instrumentation and are not subject to 40

⁵ Where the discharge is directly into a water quality limited water or a water subject to an approved TMDL as indicated in Appendix F; the sample shall be analyzed for the pollutant(s) of concern identified as the cause of the impairment as specified in Appendix G

CFR part 136 requirements. Sampling for bacteria and pollutants of concern shall be conducted using the analytical methods found in 40 CFR §136, or alternative methods approved by EPA in accordance with the procedures in 40 CFR §136. Sampling for ammonia and surfactants must use sufficiently sensitive methods to detect those parameters at or below the threshold indicator concentrations of 0.5 mg/L for ammonia and 0.25 mg/L for surfactants. Sampling for residual chlorine must use a method with a detection limit of 0.02 mg/L or 20 ug/L.

- iv. The permittee may rely on screening conducted under the MS4-2003 permit, pursuant to an EPA enforcement action, or by the state or EPA to the extent that it meets the requirements of part 2.3.4.7.b.iii.4. All data shall be reported in each annual report. Permittees that have conducted substantially equivalent monitoring to that required by part 2.3.4.7.b as part of an EPA enforcement action can request an exemption from the requirements of part 2.3.4.7.b by submitting a written request to EPA and retaining exemption approval from EPA as part of the SWMP. Until the permittee receives formal written approval of the exemption from part 2.3.4.7.b from EPA the permittee remains subject to all requirements of part 2.3.4.7.b.
 - v. The permittee shall submit all screening data used in compliance with this part in its Annual Report.
- c. Follow-up ranking of outfalls and interconnections:
- i. The permittee's outfall and interconnection ranking (2.3.4.7.a) shall be updated to reprioritize outfalls and interconnections based on information gathered during dry weather screening (part 2.3.4.7.b).
 - ii. Outfalls/interconnections where relevant information was found indicating sewer input to the MS4 or sampling results indicating sewer input⁶ shall be considered highly likely to contain illicit discharges from sanitary sources, and such outfalls/interconnections shall be ranked at the top of the High Priority Outfalls category for investigation. At this time, permittees may choose to rank other outfalls and interconnections based on any new information from the dry weather screening.
 - iii. The ranking can be updated continuously as dry weather screening information becomes available, but shall be completed within three (3) years of the effective date of the permit.

2.3.4.8. Catchment Investigations

The permittee shall develop a systematic procedure to investigate each catchment associated with an outfall or interconnection within their MS4 system.

a. Timelines:

- A written catchment investigation procedure shall be developed within 18 months of the permit effective date in accordance with the requirements of part 2.3.4.8.b below.
- Investigations of catchments associated with Problem Outfalls shall begin no later than two (2)

⁶ Likely sewer input indicators are any of the following:

- Olfactory or visual evidence of sewage,
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and bacteria levels greater than the water quality criteria applicable to the receiving water, or
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and detectable levels of chlorine.

years from the permit effective date.

- Investigations of catchments associated with High and Low Priority Outfalls shall follow the ranking of outfalls updated in part 2.3.4.7.c.
- Investigations of catchments associated with Problem Outfalls shall be completed with seven (7) years of the permit effective date
- Investigations of catchments where any information gathered on the outfall/interconnection identifies sewer input⁷ shall be completed within seven (7) years of the permit effective date.
- Investigations of catchments associated with all Problem, High- and Low-Priority Outfalls shall be completed within ten (10) years of the permit effective date.

*For the purposes of these milestones, an individual catchment investigation will be considered complete if all relevant procedures in part 2.3.4.8.c. and 2.3.4.8.d. below have been completed.

b. A written catchment investigation procedure shall be developed that:

- i. **Identifies maps, historic plans and records, and other sources of data**, including but not limited to plans related to the construction of the storm drain and of sanitary sewers, prior work performed on the storm drains or sanitary sewers, board of health or other municipal data on septic system failures or required upgrades, and complaint records related to SSOs, sanitary sewer surcharges, and septic system breakouts. These data sources will be used in identifying system vulnerability factors within each catchment.
- ii. **Includes a manhole inspection methodology** that shall describe a storm drain network investigation that involves systematically and progressively observing, sampling (as required below) and evaluating key junction manholes (see definition in Appendix A) in the MS4 to determine the approximate location of suspected illicit discharges or SSOs. The manhole inspection methodology may either start from the outfall and work up the system or start from the upper parts of the catchment and work down the system or be a combination of both practices. Either method must, at a minimum, include an investigation of each key junction manhole within the MS4, even where no evidence of an illicit discharge is observed at the outfall. The manhole inspection methodology must describe the method the permittee will use. The manhole inspection methodology shall include procedures for dry and wet weather investigations.
- iii. **Establishes procedures to isolate and confirm sources of illicit discharges** where manhole investigations or other physical evidence or screening has identified that MS4 alignments are influenced by illicit discharges or SSOs. These shall include isolation of the drainage area for implementation of more detailed investigations, inspection of additional manholes along the alignment to refine the location of potential contaminant sources, and methods such as sandbagging key junction manhole inlets, targeted internal plumbing inspections, dye testing, video inspections, or smoke testing to isolate and confirm the sources.

c. Requirements for each catchment investigation associated with an outfall/interconnection:

- i. For each catchment being investigated, the permittee shall review relevant mapping and historic plans and records gathered in accordance with Part 2.3.4.8.b.i. This review shall be used to identify

⁷ Likely sewer input indicators are any of the following:

- Olfactory or visual evidence of sewage,
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and bacteria levels greater than the water quality criteria applicable to the receiving water, or
- Ammonia ≥ 0.5 mg/L, surfactants ≥ 0.25 mg/L, and detectable levels of chlorine.

areas within the catchment with higher potential for illicit connections. The permittee shall identify and record the presence of any of the following specific **System Vulnerability Factors (SVFs)**:

- History of SSOs, including, but not limited to, those resulting from wet weather, high water table, or fat/oil/grease blockages;
- Common or twin-invert manholes serving storm and sanitary sewer alignments;
- Common trench construction serving both storm and sanitary sewer alignments;
- Crossings of storm and sanitary sewer alignments where the sanitary system is shallower than the storm drain system;
- Sanitary sewer alignments known or suspected to have been constructed with an underdrain system;
- Inadequate sanitary sewer level of service (LOS) resulting in regular surcharging, customer back-ups, or frequent customer complaints;
- Areas formerly served by combined sewer systems;
- Sanitary sewer infrastructure defects such as leaking service laterals, cracked, broken, or offset sanitary infrastructure, directly piped connections between storm drain and sanitary sewer infrastructure, or other vulnerability factors identified through Inflow/Infiltration Analyses, Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Surveys, or other infrastructure investigations.

EPA recommends the permittee include the following in their consideration of System Vulnerability Factors:

- Sewer pump/lift stations, siphons, or known sanitary sewer restrictions where power/equipment failures or blockages could readily result in SSOs;
- Any sanitary sewer and storm drain infrastructure greater than 40 years old;
- Widespread code-required septic system upgrades required at property transfers (indicative of inadequate soils, water table separation, or other physical constraints of the area rather than poor owner maintenance);
- History of multiple Board of Health actions addressing widespread septic system failures (indicative of inadequate soils, water table separation, or other physical constraints of the area rather than poor owner maintenance);

The permittee shall document the presence or absence of System Vulnerability Factors for each catchment, retain this documentation as part of its IDDE program, and report this information in Annual Reports. Catchments with a minimum of one (1) System Vulnerability Factor are subject to wet weather sampling requirements of part 2.3.4.8.c.ii.2.

- ii. For each catchment, the permittee must inspect key junction manholes and gather catchment information on the locations of MS4 pipes, manholes, and the extent of the contributing catchment.

1. For all catchments

- a) Infrastructure information shall be incorporated into the permittee's mapping required at part 2.3.4.5; the permittee will refine their catchment delineation based on the field investigation where appropriate.
- b) The SVF inventory for the catchment will be updated based on information obtained during the inspection, including common (twin invert) manholes, directly piped connections between storm drains and sanitary sewer infrastructure, common weir walls, sanitary sewer underdrain connections and other structural vulnerabilities where sanitary discharges could enter the storm drain system during wet weather.

1) **Where a minimum of one (1) SVF is identified based on previous information**

or the investigation, a wet weather investigation must be conducted at the associated outfall (see below).

- c) During dry weather, key junction manholes⁸ shall be opened and inspected systematically for visual and olfactory evidence of illicit connections (e.g., excrement, toilet paper, gray filamentous bacterial growth, or sanitary products present).
 - 1) If flow is observed, the permittee shall sample the flow at a minimum for ammonia, chlorine and surfactants and can use field kits for these analyses.
 - 2) Where sampling results or visual or olfactory evidence indicate potential illicit discharges or SSOs, the area draining to the junction manhole shall be flagged for further upstream investigation.
- d) Key junction and subsequent manhole investigations will proceed until the location of suspected illicit discharges or SSOs can be isolated to a pipe segment between two manholes. If no evidence of an illicit discharge is found, catchment investigations will be considered complete upon completion of key junction manhole sampling.

2. For all catchments with a minimum of one (1) SVF identified

- a) The permittee shall meet the requirements above for dry weather screening
- b) The permittee shall inspect and sample under wet weather conditions to the extent necessary to determine whether wet weather-induced high flows in sanitary sewers or high groundwater in areas served by septic systems result in discharges of sanitary flow to the MS4.
 - 1) The permittee shall conduct at least one wet weather screening and sampling at the outfall that includes the same parameters required during dry weather screening, part 2.3.4.7.b.iii.4.
 - 2) Wet weather sampling and screening shall proceed during or after a storm event of sufficient depth or intensity to produce a stormwater discharge. EPA strongly recommends sampling during the spring (March through June) when groundwater levels are relatively high.
 - 3) The permit does not require a minimum rainfall event prior to wet weather screening. However, permittees may incorporate provisions that assist in targeting such discharges, including avoiding sampling during the initial period of discharge ("first flush") and/or identifying minimum storm event intensities likely to trigger sanitary sewer interconnections.
- c) This sampling can be done upon completion of any dry weather investigation but must be completed before the catchment investigation is marked as complete.

- iii. All data collected as part of the dry and wet weather catchment investigations shall be recorded and reported in each annual report.

d. Identification/Confirmation of illicit source

Where the source of an illicit discharge has been approximated between two manholes in the permittee's MS4, the permittee shall isolate and identify/confirm the source of the illicit discharge using more detailed methods identified in their written procedure (2.3.4.8.b.iii). For outfalls that contained evidence of an illicit discharge, catchment investigations will be considered complete upon

⁸ Where catchments do not contain junction manholes, the dry weather screening and sampling shall be considered as meeting the manhole inspection requirement. In these catchments, dry weather screenings that indicate potential presence of illicit discharges shall be further investigated pursuant to part 2.3.4.8.d. Investigations in these catchments may be considered complete where dry weather screening reveals no flow; no evidence of illicit discharges or SSOs is indicated through sampling results or visual or olfactory means; and no wet weather System Vulnerability Factors are identified.

confirmation of all illicit sources.

e. Illicit discharge removal

When the specific source of an illicit discharge is identified, the permittee shall exercise its authority as necessary to require its removal pursuant to part 2.3.4.2 or 2.3.4.3.

- i. For each confirmed source the permittee shall include in the annual report the following information:
 - the location of the discharge and its source(s);
 - a description of the discharge;
 - the method of discovery;
 - date of discovery;
 - date of elimination, mitigation or enforcement action OR planned corrective measures and a schedule for completing the illicit discharge removal; and
 - estimate of the volume of flow removed.
- ii. Within one year of removal of all identified illicit discharges within a catchment area, confirmatory outfall or interconnection screening shall be conducted. The confirmatory screening shall be conducted in dry weather unless System Vulnerability Factors have been identified, in which case both dry weather and wet weather confirmatory screening shall be conducted. If confirmatory screening indicates evidence of additional illicit discharges, the catchment shall be scheduled for additional investigation.

2.3.4.9. Indicators of IDDE Program Progress

The permittee shall define or describe indicators for tracking program success and evaluate and report on the overall effectiveness of the IDDE program in each annual report. At a minimum the permittee shall document in each annual report:

- the number of SSOs and illicit discharges identified and removed,
- the number and percent of total outfall catchments served by the MS4 evaluated using the catchment investigation procedure,
- all dry weather and wet weather screening and sampling results and
- the volume of sewage removed

2.3.4.10 Ongoing Screening

Upon completion of all catchment investigations pursuant to part 2.3.4.8.c and illicit discharge removal and confirmation (if necessary) pursuant to paragraph 2.3.4.8.e, each outfall or interconnection shall be reprioritized for screening in accordance with part 2.3.4.8.a and scheduled for ongoing screening once every five years. Ongoing screening shall consist of dry weather screening and sampling consistent with part 2.3.4.7.b; wet weather screening and sampling shall also be required at outfalls where wet weather screening was required due to SVFs and shall be conducted in accordance with part 2.3.4.8.c.ii. All sampling results shall be reported in the permittee's annual report.

2.3.4.11 Training

The permittee shall, at a minimum, annually provide training to employees involved in IDDE program about the program, including how to recognize illicit discharges and SSOs. The permittee shall report on the frequency and type of employee training in the annual report.

2.3.5. Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control

Objective: The objective of an effective construction stormwater runoff control program is to minimize or eliminate erosion and maintain sediment on site so that it is not transported in stormwater and allowed to discharge to a water of the U.S through the permittee's MS4. The construction site stormwater runoff control program required by this permit is a separate and distinct program from EPA's stormwater construction permit program. (<http://cfpub1.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/cgp.cfm>)

- a. Permittees shall implement and enforce a program to reduce pollutants in any stormwater runoff discharged to the MS4 from all construction activities that result in a land disturbance of greater than or equal to one acre within the regulated area. The permittee's program shall include disturbances less than one acre if that disturbance is part of a larger common plan of development or sale that would disturb one or more acres. Permittees authorized under the MS4-2003 permit shall continue to implement and enforce their existing program and modify as necessary to meet the requirements of this part.
- b. The permittee does not need to apply its construction program requirements to projects that receive a waiver from EPA under the provisions of 40 CFR § 122.26(b) (15) (i).
- c. The permittee shall develop and implement a construction site runoff control program that includes the elements in Paragraphs i. through v. of this part:
 - i. An ordinance or regulatory mechanism that requires the use of sediment and erosion control practices at construction sites. In addition to addressing sediment and erosion control, the ordinance must include controls for other wastes on construction sites such as demolition debris, litter and sanitary wastes. Development of an ordinance or other regulatory mechanism was a requirement of the MS4-2003 permit (See part II.B.4 and part IV.B.4). The ordinance or other regulatory mechanism required by the MS4-2003 permit shall have been effective by May 1, 2008.
 - ii. Written (hardcopy or electronic) procedures for site inspections and enforcement of sediment and erosion control measures. If not already existing, these procedures shall be completed within one (1) year from the effective date of the permit. The procedures shall clearly define who is responsible for site inspections as well as who has authority to implement enforcement procedures. The program shall provide that the permittee may, to the extent authorized by law, impose sanctions to ensure compliance with the local program. These procedures and regulatory authorities shall be documented in the SWMP.
 - iii. Requirements for construction site operators performing land disturbance activities within the MS4 jurisdiction that result in stormwater discharges to the MS4 to implement a sediment and erosion control program that includes BMPs appropriate for the conditions at the construction site. The program may include references to BMP design standards in state manuals, such as the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook⁹, or design standards developed by the MS4. EPA supports and encourages the use of design standards in local programs. Examples of appropriate sediment and erosion control measures for construction sites include local requirements to:

⁹ The handbook is available at: <http://www.mass.gov/dep/water/laws/policies.htm#storm>

1. Minimize the amount of disturbed area and protect natural resources;
 2. Stabilize sites when projects are complete or operations have temporarily ceased;
 3. Protect slopes on the construction site;
 4. Protect all storm drain inlets and armor all newly constructed outlets;
 5. Use perimeter controls at the site;
 6. Stabilize construction site entrances and exits to prevent off-site tracking;
 7. Inspect stormwater controls at consistent intervals.
- iv. Requirements for construction site operators within the MS4 jurisdiction to control wastes, including but not limited to, discarded building materials, concrete truck wash out, chemicals, litter, and sanitary wastes. These wastes may not be discharged to the MS4.
- v. Written procedures for site plan review and inspection and enforcement. If not already existing, the procedures for site plan review and inspection and enforcement shall be completed within one (1) year from the effective date of the permit. The site plan review procedure shall include a pre-construction review by the permittee of the site design, the planned operations at the construction site, planned BMPs during the construction phase, and the planned BMPs to be used to manage runoff created after development. The review procedure shall incorporate procedures for the consideration of potential water quality impacts, and procedures for the receipt and consideration of information submitted by the public. The site plan review procedure shall also include evaluation of opportunities for use of low impact design and green infrastructure. When the opportunity exists, the permittee shall encourage project proponents to incorporate these practices into the site design. The procedures for site inspections conducted by the permittee shall include the requirement that inspections occur during construction of BMPs as well as after construction of BMPs to ensure they are working as described in the approved plans, clearly defined procedures for inspections including qualifications necessary to perform the inspections, the use of mandated inspection forms if appropriate, and procedure for tracking the number of site reviews, inspections, and enforcement actions. This tracking information shall be included as part of each annual report required by part 4.4.

2.3.6. Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment (Post Construction Stormwater Management)

Objective: The objective of this control measure is to reduce the discharge of pollutants found in stormwater through the retention or treatment of stormwater after construction on new or redeveloped sites. For the purposes of this part (2.3.6.), the following definitions apply:

site is defined as the area extent of construction activities, including but not limited to the creation of new impervious cover and improvement of existing impervious cover (e.g. repaving not covered by 2.3.6.a.ii.4.d.)

new development is defined as any construction activities or land alteration resulting in total earth disturbances equal to or greater than 1 acre (or activities that are part of a larger common plan of development disturbing greater than 1 acre) on an area that has not previously been developed to include impervious cover.

redevelopment is defined as any construction, land alteration, or improvement of impervious surfaces resulting in total earth disturbances equal to or greater than 1 acre (or activities that are part of a larger common plan of development disturbing greater than 1 acre) that does not meet the definition of new development (see above).

- a. Permittees shall develop, implement, and enforce a program to address post-construction stormwater runoff from all new development and redevelopment sites that disturb one or more acres and discharge into the permittees MS4 at a minimum. Permittees authorized under the MS4-2003 permit shall continue to implement and enforce their program and modify as necessary to meet the requirements of this part.
 - i. The permittee's new development/ redevelopment program shall include sites less than one acre if the site is part of a larger common plan of development or redevelopment which disturbs one or more acre.
 - ii. The permittee shall develop or modify, as appropriate, an ordinance or other regulatory mechanism within two (2) years of the effective date of the permit to contain provisions that are as least as stringent as the following:
 1. Low Impact Development (LID) site planning and design strategies must be used to the maximum extent feasible.
 2. The design of treatment and infiltration practices should follow the guidance in Volume 2 of the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook, as amended, or other federally or State approved¹⁰ BMP design guidance.
 3. Stormwater management systems on new development sites shall be designed to:
 - a) Not allow new stormwater conveyances to discharge untreated stormwater in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 1;
 - b) Control peak runoff rates in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 2¹¹;
 - c) Recharge groundwater in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 3¹²;
 - d) Eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants from land uses with higher pollutant loads as defined in the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 5;
 - e) Protect Zone II or Interim Wellhead Protection Areas of public water supplies in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 6¹³;
 - f) Implement long term maintenance practices in accordance with Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook Standard 9; and
 - g) Require that all stormwater management systems be designed to:
 - 1) Retain the volume of runoff equivalent to, or greater than, one (1.0) inch multiplied by the total post-construction impervious surface area on the

¹⁰ State approved includes any state in the United States, including, but not limited to, approved guidance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

¹¹ Requirement necessary for Section 401 water quality certification by Massachusetts

¹² Requirement necessary for Section 401 water quality certification by Massachusetts

¹³ Requirement necessary for Section 401 water quality certification by Massachusetts

- site AND/OR
- 2) Remove 90% of the average annual load of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) generated from the total post-construction impervious area on the site¹⁴ AND 60% of the average annual load of Total Phosphorus (TP) generated from the total post-construction impervious surface area on the site¹⁴. Pollutant removal shall be calculated consistent with EPA Region 1's BMP Performance Extrapolation Tool or other BMP performance evaluation tool provided by EPA Region 1, where available. If EPA Region 1 tools do not address the planned or installed BMP performance any federally or State approved¹⁵ BMP design guidance or performance standards (e.g. State stormwater handbooks and design guidance manuals) may be used to calculate BMP performance.
4. Redevelopment Requirements
- a) Stormwater management systems on Redevelopment sites shall meet the following sections of part 2.3.6.a.ii.3 to the maximum extent feasible:
 - 1) Part 2.3.6.a.ii.3(a) (Massachusetts Stormwater Standard 1);
 - 2) Part 2.3.6.a.ii.3(b) (Massachusetts Stormwater Standard 2);
 - 3) Part 2.3.6.a.ii.3(c) (Massachusetts Stormwater Standard 3); and
 - 4) The pretreatment and structural best management practices requirements of 2.3.6.a.ii.3(d) and 2.3.6.a.ii.3(e) (Massachusetts Stormwater Standards 5 and 6).
 - b) Stormwater management systems on Redevelopment sites shall also improve existing conditions by requiring that stormwater management systems be designed to:
 - 1) Retain the volume of runoff equivalent to, or greater than, 0.80 inch multiplied by the total post-construction impervious surface area on the site AND/OR
 - 2) Remove 80% of the average annual post-construction load of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) generated from the total post-construction impervious area on the site AND 50% of the average annual load of Total Phosphorus (TP) generated from the total post-construction impervious surface area on the site. Pollutant removal shall be calculated consistent with EPA Region 1's BMP Performance Extrapolation Tool or other BMP performance evaluation tool provided by EPA Region 1 where available. If EPA Region 1 tools do not address the planned or installed BMP performance any federally or State approved BMP design guidance or performance standards (e.g. State stormwater handbooks and design guidance manuals) may be used to calculate BMP performance.
 - c) Stormwater management systems on redevelopment sites may utilize offsite mitigation within the same USGS HUC10 as the redevelopment site to meet the equivalent retention or pollutant removal requirements in part 2.3.6.a.ii.4(b).
 - d) Redevelopment activities that are exclusively limited to maintenance and improvement of existing roadways, (including widening less than a single

¹⁴ The required removal percentage is not required for each storm, it is the average removal over a year that is required

¹⁵ See footnote 14

lane, adding shoulders, correcting substandard intersections, improving existing drainage systems, and repaving projects) shall improve existing conditions where feasible and are exempt from part 2.3.6.a.ii.4(a), part 2.3.6.a.ii.4(b) and part 2.3.6.a.ii.4(c). Roadway widening or improvements that increase the amount of impervious area on the redevelopment site by greater than or equal to a single lane width shall meet the requirements of part 2.3.6.a.ii.4(a) – (c) fully.

- iii. The permittee shall require, at a minimum, the submission of as-built drawings no later than two (2) years after completion of construction projects. The as-built drawings must depict all on site controls, both structural and non-structural, designed to manage the stormwater associated with the completed site (post construction stormwater management). The new development/redevelopment program shall have procedures to ensure adequate long-term operation and maintenance of stormwater management practices that are put in place after the completion of a construction project. These procedures may include the use of dedicated funds or escrow accounts for development projects or the acceptance of ownership by the permittee of all privately owned BMPs. These procedures may also include the development of maintenance contracts between the owner of the BMP and the permittee. Alternatively, these procedures may include the submission of an annual certification documenting the work that has been done over the last 12 months to properly operate and maintain the stormwater control measures. The procedures to require submission of as-built drawings and ensure long term operation and maintenance shall be a part of the SWMP. The permittee shall report in the annual report on the measures that the permittee has utilized to meet this requirement.
- b. Within four (4) years of the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall develop a report assessing current street design and parking lot guidelines and other local requirements that affect the creation of impervious cover. This assessment shall be used to provide information to allow the permittee to determine if changes to design standards for streets and parking lots can be made to support low impact design options. If the assessment indicates that changes can be made, the assessment shall include recommendations and proposed schedules to incorporate policies and standards into relevant documents and procedures to minimize impervious cover attributable to parking areas and street designs. The permittee shall implement all recommendations, in accordance with the schedules, contained in the assessment. The local planning board and local transportation board should be involved in this assessment. This assessment shall be part of the SWMP. The permittee shall report in each annual report on the status of this assessment including any planned or completed changes to local regulations and guidelines.
- c. Within four (4) years from the effective date of the permit, the permittee shall develop a report assessing existing local regulations to determine the feasibility of making, at a minimum, the following practices allowable when appropriate site conditions exist:
 - i. Green roofs;
 - ii. Infiltration practices such as rain gardens, curb extensions, planter gardens, porous and pervious pavements, and other designs to manage stormwater using landscaping and structured or augmented soils; and
 - iii. Water harvesting devices such as rain barrels and cisterns, and the use of stormwater for non-potable uses.

The assessment should indicate if the practices are allowed in the MS4 jurisdiction and under what circumstances are they allowed. If the practices are not allowed, the permittee shall determine what hinders the use of these practices, what changes in local regulations may be made to make them allowable, and provide a schedule for implementation of recommendations. The permittee shall implement all recommendations, in accordance with the schedules, contained in the assessment. The permittee shall report in each annual report on its findings and progress towards making the practices allowable. (Information available at:

<http://www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/stormwater/assets/pdf/AddressingBarrier2LID.pdf> and
<http://www.mapc.org/resources/low-impact-dev-toolkit/local-codes-lid>)

- d. Four (4) years from the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall identify a minimum of 5 permittee-owned properties that could potentially be modified or retrofitted with BMPs designed to reduce the frequency, volume, and pollutant loads of stormwater discharges to and from its MS4 through the reduction of impervious area. Properties and infrastructure for consideration shall include those with the potential for reduction of on-site impervious area (IA) as well as those that could provide reduction of off-site IA. At a minimum, the permittee shall consider municipal properties with significant impervious cover (including parking lots, buildings, and maintenance yards) that could be modified or retrofitted. MS4 infrastructure to be considered includes existing street right-of-ways, outfalls and conventional stormwater conveyances and controls (including swales and detention practices) that could be readily modified or retrofitted to provide reduction in frequency, volume or pollutant loads of such discharges through reduction of impervious cover.

In determining the potential for modifying or retrofitting particular properties, the permittee shall consider factors such as access for maintenance purposes; subsurface geology; depth to water table; proximity to aquifers and subsurface infrastructure including sanitary sewers and septic systems; and opportunities for public use and education. In determining its priority ranking, the permittee shall consider factors such as schedules for planned capital improvements to storm and sanitary sewer infrastructure and paving projects; current storm sewer level of service; and control of discharges to water quality limited waters, first or second order streams, public swimming beaches, drinking water supply sources and shellfish growing areas.

Beginning with the fifth year annual report and in each subsequent annual report, the permittee shall identify additional permittee owned sites and infrastructure that could be retrofitted such that the permittee maintains a minimum of 5 sites in their inventory, until such a time as when the permittee has less than 5 sites remaining. In addition, the permittee shall report on all properties that have been modified or retrofitted with BMPs to mitigate IA that were inventoried in accordance with this part. The permittee may also include in its annual report non-MS4 owned property that has been modified or retrofitted with BMPs to mitigate IA.

2.3.7. Good House Keeping and Pollution Prevention for Permittee Owned Operations

Objective: The permittee shall implement an operations and maintenance program for permittee-owned operations that has a goal of preventing or reducing pollutant runoff and protecting water quality from all permittee-owned operations.

a. Operations and Maintenance Programs

- i. Within two (2) years from the effective date of the permit, the permittee shall develop, if not already developed, written (hardcopy or electronic) operations and maintenance procedures for the municipal activities listed below in part 2.3.7.a.ii. These written procedures shall be included as part of the SWMP.

ii. Within two (2) year of the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall develop an inventory of all permittee owned facilities within the categories listed below. The permittee shall review this inventory annually and update as necessary.

1. Parks and open space: Establish procedures to address the proper use, storage, and disposal of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers including minimizing the use of these products and using only in accordance manufacturer's instruction. Evaluate lawn maintenance and landscaping activities to ensure practices are protective of water quality. Protective practices include reduced mowing frequencies, proper disposal of lawn clippings, and use of alternative landscaping materials (e.g., drought resistant planting). Establish pet waste handling collection and disposal locations at all parks and open space where pets are permitted, including the placing of proper signage concerning the proper collection and disposal of pet waste. Establish procedures to address waterfowl congregation areas where appropriate to reduce waterfowl droppings from entering the MS4. Establish procedures for management of trash containers at parks and open space (scheduled cleanings; sufficient number). Establish procedures to address erosion or poor vegetative cover when the permittee becomes aware of it; especially if the erosion is within 50 feet of a surface water.
2. Buildings and facilities where pollutants are exposed to stormwater runoff: This includes schools (to the extent they are permittee-owned or operated), town offices, police, and fire stations, municipal pools and parking garages and other permittee-owned or operated buildings or facilities. Evaluate the use, storage, and disposal of petroleum products and other potential stormwater pollutants. Provide employee training as necessary so that those responsible for handling these products know proper procedures. Ensure that Spill Prevention Plans are in place, if applicable, and coordinate with the fire department as necessary. Develop management procedures for dumpsters and other waste management equipment. Sweep parking lots and keep areas surrounding the facilities clean to reduce runoff of pollutants.
3. Vehicles and Equipment: Establish procedures for the storage of permittee vehicles. Vehicles with fluid leaks shall be stored indoors or containment shall be provided until repaired. Evaluate fueling areas owned or operated by the permittee. If possible, place fueling areas under cover in order to minimize exposure. Establish procedures to ensure that vehicle wash waters are not discharged to the municipal storm sewer system or to surface waters. This permit does not authorize such discharges.

iii. Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance

1. The permittee shall establish within two (2) year of the effective date of the permit a written (hardcopy or electronic) program detailing the activities and procedures the permittee will implement so that the MS4 infrastructure is maintained in a timely manner to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4. If the permittee has an existing program to maintain its MS4 infrastructure in a timely manner to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants from the MS4, the permittee shall document the program in the SWMP.

2. The permittee shall optimize routine inspections, cleaning and maintenance of catch basins such that the following conditions are met:
 - Prioritize inspection and maintenance for catch basins located near construction activities (roadway construction, residential, commercial, or industrial development or redevelopment). Clean catch basins in such areas more frequently if inspection and maintenance activities indicate excessive sediment or debris loadings.
 - Establish a schedule with a goal that the frequency of routine cleaning will ensure that no catch basin at anytime will be more than 50 percent full.
 - If a catch basin sump is more than 50 percent full during two consecutive routine inspections/cleaning events, the permittee shall document that finding, investigate the contributing drainage area for sources of excessive sediment loading, and to the extent practicable, abate contributing sources. The permittee shall describe any actions taken in its annual report.
 - For the purposes of this part, an excessive sediment or debris loading is a catch basin sump more than 50 percent full. A catch basin sump is more than 50 percent full if the contents within the sump exceed one half the distance between the bottom interior of the catch basin to the invert of the deepest outlet of the catch basin.
 - The permittee shall document in the SWMP and in the first annual report its plan for optimizing catch basin cleaning, inspection plans, or its schedule for gathering information to develop the optimization plan. Documentation shall include metrics and other information used to reach the determination that the established plan for cleaning and maintenance is optimal for the MS4. The permittee shall keep a log of catch basins cleaned or inspected.
 - The permittee shall report in each annual report the total number of catch basins, number inspected, number cleaned, and the total volume or mass of material removed from all catch basins.
3. The permittee shall establish and implement procedures for sweeping and/or cleaning streets, and permittee-owned parking lots. All streets with the exception of rural uncurbed roads with no catch basins or high speed limited access highways shall be swept and/or cleaned a minimum of once per year in the spring (following winter activities such as sanding). The procedures shall also include more frequent sweeping of targeted areas determined by the permittee on the basis of pollutant load reduction potential, based on inspections, pollutant loads, catch basin cleaning or inspection results, land use, water quality limited or TMDL waters or other relevant factors as determined by the permittee. The permittee shall report in each annual report the number of miles cleaned or the volume or mass of material removed.

For rural uncurbed roadways with no catch basins and limited access highways, the permittee shall either meet the minimum frequencies above, or develop and implement an inspection, documentation and targeted sweeping plan within two (2) year of the effective date of the permit, and submit such plan with its year one annual report.
4. The permittee shall ensure proper storage of catch basin cleanings and street sweepings prior to disposal or reuse such that they do not discharge to receiving

waters. These materials should be managed in compliance with current MassDEP policies:

- For catch basins cleanings:
<http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/recycle/regulations/management-of-catch-basin-cleanings.html>
- For street sweepings:
<http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dep/recycle/laws/stsweep.pdf>.

5. The permittee shall establish and implement procedures for winter road maintenance including the use and storage of salt and sand; minimize the use of sodium chloride and other salts, and evaluate opportunities for use of alternative materials; and ensure that snow disposal activities do not result in disposal of snow into waters of the United States. For purposes of this MS4 Permit, salt shall mean any chloride-containing material used to treat paved surfaces for deicing, including sodium chloride, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, and brine solutions.
 6. The permittee shall establish and implement inspection and maintenance frequencies and procedures for all stormwater treatment structures such as water quality swales, retention/detention basins, infiltration structures, proprietary treatment devices or other similar structures. All permittee-owned stormwater treatment structures (excluding catch basins) shall be inspected annually at a minimum.
- iv. The permittee shall report in the annual report on the status of the inventory required by this part and any subsequent updates; the status of the O&M programs for the permittee-owned facilities and activities in part 2.3.7.a.ii; and the maintenance activities associated with each.
 - v. The permittee shall keep a written (hardcopy or electronic) record of all required activities including but not limited to maintenance activities, inspections and training required by part 2.3.7.a. The permittee shall maintain, consistent with part 4.2.a, all records associated with maintenance and inspection activities required by part 2.3.7.a.

b. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

The permittee shall develop and fully implement a SWPPP for each of the following permittee-owned or operated facilities: maintenance garages, public works yards, transfer stations, and other waste handling facilities where pollutants are exposed to stormwater as determined by the permittee. If facilities are located at the same property, the permittee may develop one SWPPP for the entire property. The SWPPP is a separate and different document from the SWMP required in part 1.10. A SWPPP does not need to be developed for a facility if the permittee has either developed a SWPPP or received a no exposure certification for the discharge under the Multi-Sector General Permit or the discharge is authorized under another NPDES permit.

- i. No later than two (2) years from the effective date of the permit, the permittee shall develop and implement a written (hardcopy or electronic) SWPPP for the facilities described above. The SWPPP shall be signed in accordance with the signatory requirements of Appendix B – Subparagraph 11.

ii. The SWPPP shall contain the following elements:

1. Pollution Prevention Team

Identify the staff on the team, by name and title. If the position is unstaffed, the title of the position should be included and the SWPPP updated when the position is filled. The role of the team is to develop, implement, maintain, and revise, as necessary, the SWPPP for the facility.

2. Description of the facility and identification of potential pollutant sources

The SWPPP shall include a map of the facility and a description of the activities that occur at the facility. The map shall show the location of the stormwater outfalls, receiving waters, and any structural controls. Identify all activities that occur at the facility and the potential pollutants associated with each activity including the location of any floor drains. These may be included as part of the inventory required by part 2.3.7.a.

3. Identification of stormwater controls

The permittee shall select, design, install, and implement the control measures detailed in paragraph iv below to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from the permittee owned facility.

The selection, design, installation, and implementation of the control measures shall be in accordance with good engineering practices and manufacturer's specifications. The permittee shall also take all reasonable steps to control or address the quality of discharges from the site that may not originate at the facility.

If the discharge from the facility is to a water quality limited water and the facility has the potential to discharge the pollutant identified as causing the water quality limitation, the permittee shall identify the control measures that will be used to address this pollutant at the facility so that the discharge does not cause or contribute to a violation of a water quality standard.

4. The SWPPP shall include the following management practices:

- a) Minimize or Prevent Exposure: The permittee shall to the extent practicable either locate materials and activities inside, or protect them with storm-resistant coverings in order to prevent exposure to rain, snow, snowmelt and runoff (although significant enlargement of impervious surface area is not recommended). Materials do not need to be enclosed or covered if stormwater runoff from affected areas will not be discharged directly or indirectly to surface waters or to the MS4 or if discharges are authorized under another NPDES permit.
- b) Good Housekeeping: The permittee shall keep clean all exposed areas that are potential sources of pollutants, using such measures as sweeping at regular intervals. Ensure that trash containers are closed when not in use, keep storage areas well swept and free from leaking or damaged containers; and store leaking vehicles needing repair indoors.
- c) Preventative Maintenance: The permittee shall regularly inspect, test, maintain, and repair all equipment and systems to avoid situations that

may result in leaks, spills, and other releases of pollutants in stormwater to receiving waters. Inspections shall occur at a minimum once per quarter.

- d) Spill Prevention and Response: The permittee shall minimize the potential for leaks, spills, and other releases that may be exposed to stormwater and develop plans for effective response to such spills if or when they occur. At a minimum, the permittee shall have procedures that include:
- Preventive measures such as barriers between material storage and traffic areas, secondary containment provisions, and procedures for material storage and handling.
 - Response procedures that include notification of appropriate facility personnel, emergency agencies, and regulatory agencies, and procedures for stopping, containing, and cleaning up leaks, spills and other releases. Measures for cleaning up hazardous material spills or leaks shall be consistent with applicable Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations at 40 CFR section 264 and 40 CFR section 265. Employees who may cause, detect, or respond to a spill or leak shall be trained in these procedures and have necessary spill response equipment available. If possible, one of these individuals should be a member of the Pollution Prevention Team; and
 - Contact information for individuals and agencies that shall be notified in the event of a leak, spill, or other release. Where a leak, spill, or other release containing a hazardous substance or oil in an amount equal to or in excess of a reportable quantity established under 40 CFR section 110, 40 CFR section 117, or 40 CFR section 302, occurs during a 24-hour period, the permittee shall notify the National Response Center (NRC) at (800) 424-8802 in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR section 110, 40 CFR section 117, and 40 CFR section 302 as soon as the permittee has knowledge of the discharge. State or local requirements may necessitate reporting spills or discharges to local emergency, public health or drinking water supply agencies, and owners of public drinking water supplies. Contact information shall be in locations that are readily accessible and available.
- e) Erosion and Sediment Control: The permittee shall use structural and non-structural control measures at the facility to stabilize and contain runoff from exposed areas and to minimize or eliminate onsite erosion and sedimentation. Efforts to achieve this may include the use of flow velocity dissipation devices at discharge locations and within outfall channels where necessary to reduce erosion.
- f) Management of Runoff: The permittee shall manage stormwater runoff from the facility to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants. This may include management practices which divert runoff from areas that

are potential sources of pollutants, contain runoff in such areas, or reuse, infiltrate or treat stormwater to reduce the discharge of pollutants.

- g) Salt Storage Piles or Piles Containing Salt: For storage piles of salt or piles containing salt used for deicing or other purposes (including maintenance of paved surfaces) for which the discharge during precipitation events discharges to the permittee's MS4, any other storm sewer system, or to a Water of the US, the permittee shall prevent exposure of the storage pile to precipitation by enclosing or covering the storage piles. Such piles shall be enclosed or covered within two (2) years of the permit effective date. The permittee shall implement appropriate measures (e.g., good housekeeping, diversions, containment) to minimize exposure resulting from adding to or removing materials from the pile. The permittee is encouraged to store piles in such a manner as not to impact surface water resources, ground water resources, recharge areas, and wells.
- h) Employee Training: The permittee shall regularly train employees who work in areas where materials or activities are exposed to stormwater, or who are responsible for implementing activities identified in the SWPPP (e.g., inspectors, maintenance personnel), including all members of the Pollution Prevention Team. Training shall cover both the specific components and scope of the SWPPP and the control measures required under this part, including spill response, good housekeeping, material management practices, any best management practice operation and maintenance, etc. EPA recommends annual training.

The permittee shall document the following information for each training:

- The training date, title and training duration;
 - List of municipal attendees;
 - Subjects covered during training
- i) Maintenance of Control Measures: The permittee shall maintain all control measures, required by this permit in effective operating condition. The permittee shall keep documentation onsite that describes procedures and a regular schedule for preventative maintenance of all control measures and discussions of back-up practices in place should a runoff event occur while a control measure is off-line. Nonstructural control measures shall also be diligently maintained (e.g., spill response supplies available, personnel trained).

iii. The permittee shall conduct the following inspections:

1. Site Inspections: Inspect all areas that are exposed to stormwater and all stormwater control measures. Inspections shall be conducted at least once each calendar quarter. More frequent inspections may be required if significant activities are exposed to stormwater. Inspections shall be performed when the facility is in operation. At least one of the quarterly inspections shall occur during a period when a stormwater discharge is occurring.

The permittee shall document the following information for each facility inspection:

- The inspection date and time;
- The name of the inspector;
- Weather information and a description of any discharge occurring at the time of the inspection;
- Identification of any previously unidentified discharges from the site;
- Any control measures needing maintenance or repair;
- Any failed control measures that need replacement.
- Any SWPPP changes required as a result of the inspection.

If during the inspections, or any other time, the permittee identifies control measures that need repair or are not operating effectively, the permittee shall repair or replace them before the next anticipated storm event if possible, or as soon as practicable following that storm event. In the interim, the permittee shall have back-up measures in place.

The permittee shall report the findings from the Site Inspections in the annual report.

- iv. The permittee must keep a written (hardcopy or electronic) record of all required activities including but not limited to maintenance, inspections, and training required by part 2.3.7.b. The permittee shall maintain all records associated with the development and implementation of the SWPPP required by this part consistent with the requirements of part 4.2.

3.0. Additional Requirements for Discharges to Surface Drinking Water Supplies and Their Tributaries

- a. Permittees which discharge to public surface drinking water supply sources (Class A and Class B surface waters used for drinking water) or their tributaries should consider these waters a priority in the implementation of the SWMP.
- b. Permittees should provide pretreatment and spill control measures to stormwater discharges to public drinking water supply sources or their tributaries to the extent feasible.
- c. Direct discharges to Class A waters should be avoided to the extent feasible.

4.0. Program Evaluation, Record Keeping, and Reporting

4.1. Program Evaluation

- a. The permittee shall annually self-evaluate its compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit and submit each self-evaluation in the Annual Report. The permittee shall also maintain the annual evaluation documentation as part of the SWMP.
- b. The permittee shall evaluate the appropriateness of the selected BMPs in achieving the objectives of each control measure and the defined measurable goals. Where a BMP is found to be ineffective the permittee shall change BMPs in accordance with the provisions below. In addition, permittees may augment or change BMPs at any time following the provisions below:

- Changes adding (but not subtracting or replacing) components or controls may be made at any time.
- Changes replacing an ineffective or infeasible BMP specifically identified in the SWMP with an alternative BMP may be made as long as the basis for the changes is documented in the SWMP by, at a minimum:
 - An analysis of why the BMP is ineffective or infeasible;
 - Expectations on the effectiveness of the replacement BMP; and
 - An analysis of why the replacement BMP is expected to achieve the defined goals of the BMP to be replaced.

The permittee shall indicate BMP modifications along with a brief explanation of the modification in each Annual Report.

- c. EPA or MassDEP may require the permittee to add, modify, repair, replace or change BMPs or other measures described in the annual reports as needed:

- To address impacts to receiving water quality caused or contributed to by discharges from the MS4; or
- To satisfy conditions of this permit

Any changes requested by EPA or MassDEP will be in writing and will set forth the schedule for the permittee to develop the changes and will offer the permittee the opportunity to propose alternative program changes to meet the objective of the requested modification.

4.2. Record Keeping

- a. The permittee shall keep all records required by this permit for a period of at least five years. EPA may extend this period at any time. Records include information used in the development of any written (hardcopy or electronic) program required by this permit, any monitoring results, copies of reports, records of screening, follow-up and elimination of illicit discharges; maintenance records; inspection records; and data used in the development of the notice of intent, SWMP, SWPPP, and annual reports. This list provides examples of records that should be maintained, but is not all inclusive.
- b. Records other than those required to be included in the annual report, part 4.4, shall be submitted only when requested by the EPA or the MassDEP.
- c. The permittee shall make the records relating to this permit, including the written (hardcopy or electronic) stormwater management program, available to the public. The public may view the records during normal business hours. The permittee may charge a reasonable fee for copying requests. The permittee is encouraged to satisfy this requirement by posting records online.

4.3. Outfall Monitoring Reporting

- a. The permittee shall monitor and sample its outfalls at a minimum through sampling and testing at the frequency and locations required in connection with IDDE screening under part 2.3.4.7.b. and 2.3.4.8.c.ii.2. The monitoring program may also include additional outfall and interconnection monitoring as determined by the permittee in connection with assessment of SWMP effectiveness

pursuant to part 4.1; evaluation of discharges to water quality limited waters pursuant to part 2.2; assessment of BMP effectiveness pursuant to part 2.2 or 2.3; or otherwise.

- b. The permittee shall document all monitoring results each year in the annual report. The report shall include the date, outfall or interconnection identifier, location, weather conditions at time of sampling, precipitation in previous 48 hours, field screening parameter results, and results of all analyses. The annual report shall include all of this information and data for the current reporting period and for the entire permit period.
- c. The permittee shall also include in the annual report results from any other stormwater or receiving water quality monitoring or studies conducted during the reporting period where that data is being used by the permittee to inform permit compliance or program effectiveness. If such monitoring or studies were conducted on behalf of the permittee, or if monitoring or studies conducted by other entities were reported to the permittee, a brief description of the type of information gathered or received shall be included in the annual report(s) covering the time period(s) the information was received.

4.4. Annual Reports

- a. The permittee shall submit annual reports each year of the permit term. The reporting period will be a one year period commencing on the permit effective date, and subsequent anniversaries thereof, except that the first annual report under this permit shall also cover the period from May 1, [year of final permit issuance] to the permit effective date. The annual report is due ninety days from the close of each reporting period.
- b. The annual reports shall contain the following information:
 - i. A self-assessment review of compliance with the permit terms and conditions.
 - ii. An assessment of the appropriateness of the selected BMPs.
 - iii. The status of any plans or activities required by part 2.1 and/ or part 2.2, including:
 - Identification of all discharges determined to be causing or contributing to an exceedance of water quality standards and description of response including all items required by part 2.1.1;
 - For discharges subject to TMDL related requirements, identification of specific BMPs used to address the pollutant identified as the cause of impairment and assessment of the BMPs effectiveness at controlling the pollutant (part 2.2.1. and Appendix F) and any deliverables required by Appendix F;
 - For discharges to water quality limited waters a description of each BMP required by Appendix H and any deliverables required by Appendix H.
 - iv. An assessment of the progress towards achieving the measurable goals and objectives of each control measure in part 2.3 including:
 - Evaluation of the public education program including a description of the targeted messages for each audience; method of distribution and dates of distribution; methods used to evaluate the program; and any changes to the program.
 - Description of the activities used to promote public participation including documentation of compliance with state public notice regulations.

- Description of the activities related to implementation of the IDDE program including: status of the map; status and results of the illicit discharge potential ranking and assessment; identification of problem catchments; status of all protocols described in part 2.3.4.(program responsibilities and systematic procedure); number and identifier of catchments evaluated; number and identifier of outfalls screened; number of illicit discharges located; number of illicit discharges removed; gallons of flow removed; identification of tracking indicators and measures of progress based on those indicators; and employee training.
 - Evaluation of the construction runoff management including number of project plans reviewed; number of inspections; and number of enforcement actions.
 - Evaluation of stormwater management for new development and redevelopment including status of ordinance development (2.3.6.a.ii.), review and status of the street design assessment(2.3.6.b.), assessments to barriers to green infrastructure (2.3.6.c), and retrofit inventory status (2.3.6.d.)
 - Status of the O&M Programs required by part 2.3.7.a.
 - Status of SWPPP required by part 2.3.7.b. including inspection results.
 - Any additional reporting requirements in part 3.0.
- v. All outfall screening and monitoring data collected by or on behalf of the permittee during the reporting period and cumulative for the permit term, including but not limited to all data collected pursuant to part 2.3.4. The permittee shall also provide a description of any additional monitoring data received by the permittee during the reporting period.
- vi. Description of activities for the next reporting cycle.
- vii. Description of any changes in identified BMPs or measurable goals.
- viii. Description of activities undertaken by any entity contracted for achieving any measurable goal or implementing any control measure.
- c. Reports shall be submitted to EPA at the following address:
- United State Environmental Protection Agency
Stormwater and Construction Permits Section (OEP06-1)
Five Post Office Square, Suite 100
Boston, MA 02109
- Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
One Winter Street – 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
ATTN: Frederick Civian
- Or submitted electronically to EPA at the following email address: stormwater.reports@epa.gov. After December 21, 2020 all Annual Reports must be submitted electronically.

5.0. Non-Traditional MS4s

Non-traditional MS4s are MS4s owned and operated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, counties or other public agencies within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and properties owned and operated by the United States (Federal Facilities) within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This part addresses all non-traditional MS4s except MS4s that are owned or operated by transportation agencies, which are addressed in part 6.0 below.

5.1. Requirements for Non-Traditional MS4s

All requirements and conditions of parts 1 – 4 above apply to all Non-traditional MS4s, except as specifically provided below:

5.1.1. Public education

For the purpose of this permit, the audiences for a Non-traditional MS4 include the employees, clients and customers (including students at education MS4s), visitors to the property, tenants, long term contractors and any other contractors working at the facility where the MS4 is located. The permittee may use some of the educational topics included in part 2.3.2.d. as appropriate, or may focus on topics specific to the MS4. The permittee shall document the educational topics for each target audience in the SWMP and annual reports.

5.1.2. Ordinances and regulatory mechanisms

Some Non-traditional MS4s may not have authority to enact an ordinance, by-law, or other regulatory mechanisms. MS4s without the authority to enact an ordinance shall ensure that written policies or procedures are in place to address the requirements of part 2.3.4.5., part 2.3.4.6 and part 2.3.6.a.

5.1.3. Assessment of Regulations

Non-traditional MS4s do not need to meet the requirements of part 2.3.6.c.

5.1.4. New Dischargers

New MS4 facilities are subject to additional water quality-based requirements if they fall within the definition of “new discharger” under 40 CFR § 122.2: “A new discharger is any building, structure, facility or installation (a) from which there is or may be a ‘discharge of pollutants’ (b) that did not commence the ‘discharge of pollutants’ at a particular ‘site’ prior to August 13, 1979; (c) which is not a ‘new source’; and (d) which never received a finally effective NPDES permit for discharges at that ‘site.’ The term “site” is defined in § 122.2 to mean “the land or water area where any ‘facility or activity’ is physically located or conducted including adjacent land used in connection with the facility or activity.”

Consistent with these definitions, a Non-traditional MS4 is a “new discharger” if it discharges stormwater from a new facility with an entirely new separate storm sewer system that is not physically located on the same or adjacent land as an existing facility and associated system operated by the same MS4.

Any Non-traditional MS4 facility that is a “new discharger” and discharges to a waterbody listed in category 5 or 4b on the Massachusetts Integrated Report of waters listed pursuant to Clean Water

Act section 303(d) and 305(b) due to nutrients (Total Nitrogen or Total Phosphorus), metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride) or oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease), or discharges to a waterbody with an approved TMDL for any of those pollutants, is not eligible for coverage under this permit and shall apply for an individual permit.

Any Non-traditional MS4 facility that is a “new discharger” and discharges to a waterbody that is in attainment is subject to Massachusetts antidegradation regulations at 314 CMR 4.04. The permittee shall comply with the provisions of 314 CMR 4.04 including information submittal requirements and obtaining authorization for new discharges where appropriate¹⁶. Any authorization of new discharges by MassDEP shall be incorporated into the permittee's SWMP. If an applicable MassDEP approval specifies additional conditions or requirements, then those requirements are incorporated into this permit by reference. The permittee must comply with all such requirements.

6.0 Requirements for MS4s Owned or Operated by Transportation Agencies

This part applies to all MS4s owned or operated by any state or federal transportation agency (except Massachusetts Department of Transportation –MassDOT- Highway Division, which is subject to a separate individual permit). All requirements and conditions of this permit apply with the following exceptions:

6.1 Public education

For the purpose of this permit, the audiences for a transportation agency education program include the general public (users of the roadways), employees, and any contractors working at the location. The permittee may use some of the educational topics included in part 2.3.2.d. as appropriate, or may focus on topics specific to the agency. The permittee shall document the educational topics for each target audience.

6.2 Ordinances and regulatory mechanisms

The transportation agency may not have authority to enact an ordinance, by-law or other regulatory mechanisms. The agency shall ensure that written agency policies or procedures are in place to address the requirements of part 2.3.4.5., part 2.3.4.6 and part 2.3.6.a.

6.3 Assessment of regulations

Non-traditional MS4s do not need to meet the requirements of part 2.3.6.c.

6.4 New Dischargers

New MS4 facilities are subject to additional water quality-based requirements if they fall within the definition of “new dischargers” under 40 CFR § 122.2: “A new discharger is any building, structure, facility or installation (a) from which there is or may be a ‘discharge of pollutants’ (b) that did not commence the ‘discharge of pollutants’ at a particular ‘site’ prior to August 13, 1979; (c) which is not a ‘new source’; and (d) which never received a finally effective NPDES permit for discharges at that ‘site.’ The term “site” is defined in § 122.2 to mean “the land or water area where any ‘facility or activity’ is physically located or conducted including adjacent land used in connection with the facility or activity.”

¹⁶ Contact MassDEP for guidance on compliance with 314 CMR 4.04

Consistent with these definitions, a new transportation MS4 is a “new discharger” if it discharges stormwater from a new facility with an entirely new separate storm sewer system that is not physically located on the same or adjacent land as an existing facility and associated system operated by the same MS4.

Any transportation MS4 facility that is a “new discharger” and discharges to a waterbody listed as impaired in category 5 or 4b on the Massachusetts Integrated Report of waters listed pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d) and 305(b) due to nutrients (Total Nitrogen or Total Phosphorus), metals (Cadmium, Copper, Iron, Lead or Zinc), solids (TSS or Turbidity), bacteria/pathogens (E. Coli, Enterococcus or Fecal Coliform), chloride (Chloride) or oil and grease (Petroleum Hydrocarbons or Oil and Grease), or discharges to a waterbody with an approved TMDL for any of those pollutants, is not eligible for coverage under this permit and shall apply for an individual permit.

Any transportation MS4 facility that is a “new discharger” and discharges to a waterbody that is in attainment is subject to Massachusetts antidegradation regulations at 314 CMR 4.04. The permittee shall comply with the provisions of 314 CMR 4.04 including information submittal requirements and obtaining authorization for new discharges where appropriate¹⁷. Any authorization of new discharges by MassDEP shall be incorporated into the permittee's SWMP. If an applicable MassDEP approval specifies additional conditions or requirements, then those requirements are incorporated into this permit by reference. The permittee must comply with all such requirements. |

¹⁷ Contact MassDEP for guidance on compliance with 314 CMR 4.04

Exhibit B

EPA's Response to Comments Document

Due to the immense volume of this document (over 600 pages in length) CRR has not appended this document to its petition. An electronic copy is available at:

<https://www3.epa.gov/region1/npdcs/stormwater/ma/2016fpd/rtc-2016-ma-sms4-gp.pdf>

Exhibit C

CRR's April 28, 2016 Letter to EPA HQ

CENTER FOR REGULATORY REASONABLENESS

**1620 I STREET, N.W.
SUITE 701
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
TELEPHONE: 202-600-7071
FAX: 202-463-4207**

www.centerforregulatoryreasonableness.org

April 28, 2016

VIA ELECTRONIC AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (2410T)
Washington, DC 20460

**RE: Imposition of Unlawful Small MS4 General Permit Requirements for New
Hampshire (Pending) and Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Final)**

Dear Ms. McCarthy:

The undersigned Center for Regulatory Reasonableness ("Center" or "CRR"), on behalf of its public members in New Hampshire and its members in other states subject to MS4 program requirements, writes to advise that EPA Region 1 and Headquarters have departed from express statutory requirements, applicable Agency rules, controlling judicial precedent, and norms of administrative law and procedure, in proposing a General Permit for New Hampshire small MS4 communities and finalizing the General Permit for small MS4 communities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. EPA claims that NPDES rules mandate these approaches. However, because these more restrictive permit provisions and EPA's interpretation of related NPDES requirements (*e.g.*, 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.4, 122.26 and 122.44(d)) radically depart from the adopted rules, such provisions and rule reinterpretations constitute unlawful amendments of the adopted rules. See, *Iowa League of Cities v. EPA*, 711 F 3d 844 (8th Cir. 2013). Therefore, to protect the due process rights of the regulatory community and ensure proper allocation of limited municipal resources, the Center requests that you immediately review the complaints enumerated herein, regarding the proposed/final MS4 permits/NPDES rule interpretations and promptly clarify that the adopted NPDES rules do not impose such requirements.

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 2

Overview of Impermissible Regional MS4 Permitting Action

The Region 1 New Hampshire permit proposal and final Massachusetts permit effectively require that each small MS4 permittee guarantee that it will not *cause or contribute* to any State water quality standard exceedance.¹ The Region claims that 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) authorizes this provision and the assumption that any MS4 discharging to waters designated as impaired, will necessarily have to reduce its contribution of any so designated pollutants. A permittee is given little time for compliance, in the event of a discharge that “causes or contributes to” a water quality standards violation, a scant 60-days is provided to eliminate the condition.” Where such elimination is not possible – as is the case for most anticipated events – the grantee is still placed on a short tether for compliance.²

The net result of these provisions is that the Region 1 regulatory scheme for MS4 permittees imposes a virtual compliance obligation for all discharges relative to water quality requirements. Region 1 observes “that the approach to stormwater management in MS4s required under this [2013] permit [is so significant that it] may require a “paradigm shift” in many communities[.]” Draft Permit Fact Sheet, at 35. In fact, as noted, there is great opposition to the Region 1 approach, even by affected States. This opposition can be seen, for example, in the August 15, 2013, comments by Thomas S. Burack, Commissioner, State of New Hampshire, Department of Environmental Services, where he states: “For the reasons below, DES suggests that EPA delay the effective date of Section 2.2 of the Permit for as long as 3 years after the date of signature and final release to the public. In addition, DES supports a longer time frame for the communities in New Hampshire to achieve compliance with the Permit.” (Att. 1).

To accomplish this goal, however, the Region, at the very least: (1) ignores Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act (“CWA” or “Act”) [33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)], and existing MS4 regulations [40 C.F.R. § 122.32-36], both of which direct EPA to implement an iterative compliance process; (2) revises – without the benefits of rulemaking – 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) water quality regulations, by equating the mere fact of a discharge, as representing a direct violation of water quality standards, thereby reversing the burden of proof expressed in EPA rules; and, (3) eliminates the schedule of compliance authority that was adopted by New Hampshire and approved by EPA. The net result is the creation – through the Regional MS4 permit process – of an entirely new, and *ad hoc*, permitting regime; a creation fashioned without the benefit of rulemaking. In fact,

¹ “2.1.1 Requirement to Meet Water Quality Standards a. The permittee shall reduce the discharge of pollutants such that the discharges from the MS4 *do not cause or contribute* to an exceedance of water quality standards.” (Emphasis supplied.)

² “Where elimination of the condition causing or contributing to an exceedance of water quality standards within 60 days of its identification is not possible, the *permittee shall establish an expeditious schedule for elimination and report the dates of identification and schedules for removal in the permittee’s annual reports. The permittee shall immediately commence actions necessary for elimination. The permittee shall diligently pursue elimination of all conditions causing or contributing to an exceedance of water quality standards.*” (Emphasis supplied.) Renoticed Section 2.1.1.d.

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 3

the Region's efforts contradict the Agency's own current and parallel rulemaking efforts, adding further fatal ambiguity to the New Hampshire MS4 program.

EPA Cannot Ignore Congress, the Courts, and Current Agency Regulation

When Congress amended the CWA in 1987 to comprehensively regulate, *inter alia*, municipal stormwater discharges, it established a structure to permit flexibility among local permittees to tailor their control of municipal stormwater discharges: “(B) **Municipal Discharge.**-- Permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers—(iii) *shall require controls* to reduce the discharge of pollutants *to the maximum extent practicable* (“MEP”), including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.” (Emphasis supplied). 40 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B)(iii). EPA’s initial MS4 rulemaking efforts reflected the statutory focus on the MEP standard and development of measureable goals.³ That is, the Agency consistently recognized several permit cycles would be required to fully address water quality issues: “EPA has long recognized that *it may take decades or longer* to address the water quality impacts of existing municipal stormwater discharges.” (Emphasis supplied). Draft Permit Fact Sheet, at 50; *see also* 64 Fed. Reg. 68,782 (December 8, 1999). The Region 1 approach, which presumes enforceable water quality violations by any immediately noncomplying small MS4, operates as if Congress and EPA have not already included water quality considerations within the MS4 permitting program.

Region 1, as well, finds no help in judicial reviews of the Agency’s MS4 program. Courts, for example, have refused to impose strict storm water compliance with existing water quality-based effluent limitations: “[W]e conclude that 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B)(iii) does not require municipal storm-sewer discharges to comply strictly with 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C).” *Defenders of Wildlife, et al. v. Browner, et al.*, 191 F.3d, 1159, 1165 (9th Cir. 1999) (“*Browner*”). Even where a court was concerned with the procedurally open-ended nature of the then-existing Phase II regulations, it directed only process-related reform; no new substantive requirements for MS4 permitting was directed: “The court remanded the Phase II rule’s provisions for small MS4 NPDES general permits because they lacked procedures for permitting authority review and public notice and the opportunity to request a hearing on NOIs submitted under general MS4 permits.” 81 Fed. Reg. 417 (January 6, 2016) (referring to *Environmental Defense Center, et al. v. EPA*, 344 F.3d 832 (9th Cir. 2003) (“*EDC*”).

Unfortunately, the Region 1 MS4 permit approach ignores all of this, and displaces the progressive model created by Congress and EPA rulemaking. By presuming an immediate and adverse water quality impact by small MS4 storm water discharges, the Region effectively eliminates the need for an iterative process to reflect MEP. EPA is not free to ignore its underlying statutory authority or its own issued regulations. The Agency is required to faithfully apply its existing regulations in issuing NPDES permits: “As long as this federal regulation

³ *See, e.g.*, 40 C.F.R. §§122.33(b)(1), 122.34(a).

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 4

remains in force the Executive Branch is bound by it, and indeed the United States as the sovereign composed of the three branches is bound to respect and to enforce it.” *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 696 (1974). Attempts to “find a better way” are never supportable, where they resist compliance with established law: “[I]t is elementary that an agency must adhere to its own rules and regulations. Ad hoc departures from those rules, even to achieve laudable aims, cannot be sanctioned, for therein lie the seeds of destruction of the orderliness and predictability which are the hallmarks of lawful administrative action.” (Citations omitted). *Reuters Ltd. v. F.C.C.*, 781 F.2d 946, 950-51 (D.C. Cir. 1986).

Region 1 Ignores Proposed Agency Rulemaking

Region 1 is certainly wrong by stating that its New Hampshire MS4 General Permit approach is “consistent with the national approach as stormwater permits are issued” (Fact Sheet, at 143), when the Agency is in a formal rulemaking process to develop such a national standard.⁴ The process is ongoing, with the comment period not having closed until March 21, 2016. At the very least, the Region must coordinate its own permitting process with whatever new process the Agency develops.

The pending EPA Rulemaking is directly pertinent to the New Hampshire (and other State) entities subject to the Region 1 General MS4 Permit. In fact, the Agency expressly reflects the central nature of iterative process as ongoing EPA policy: “A foundational principle of MS4 permits is that from permit term to permit term *iterative progress will be made towards meeting water quality objectives*, and that adjustments in the form of modified permit requirements will be made where necessary to reflect current water quality conditions, BMP effectiveness, and other current relevant information.” (Emphasis supplied). 81 Fed. Reg., at 422. EPA does not suggest any expansion of statutory authority here, only that, whatever permitting option that is selected “must ensure the permitting authority provides a final determination on whether the requirements to which the MS4 is subject, whether articulated fully in the permit itself or defined in whole or part by the MS4 operator in the NOI, meet the NPDES requirements to reduce discharges to the MEP, to protect water quality, and to satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Act.” *Id.*, at 420.

EPA Incorrectly Presumes the Need for Water Quality Based Permits

The Center’s discussion has already shown that the proposed and final MS4 permit actions virtually ignores the limitations of CWA Section 402(p), and EPA MS4 regulations (which focus on a gradual, iterative process to achieve water quality standards, consistent with the approach that represents achievement to the *maximum extent practicable*), as well as newly developing regulations. The Region, however, also ignores the careful, multi-step approach required by the long-standing NPDES rule (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)) and for determining when an additional water

⁴ *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System General Permit*, 81 Fed. Reg. 415-435 (January 6, 2016).

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 5

quality based effluent limitations (“*WQBELs*”), may be imposed and related implementing guidance on how to calculate an appropriate *WQBEL*.

The Region’s approach is inconsistent with the EPA required process for at least two related reasons. First, the Region requires, under Section 2.1.1, that each storm water permit is a water quality based permit – without conducting the analyses required by 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) to prove the need for such limitations. Second, the Region places on the permittee the sole dual burden of determining what is needed to immediately meet water quality standards, and then to meet them: “The *permittee shall reduce* the discharge of pollutants such that the discharges from the MS4 *do not cause or contribute* to an exceedance of water quality standards.” (Emphasis supplied). Such presumptions and burden shifts do not exist in EPA regulations or guidance.⁵

The EPA *NPDES Permit Writers Manual*, Section 6.3.1 (2010) examines *what the EPA Permit Writer must do* to create and impose *WQBELs*. The *Permit Writers Manual* focuses on the express language of 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) and explains that a *reasonable potential analysis* is needed to determine whether a *WQBEL* is even needed: “Because of that regulation [Section 122.44(d)(1)(i)], EPA and many authorized NPDES states refer to the *process that a permit writer uses to determine whether a WQBEL is required in an NPDES permit as a reasonable potential analysis*.” (Emphasis supplied). EPA then breaks down the regulation another way, to show what the analysis must consider to understand how a water quality standard exceedance could occur: “Wording the *requirements of the regulation* another way, a *reasonable potential analysis* is used to determine whether a discharge, *alone or in combination with other sources of pollutants to a waterbody* and under a set of conditions arrived at by making a series of reasonable assumptions, could lead to an excursion above an applicable water quality standard.” *Id.* The Agency is clear that it has the burden – *through the Permit Writer* – to find the source of a potential water quality excursion; the proposed/final MS4 permit has it exactly wrong, by imposing both the presumption of a discharge as being the “cause or contribution” of a water quality exceedance, and that it is the burden of the discharger to prevent it or prove its innocence.⁶

EPA is not free to make *ad hoc* revisions to the adopted rules to lessen its regulatory burdens. The permitting authority – again, *not the discharger* – “shall use procedures which account for existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, the variability of the pollutant [and other requirements].” 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(2). Extant rules also permit a “case-by-case”

⁵ Language including a prohibition for “contributing” to a water quality violation is inconsistent with the CWA. Courts have already determined that causation is necessary to impose liability. *See, e.g., Nat’l Ass’n of Metal Finishers v. EPA*, 719 F.2d 624 (3rd Cir. 1983).

⁶ EPA also further advises the Permit Writer of the complexity of the analysis: “The regulation also specifies that the *reasonable potential determination* must apply not only to numeric criteria, but also to narrative criteria (*e.g., no toxics in toxic amounts, presence of pollutants or pollutant parameters in amounts that would result in nuisance algal blooms*).” *Id.*

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 6

approach to setting WQBELs, under certain circumstances, consistent with the *Permit Writers Manual*. See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(vi)(B). None of these existing rules can be read in any way to expand EPA's authority to require, via presumption, the imposition of water quality-based effluent limitations for all MS4 permittees. Such a result is hardly consistent with the MEP standard of Section 402(p) of the CWA, or of the Permit Writer's burden – not that of the discharger – to produce a *reasonable potential analysis*, which is prefatory to imposing WQBELs. EPA has ignored Congress, the courts, and EPA's own water quality regulations in seeking to use the stormwater permit process to implement an entirely new regulatory regime. An agency is bound to comply with its own regulations. See, e.g., *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260 (1954). EPA is not free to pick and choose what provisions of a statute – or regulation – it will recognize: “*Chevron* allows agencies to choose among competing reasonable interpretations of a statute; it does not license interpretive gerrymanders under which an agency keeps parts of statutory context it likes while throwing away parts it does not.” *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. ___, Slip Op. at 9, 135 S. Ct. 2699, 2708 (2015) (Emphasis supplied).

EPA Eliminates Allowable Schedules of Compliance from Permits

The practical outcome of Region 1's MS4 General Permits is to create a separate class of permittees in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. This new class does not have the statutorily-promised levels of local decision-making and flexibility in addressing needed pollution controls, including extending schedules needed to address applicable water quality requirements. In fact, Region 1, by presuming that the mere presence of a pollutant in the MS4 discharge meets its “cause or contribute” standard, and requiring virtually immediate corrective action, eliminates the entire concept of an allowable schedule of compliance altogether from its MS4 permits.⁷

EPA's newly pending regulations directly contradict Region 1 on the expectation of building in an allowable schedule for MS4 permittees: “EPA continues to view MEP as iterative, in that *each successive permits needs to define* what is required to meet the MEP standard for that permit term.” (Emphasis supplied) 81 Fed. Reg., at 421. Under its *Traditional Permit Approach*, EPA directs that significant levels of information must be reviewed for succeeding MS4 permits to determine their effectiveness in meeting necessary goals: “Thus, in advance of issuing any successive small MS4 general permit, the permitting authority would need to review . . . information on the relative progress made by permittees to meet applicable milestones, compliance problems . . . the effectiveness of the required activities and selected BMPs under the existing permit, and any improvements or degradation in water quality.” *Id.*, at 422.

⁷ EPA NPDES permits regularly contain a schedule of compliance, which is necessary to the ordered achievement of applicable requirements: “Schedule of compliance means a schedule of remedial measures included in a ‘permit,’ including an enforceable sequence of interim requirements (for example, actions, operations, or milestone events) leading to compliance with the ‘appropriate Act and regulations.’” 40 C.F.R. §124.2(a).

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 7

Language from the proposed new rules, at 40 C.F.R. § 124.34(a), expressly authorize schedules of compliance considerations. EPA states that “effluent limitations may be expressed as requirements to implement best management practices (BMPs) with clear, specific, and measureable requirements, including . . . *schedules for implementation and maintenance*, and frequency of actions.” 81 Fed. Reg., at 432 (Emphasis supplied). Newly issued MS4 permits are permitted a term of “up to” five years, while “[e]ach successive permit must meet the requirements of this section based on current water quality conditions, record of BMP effectiveness, and other relevant information.” *Id.* However, the newly crafted permit provisions ignore the Agency’s own revised direction on MS4 permitting, as well as what Congress intended, which focused on an iterative process, as well as directing studies intended for “establishing procedures and methods to control stormwater discharges *to the extent necessary to mitigate impacts* on water quality.” CWA, Section 402(p)(5)(C) (Emphasis supplied).

EPA Engages In Improper Rulemaking

EPA may wish that more expansive powers were provided to it within the CWA to *skip over* the centrality of the MEP standard, and the flexibility that it requires, in favor of forcing an immediate level of water quality compliance by MS4 permittees. As an appellate court recently said, however, in vacating the Agency’s blending rule, an agency needs to recognize, and implement, the powers provided to it by Congress. *Iowa League of Cities v. EPA*, 711 F.3d 844, 877 (8th Cir. 2013); *citing, Am. Iron & Steel Inst. v. EPA*, 115 F.3d 979, 996 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (“The EPA would like to apply effluent limitations to the discharge of flows from one internal treatment unit to another. We cannot reasonably conclude that it has the statutory authority to do so.”).

A court reviewing EPA’s creation of a new class of permittees, would likely stop at the *first step* of *Chevron* in striking the EPA action as *ultra vires*, “If the intent of Congress is clear, that is the end of the matter; the court as well as the agency must give effect to the unambiguous expressed intent of Congress.” *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 467 U.S. 837, 842-43 (1984). Congress, for control of stormwater discharges, has clearly spoken; local governments are to be permitted to develop responses to meeting applicable requirements to the “maximum extent practicable.” No mandate exists to never “cause or contribute” to a water quality exceedance. If the Agency wishes to impose such a new requirement in MS4 permits, EPA would need to incorporate the notice and comment requirements of the APA, under 5 U.S.C. §§ 553(b) and (c); absent this, the proposed new rule that Region 1 offers must be vacated. *See, e.g., Iowa League of Cities, v. EPA*, 711 F.3d, at 874-876.

Request for Immediate Administrator Review and Staying Action

The Region’s proposed MS4 General Permit for small communities is without legal support. EPA radically departs from CWA stormwater and water quality-based permitting requirements, and Agency regulations, and is inconsistent with EPA’s own pending rulemaking. Certainly,

**CENTER FOR REGULATORY
REASONABLENESS**

Hon. Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environment Protection Agency
April 28, 2016
Page | 8

EPA would need to undergo further APA rulemaking, given the Region's intent to introduce a new *legislative* rule applicable to small MS4 communities.

We ask that you give this matter significant priority, and take all steps to implement necessary corrective action. The present finalized Massachusetts and draft New Hampshire MS4 General Permits need to be withdrawn, as a necessary first step, to act in accordance with federal law. EPA also needs to clarify that the existing NPDES rules cannot be used, in conjunction with a Section 303(d) impairment listing, to presume that a water quality-based limitation is necessary for a municipal MS4 permittee.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher L. Risetto, General Counsel

Att. (1)



The State of New Hampshire
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES



Thomas S. Burack, Commissioner

August 15, 2013

Mr. Newton Tedder, US EPA - Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code—OEP06-4
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Subject: Comments on the February 12, 2013 New Hampshire Draft Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System NPDES General Permit

The Department of Environmental Services appreciates your thoughtful development of the most recent draft of the subject permit and your thorough response to comments. We thank you for reaching out to the regulated communities and spending the time and effort to assist us in interpreting the permit requirements. The permit's requirements are complicated and, as written, will need additional clarification. Although many of our questions have been answered, we would like to provide you with the following written comments on the permit requirements to assist us in working together to meet our joint water quality goals.

1. Given that DES programs are resource-constrained and likely to experience additional funding reductions, DES is concerned that the subject permit creates an additional workload for DES programs that is non-productive. For example, DES has an effective program to deal with antidegradation, but the very specific requirements in Section 2.1.2.b will likely result in DES needing to unnecessarily review every change in land use, regardless of how small (e.g., paving of a driveway), in every MS4 community. Section 2.1.2.b could simply read: "b. Permittees must comply with the provisions of the NH antidegradation provisions", allowing DES the flexibility to implement programs in the most effective way possible.
2. Section 2.2 is arguably the section of the draft permit that is most open-ended as far as community expense is concerned, particularly with the large number of impaired water listings and TMDLs in New Hampshire. Restoring impaired waters is as complicated and time-consuming as it is important, and TMDLs provide a valuable tool in their restoration. However, although MS4 communities can do their part, they cannot do it alone. Watershed-wide participation in integrated adaptive management approaches are necessary if water quality objectives are to be met. For the reasons below, DES suggests that EPA delay the effective date of Section 2.2 of the Permit for as long as 3 years after the date of signature and final release to the public. In addition, DES supports a longer time frame for the communities in New Hampshire to achieve compliance with the Permit. DES is committed to working with EPA and the New Hampshire legislature to modify administrative rules to enable the use of compliance schedules in general permits to allow for longer timeframes to meet the more challenging requirements of the permit. The permit should assure that the permittees take action to solve

DES Web site: www.des.nh.gov

Att. 1

P.O. Box 95, 29 Hazen Drive, Concord, New Hampshire 03302-0095
Telephone: (603) 271-3503 • Fax: (603) 271-2867 • TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964

1 of 3

confirmed water quality problems but not put them in a position of immediate non-compliance, with no ability to comply within the permit term.


- a. As shown in the attached spreadsheet, prepared by DES to better understand the draft permit, most of the requirements are compressed into the first few years of the permit. Almost every requirement in the permit requires action within the first 6 – 12 months of the permit becoming effective. DES understands the importance of the new requirements in this draft. However, we also recognize the complexity, costs and practical realities associated with immediate implementation in the many relatively small communities in New Hampshire.
 - b. As discussed above, because of the large number of water bodies in New Hampshire with listings and TMDLs, including some for which additional and updated data are needed, the new requirements in Section 2.2 are magnified for the MS4 communities in New Hampshire. In the draft permit, DES would like to see the addition of a data verification step prior to the creation of water quality response plans or investments in more costly best management practices (BMPs). This is especially true for impaired waters for which there are few data, that have not been sampled in many years, or for which better sampling techniques are now available.
 - c. Further, for TMDL requirements and Water Quality Response Plans (WQRPs), it should be clear that the firm deadlines to conduct investigations and begin installing BMPs are only the first step in the “adaptive management” and “reasonable further progress” processes that may require several years beyond the permit term to complete. It would be helpful in moving this critical program forward if the Permit clarified if, and how, MS4 communities can stay in compliance with Permit requirements during the time the adaptive management approach to meeting water quality standards is being implemented.
 - d. Given the expansive nature of the permit, the number of listings and TMDLs in New Hampshire, other NPDES issues within MS4 communities, and resource issues, triage should be an important concept in the final permit. Communities should, with input from state and federal agencies, be able to prioritize water bodies for restoration and protection. While all surface waters are important, some characteristics, such as public health, recovery potential, and relative severity of impact, make certain waters higher priorities. It seems unusual that the Permit requirements for listed water bodies without TMDLs are more arduous than for those where TMDLs have already been developed. A prioritization step, perhaps even on a watershed basis, should be an important part of the implementation of section 2.2 and perhaps other sections requiring expensive monitoring or investigation. Ultimately, we look forward to discussing integrated permitting options that would allow all of us to focus on projects with the highest water quality benefit, particularly in watersheds with CSO discharges.
3. The requirements related to compliance with TMDLs are confusing. Permittees need to know exactly what they are responsible for to be in compliance. It should be made clear that permittees are only responsible for pollutants derived from human activities conducted within their own MS4 boundaries. For example, if CSOs in an upstream community are listed as the cause of

impairment in the 303(d) list, and a downstream community that does not have CSOs discharges to the same water body, then the downstream community should not need to take actions other than the 6 minimum control measures described in section 2.3. Further, it should be made clear that the only TMDL that requires "relative percent reductions" is that for phosphorus, and that for the other TMDLs, there are no specific allocations that apply at the outfalls. With regard to the phosphorus TMDLs, the permit seems to focus TMDL compliance on achieving phosphorus reduction targets. As stated in the implementation sections of the TMDLs, compliance with the TMDL will be based on compliance with water quality criteria and/or thresholds for the response parameters (i.e., dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll-a and cyanobacteria) and not on meeting the phosphorus reduction targets. In addition, the TMDL states that it is anticipated that the phosphorus reductions will be conducted in phases. To be consistent with how the phosphorus TMDLs were intended to be implemented, and to avoid spending public funds on BMPs that may not be necessary to achieve water quality standards, the permit should promote, and allow time for, an adaptive implementation approach consisting of phased BMP implementation followed by ambient monitoring after each phase, to confirm if additional phosphorus control measures are warranted.

4. It appears that Water Quality Response Plans (WQRPs) are open ended. There is a need for a Phase IV for WQRPs that defines when they can be closed out or suspended. It should be made clear that, except for periodic follow-up monitoring as part of the IDDE program, the water quality response plans can be suspended when the pollutants contributing to impairments are no longer present in significant or measurable quantities in an outfall. Further, if the listed impairments are removed from the 303(d) list due to ongoing monitoring of the applicable assessment unit by DES or the permittee, then the WQRPs can be closed out.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to work with you on this critical issue. It is our hope that the new MS4 permit will serve to move all parties toward our mutual goal of meeting water quality objectives in the most effective and efficient ways possible. Please feel free to contact Vicki Quiram, Harry Stewart, Ted Diers or me if you have any questions.

Respectfully,



Thomas S. Burack
Commissioner

cc: Vicki Quiram, Assistant Commissioner, Dept. of Environmental Services
Harry Stewart, Director, Water Division, Dept. of Environmental Services
Ted Diers, Administrator, Watershed Management Bureau, Water Division, Dept. of Environmental Services

Attachment

Exhibit D

EPA HQ's June 8, 2016, Letter to CRR



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN - 8 2016

OFFICE OF WATER

Christopher L. Risetto
General Counsel
Center for Regulatory Reasonableness
1620 I Street, NW, Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Risetto:

Thank you for your April 28, 2016, letter to the Environmental Protection Agency. In your letter, you raised issues concerning general permits for small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) in the states of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. You also asked that the EPA withdraw the Final General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Small MS4s in Massachusetts, signed April 4, 2016¹ ("Massachusetts General Permit") and the Draft General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Small MS4s for New Hampshire ("Draft New Hampshire General Permit").

The EPA received many comments on the Massachusetts General Permit and responded to those in the response to comments that was included in the record when the permit was issued. In its response to comments, the EPA provided an explanation of the legal and technical basis for the permit limitations and other conditions included in the Massachusetts General Permit. The response to comments document can be found at <https://www3.epa.gov/region1/npdes/stormwater/ma/2016fpd/rtc-2016-ma-sms4-gp.pdf>.

The EPA also provided lengthy comment periods for the Draft New Hampshire General Permit. EPA published a notice of availability for the 2013 draft general permit and fact sheet in the Federal Register on February 12, 2013, and twice extended the comment period.² As a result, the entire comment period on the Draft New Hampshire General Permit was six months, from February 12, 2013 through August 15, 2013.

In response to comments received on the 2013 draft New Hampshire General Permit and to align permit requirements with New Hampshire State law, including recently updated water quality standards allowing compliance schedules in NPDES permits, the agency revised sections 2.1.1, 2.2, 2.3.6, Appendix F and Appendix H of the 2013 draft general permit and reopened the comment period on the draft revisions. The EPA provided a 63 day comment period on these draft revisions, from September 1, 2015 through November 2, 2015. Finally, the EPA provided additional time for comments received on the draft revisions from the close of the public

¹ 81 FR 21862 (April 13, 2016)

² 78 FR 20316 (April 4, 2013); 78 FR 27964 (May 13, 2013)

comment period through November 20, 2015.³ Thus, interested parties had nearly three additional months to comment on portions of the Draft New Hampshire General Permit associated with the water quality based effluent limits in the draft permit.

During these comment periods, the EPA received many comments on the Draft New Hampshire General Permit. When the EPA takes final action on the permit, the agency will respond to all significant comments submitted to the agency during those comment periods and provide an explanation of the legal and technical basis, as appropriate, to supplement the explanations provided in the fact sheet and other supporting documents for the draft permit.

Thank you for your interest in these important environmental matters. If you have any questions, please contact David Webster at (617) 918-1791.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joel Beauvais", with a stylized, cursive script.

Joel Beauvais
Deputy Assistant Administrator

³80 FR 52751 (September 1, 2015)