

Watershed-Based MS4 Pilot Permit Stakeholder Meeting

NMED District 1 Offices • January 18, 2012 • 8:30 a.m.-Noon

Summary of Agreements/Actions

The January 18, 2012 meeting was attended by 35 representatives of local federal, tribal, state, county, municipal, flood control authority, and private consulting agencies. Agenda items included:

1. Local Ideas for Sector Criteria
 2. EPA Proposal for Sector Criteria
 3. Discussion of Sector Criteria
 4. EPA Overview on Monitoring
-

Discussion Points/Agreements/Actions

1) Re: Local Ideas for Sector Criteria

Chuck Thomas from SSCAFCA presented a proposed framework of sectors, minimum control measures and specific control measures developed by representatives of Sandoval County stakeholders. Highlights include:

- a) Sectors may be designated using different criteria, e.g., by size or population of entity; by experience with the MS4 program, or others. It will be essential to agree on the criterion or criteria for allocating stakeholders into sectors.
- b) Sectors would be allocated levels of responsibility under each Minimum Control Measure. Responsibilities under each MCM might range from assessment programs, to ordinances, training, procedural reviews, etc., and different sectors would be tasked with different numbers of these over-arching types of requirements.
- c) For each MCM requirement (e.g., an ordinance or a program), respective stakeholders would each be required to perform at least one Specific Control Measure or Best Management Practice (BMP).
- d) EPA would approve the responsibilities/requirements under each MCM; the allocation of stakeholders to a sector; and the menu of BMPs. The number and type of BMPs would be chosen by each stakeholder, as each stakeholder is in the best situation to evaluate the effectiveness of each measure, and how many BMPs are actually needed to meet its responsibility.
- e) For more information, please see Chuck's presentation, "MRG Watershed-Based Permit Proposal, January 18, 2012." (A separate file is attached.)

2) Re: EPA Proposal for Sector Criteria

Nelly Smith from EPA presented a proposed framework of sectors for the group's review. Highlights include:

- a) Sector A would include "MS4s owned or operated by a city, town, borough, county located within the 2000 Albuquerque Urbanized Area boundaries and the 12 Digit HUC watersheds" outlined in previous discussion.
 - b) Sector B would include "Non-Traditional MS4s owned or operated by Federal or State governments or other public entities within the 2000 Albuquerque Urbanized Area boundaries and the 12 Digit HUC watersheds [outlined in previous discussions]....It includes flood control authorities, federal facilities, special districts, departments of transportation, etc."
 - c) Sector C would include "MS4s owned or operated by an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian Tribal Organization." (A separate file is attached.)
-

- d) An allowance for an additional category, “Sector D,” was also included in the proposed framework.
- e) For more information, please see Nelly’s presentation, “January 18, 2012 Sector Areas Revision 1.”

3) Re: Sector Framework Discussion

- a) Two other reference documents were distributed to assist the discussion of the two presentations: One was the summary of recommended compliance strategies/activities from the November 16, 2011 Stakeholder Meeting. The second was the initial proposal outlining the sector concept, presented at the September 16, 2011 Stakeholder Meeting. These are below as Appendix 1 (pp.4-6) and Appendix 2 (pg.7) of this summary.
- b) The discussion about sectors was wide-ranging. Chuck’s and Nelly’s presentations were viewed as complementary, as Chuck spoke about the way to allocate responsibilities once sectors were determined, and Nelly spoke about the sectors themselves, and offered a way to separate stakeholders into sectors. Some of the key points included:
 - i) In general, smaller and larger jurisdictional entities should be placed into different sectors. Therefore, it may not be useful to have all the entities in the proposed “Sector A” above in the same sector. For example, the proposal places the City of Albuquerque and the Village of Tijeras in the same sector.
 - ii) Sector designation should recognize responsibility for potential pollution impact. Some in the group felt that sector allocation should be primarily impact-based, but consensus has not been reached as yet.
 - iii) A clear distinction needs be made between a permittee’s *amount of responsibility* and *time to comply*. Hypothetically, a permittee may be placed in a sector requiring a relatively large amount of responsibility; however, if it has little or no experience with the MS4 program, it would have a longer time to develop a storm water program and meet its responsibilities than, say, NMDOT, UNM, AMAFCA, or the City of Albuquerque—the present Phase 1 permittees.
 - iv) There is a division of opinion on the proposed compliance framework. Some felt that the Sandoval County entities’ proposal, which emphasizes individual permittee choice of the number and type of BMPs, reflects efficiency and recognition of local conditions. However, others felt that the framework over-emphasizes local control, making the “watershed-based” permit merely an aggregate of individual permits and activities, and discouraging substantive joint efforts.
- c) There also was some confusion over the rationale for why the MRGCD is to be excluded from the watershed-based permit. Nelly agreed to try to obtain a clarification from EPA.
- d) Nelly also indicated that she will be modifying the schedule for issuing a draft watershed-based permit. The draft permit will now probably be issued in September or October 2012.

4) EPA Overview on Monitoring

- a) Nelly presented EPA’s present thinking on monitoring. The presentation reviewed EPA and USFWS monitoring requirements; went over wet and dry screening protocols; and offered wet screening guidelines for assessing water quality impacts.
- b) Guidelines for annual monitoring parameters, locations, sampling and frequency are still to be determined. For more information, please see the attached file, “Proposed Monitoring Component, January 18, 2012.”

5) Next Meeting

- a) The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, February 29, 2012 from 8:30-noon at the Los Ranchos de Albuquerque Village offices.
- b) Agenda topics will center on a) the sector framework and b) initial thinking on the cost-allocation formula.

Watershed-Based MS4 Permit Stakeholder Meeting • January 18, 2012

Meeting Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>E-mail</u>
Karen Agogino	DOE/SNL	kagogino@doeal.gov
Trevor Alsop	SSCAFCA	talsop@sscafca.com
Jessica Bennett	New Mexico Tech	
Molly Blumhoefer	UNM	mb6@unm.edu
Tony C de Baca	Town of Bernalillo	tcdebaca@townofbernalillo.org
Michael Castillo	ESCAFCA	mcastillo@escafca.com
Kelly Collins	CDM	collinska@cdm.com
Kevin Daggett	AMAFCA	kdaggett@amafca.org
Doug Dailey	URS	ddailey@urscorp.com
Carolyn Daniel	Sandia Labs	cdaniel@sandia.gov
Rob Demeule	NMDOT/HZI	rbdemeule@huitt-zollars.com
Andrew Erdmann	OSE	andrew.erdmann@state.nm.us
Steve Glass	Ciudad SWCD/ABCWUA	jstvglass@gmail.com
David Heber	OSE	david.heber@state.nm.us
Vern Hershberger	UNM	hershber@unm.edu
Sarah Holcomb	NMED SWQB	sarah.holcomb@state.nm.us
Tim Karpoff	Karpoff & Associates	timkarpoff@msn.com
Fred Marquez	Sandoval County PWD	fmarquez@sandovalcountynm.gov
Louise Marquez	Village of Tijeras	lmarquez@villageoftijeras.com
Joe Mauser	Sandia Labs	jmmause@sandia.gov
Travis Miller	UNM	travmill@unm.edu
Mary Murnane	Bernalillo County	mmurnane@bernco.gov
Joe Quintana	MRCOG	jlquintana@mrcog-nm.gov
Chip Roma	Sandia Labs	cmroma@sandia.gov
Linda Seebach	Village of Los Ranchos	lseebach@losranchosnm.gov
Chris Segura	Kirtland AFB	christopher.segura@kirtland.af.mil
Nelly Smith	EPA Region VI	nelly.smith@epa.gov
Timothy Smith	Pueblo of Sandia	
Anita Steed	Bernalillo County	asteed@bernco.gov
Cyndie Tidwell	Village of Corrales	ctidwell@corrales-nm.org
Chuck Thomas	SSCAFCA	cthomas@sscafca.com
Tim Trujillo	NMDOT-Drainage	timothytrujillo@state.nm.us
Bart Van den Plas	Pueblo of Santa Ana	bart.vandenplas@santaana-nsn.gov
Kathy Verhage	City of Albuquerque	kverhage@cabq.gov
Wayne Wormhood	Town of Bernalillo	wwormhood@townofbernalillo.org

APPENDIX 1: Middle Rio Grande Watershed-Based MS4 Permit—Second Draft of Compliance Strategies/Activities • November 16, 2011

Compliance Strategies for P2 and Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inventory City (or agency) operations. ▪ Develop an O&M Program to reduce pollution. ▪ Hold regular employee training. ▪ Develop Best Management Practices (BMPs) and measureable goals. ▪ Investigate current procedures for use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. ▪ Comply with NMDA on proper use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate in joint employee training meeting at least once annually. ▪ Share individual experiences and successes. ▪ Develop a watershed-wide approach to dog parks.
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design new parks to LID standards. ▪ Establish storm drain cleaning procedures - prioritized to perceived threats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perform agency-to-agency audits to benefit from outside experiences.
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create SWPPPs for all ongoing City (or agency) operations. ▪ Obtain MSGPs for all qualifying operations. ▪ Perform annual audits and inspections. ▪ Prioritize street sweeping operations for largest threats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research e.Coli problems at dog parks.

Compliance Strategies for Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Control

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify existing ordinances and state laws. ▪ Conduct inspections for IDD. ▪ Cleanup dumpsites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate language of ordinances/regulations ▪ Develop joint Training Program and Public Outreach Program. ▪ Develop watershed map.
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require connection to sanitary sewers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Map/record incidents. ▪ Use 24 hr. reporting method.
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that monitoring is tied to enforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate household hazardous waste collection.

Compliance Strategies for Public Involvement

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt arroyos, highways, Bosque, public parks, storm drains. B.E.M.P.4—Water quality monitoring performed by public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold forums and public meetings. Set up clean up events for gross floatable debris control. Enhance existing events e.g. Keep America Beautiful; Dia del Rio. Set up a public tracking/reporting system, using phones and social media. Establish a “311”-type number and system.
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt arroyos, highways, Bosque, public parks, storm drains. B.E.M.P.4—Water quality monitoring performed by public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt arroyos, highways, Bosque, public parks, storm drains. B.E.M.P.4—Water quality monitoring performed by public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Compliance Strategies for Construction Site Control

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure that a local government inspection process is in place and enforced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop standard SWPPP/NOI control measure for construction in watershed – available on websites. Guidelines for GI/LID watershed (publication)
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each local government requires that NOI’s to EPA be copied to its building department for review. Develop pollution reporting program – track out/wash out reports (i.e. 311). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognized (and understood) GI LID guidelines.
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review all site plans for pollution compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandated GI LID compliance.

Compliance Strategies for Post-Construction Site Control

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop Maintenance Plan. ▪ Use landscape and pavement. ▪ Establish requirements to prevent surface water pollution from post-construction. ▪ Institute an inspection process to insure compliance with BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require financial guarantees/bonding for pollution control practices. ▪ Drain through landscaping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employ retention ponds in small events, to catch first flush. ▪ Use permeable materials ▪ Establish GL/LID ordinances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a guidance manual for LID, GI for construction projects.

Compliance Strategies for Public Outreach and Education

	Individual	Joint
Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop pet-specific education. ▪ Link on jurisdiction website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribute and participate in Stormwater Quality Team. ▪ Contribute and participate in school education programs.
Enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate in local events—brochures, posters, etc. ▪ Establish a water committee/advisor group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate in regional events (i.e., State Fair, Balloon Fiesta).
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish Local newsletters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Educate industry groups (e.g., NAIOP AGC, HBNM)

Middle Rio Grande Watershed-Based MS4 Permit
APPENDIX 2: Permittee Sectors and Menu-Based SWMP Alternatives
September 16, 2011

❖ **Alternatives for establishing permittee sectors (“categories”)**

➤ **Capacity-based sectors**

- *Capacity* \cong MS4 experience x Rulemaking authority
- EPA Region 6 determines capacity ratings
- Any jurisdiction can negotiate capacity rating with EPA Region 6

Capacity	MS4 experience	Rulemaking authority	Examples
High	High	Yes	COA, KAFB
Mod-High	Moderate	Yes	BC, RR, Corrales
Mod-Low	Low	Yes	ESCAFCA, Tijeras, MRGCD, Tribes
Low	Low	No	NMDOT, UNM, SNL

➤ **Impact-based sectors**

- *Impact* \cong Discharge area x Impervious percentage x Population density (with LID/GI adjustment?)
- Factors derived from GIS and census data
- Stakeholders and EPA Region 6 agree on modeling approach
- Final sector definitions based on numerical impact ratings (task for CRADA?)

Impact	Discharge area	Impervious percent	Population density	Example
High	Large	High	High	COA
Mod-High	Large	Low	Low	Sandoval Cty
	Small	High	High	SNL
Mod-Low	Small	Low	High	Corrales
	Small	High	High	Bernalillo
Low	Small	Low	Low	Tijeras

❖ **Possible Sector-Based SWMP Requirements**

Rating	Compliance Strategies			Monitoring		
	Basic	Enhanced	Advanced	River	Outfalls	Industries
High	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mod-High	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Mod-Low	✓	✓		✓		
Low	✓			✓		

➤ **Compliance strategies examples**

- Basic: Small resource commitment
 - 6 minimum measures only
 - 1-3 [?] strategies per measure (defined in permit)
- Enhanced: Moderate resource commitment
 - “Basic” + 1-3 [?] additional strategies per measure
 - Additional strategies chosen from menu (or proposed to/approved by EPA Regions 6)
- Advanced: High resource commitment
 - “Enhanced” + 1-3 [?] additional strategies per measure
 - Additional strategies chosen from menu (or proposed to/approved by EPA Regions 6)
 - Additional measures (defined in permit) and strategies (e.g. industry outreach program)