

federal register

**Friday
November 16, 1990**

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

**40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
System Permit Application Regulations
for Storm Water Discharges; Final Rule**



**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY**

40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124

(FRL-3834-7)

RIN 2040-AA79

**National Pollutant Discharge
Elimination System Permit Application
Regulations for Storm Water
Discharges****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: Today's final rule begins to implement section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (added by section 405 of the Water Quality Act of 1987 (WQA)), which requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish regulations setting forth National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit application requirements for: storm water discharges associated with industrial activity; discharges from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 250,000 or more; and discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250,000.

Today's rule also clarifies the requirements of section 401 of the WQA, which amended CWA section 402(1)(2) to provide that NPDES permits shall not be required for discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations or oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations or transmission facilities, composed entirely of flows which are from conveyances (including but not limited to pipes, conduits, ditches, and channels) used for collecting and conveying precipitation runoff and which are not contaminated by contact with, or do not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product located on the site of such operations. This rule sets forth NPDES permit application requirements addressing storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and storm water discharges from large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems.

DATES: This final rule becomes effective December 17, 1990. In accordance with 40 CFR 23.2, this rule shall be considered final for purposes of judicial review on November 30, 1990, at 1 p.m. eastern daylight time. The public record is located at EPA Headquarters, EPA Public Information Reference Unit, room

2402, 401 M Street SW., Washington DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For further information on the rule contact: Thomas J. Seaton, Kevin Weiss, or Michael Mitchell Office of Water Enforcement and Permits (EN-336), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 475-9518.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background and Water Quality Concerns
- II. Water Quality Act of 1987
- III. Remand of 1984 Regulations
- IV. Codification Rule and Case-by-Case Designations
- V. Consent Decree of October 20, 1989
- VI. Today's Final Rule and Response to Comments
 - A. Overview
 - B. Definition of Storm Water
 - C. Responsibility for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity into Municipal Separate Storm Sewers
 - D. Preliminary Permitting Strategy for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity
 1. Tier 1—Baseline Permitting
 2. Tier 2—Watershed Permitting
 3. Tier 3—Industry Specific Permitting
 4. Tier 4—Facility Specific Permitting
 - E. Relationship of Strategy to Permit Application Requirements
 - a. Individual Permit Application Requirements
 - b. Group Application
 - c. Case-by-Case Requirements
 - F. Storm Water Discharge Sampling
 - G. Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity
 1. Permit Applicability
 - a. Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity to Waters of the United States
 - b. Storm Water Discharges Through Municipal Separate Storm Sewers
 - c. Storm Water Discharges Through Non-Municipal Storm Sewers
 2. Scope of "Associated with Industrial Activity"
 3. Individual Application Requirements
 4. Group Applications
 - a. Facilities Covered
 - b. Scope of Group Application
 - c. Group Application Requirements
 5. Group Application: Applicability in NPDES States
 6. Group Application: Procedural Concerns
 7. Permit Applicability and Applications for Oil, Gas and Mining Operations
 - a. Gas and Oil Operations
 - b. Use of Reportable Quantities to Determine if a Storm Water Discharge from an Oil or Gas Operation is Contaminated
 - c. Mining Operations
 8. Application Requirements for Construction Activities
 - a. Permit application requirements
 - b. Administrative burdens
 - G. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

1. Municipal Separate Storm Sewers
2. Effective Prohibition on Non-Storm Water Discharges
3. Site-Specific Storm Water Quality Management Programs for Municipal Systems
4. Large and Medium Municipal Storm Sewer Systems
 - a. Overview of proposed options and comments
 - b. Definition of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer system
 - c. Response to comments
 - H. Permit Application Requirements for Large and Medium Municipal Systems
 1. Implementing the Permit Program
 2. Structure of Permit Application
 - a. Part 1 Application
 - b. Part 2 Application
 3. Major Outfalls
 4. Field Screening Program
 5. Source Identification
 6. Characterization of Discharges
 - a. Screening Analysis for Illicit Discharges
 - b. Representative Data
 - c. Loading and Concentration Estimates
 7. Storm Water Quality Management Plans
 - a. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Runoff from Commercial and Residential Areas
 - b. Measures for Illicit Discharges and Improper Disposal
 - c. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity Through Municipal Systems
 - d. Measures to Reduce Pollutants in Runoff from Construction Sites Through Municipal Systems
 8. Assessment of Controls
 - I. Annual Reports
 - J. Application Deadlines
- VII. Economic Impact
- VIII. Paperwork Reduction Act
- IX. Regulatory Flexibility Act

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Background and Water Quality Concerns**

The 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (referred to as the Clean Water Act or CWA), prohibit the discharge of any pollutant to navigable waters from a point source unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. Efforts to improve water quality under the NPDES program traditionally and primarily focused on reducing pollutants in discharges of industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. This program emphasis developed for a number of reasons. At the onset of the program in 1972, many sources of industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage were not adequately controlled and represented pressing environmental problems. In addition, sewage outfalls and industrial process discharges were easily identified as responsible for poor, often drastically degraded, water quality conditions. However, as pollution control measures were initially

developed for these discharges, it became evident that more diffuse sources (occurring over a wide area) of water pollution, such as agricultural and urban runoff were also major causes of water quality problems. Some diffuse sources of water pollution, such as agricultural storm water discharges and irrigation return flows, are statutorily exempted from the NPDES program.

Since enactment of the 1972 amendments to the CWA, considering the rise of economic activity and population, significant progress in controlling water pollution has been made, particularly with regard to industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage. Expenditures by EPA, the States, and local governments to construct and upgrade sewage treatment facilities have substantially increased the population served by higher levels of treatment. Backlogs of expired permits for industrial process wastewater discharges have been reduced. Continued improvements are expected for these discharges as the NPDES program continues to place increasing emphasis on water quality-based pollution controls, especially for toxic pollutants.

Although assessments of water quality are difficult to perform and verify, several national assessments of water quality are available. For the purpose of these assessments, urban runoff was considered to be a diffuse source or nonpoint source pollution. From a legal standpoint, however, most urban runoff is discharged through conveyances such as separate storm sewers or other conveyances which are point sources under the CWA. These discharges are subject to the NPDES program. The "National Water Quality Inventory, 1988 Report to Congress" provides a general assessment of water quality based on biennial reports submitted by the States under section 305(b) of the CWA. In preparing the section 305(b) Reports, the States were asked to indicate the fraction of the States' waters that were assessed, as well as the fraction of the States' waters that were fully supporting, partly supporting, or not supporting designated uses. The Report indicates that of the rivers, lakes, and estuaries that were assessed by States (approximately one-fifth of stream miles, one-third of lake acres and one-half of estuarine waters), roughly 70% to 75% are supporting the uses for which they are designated. For waters with use impairments, States were asked to determine impacts due to diffuse sources (agricultural and urban runoff and other sources), municipal sewage, industrial process wastewaters,

combined sewer overflows, and natural and other sources, then combine impacts to arrive at estimates of the relative percentage of State waters affected by each source. In this manner, the relative importance of the various sources of pollution that are causing use impairments was assessed and weighted national averages were calculated. Based on 37 States that provided information on sources of pollution, industrial process wastewaters were cited as the cause of nonsupport for 7.5% of rivers and streams, 10% of lakes, and 6% of estuaries. Municipal sewage was the cause of nonsupport for 13% of rivers and streams, 5% lakes, 48% estuaries, 41% of the Great Lake shoreline, and 11% of coastal waters. The Assessment concluded that pollution from diffuse sources, such as runoff from agricultural, urban areas, construction sites, land disposal and resource extraction, is cited by the States as the leading cause of water quality impairment. These sources appear to be increasingly important contributors of use impairment as discharges of industrial process wastewaters and municipal sewage plants come under increased control and as intensified data collection efforts provide additional information. Some examples of diffuse sources cited as causing use impairment are: for rivers and streams, 9% from separate storm sewers, 6% from construction and 13% from resource extraction; for lakes, 28% from separate storm sewers and 26% from land disposal; for the Great Lakes shoreline, 10% from separate storm sewers, 34% from resource extraction, and 82% from land disposal; for estuaries, 28% from separate storm sewers and 27% from land disposal; and for coastal areas, 20% from separate storm sewers and 29% from land disposal.

The States conducted a more comprehensive study of diffuse pollution sources under the sponsorship of the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators (ASIWPCA) and EPA. The study resulted in the report "America's Clean Water—The States' Nonpoint Source Assessment, 1985" which indicated that 38 States reported urban runoff as a major cause of beneficial use impairment. In addition, 21 States reported construction site runoff as a major cause of use impairment.

To provide a better understanding of the nature of urban runoff from commercial and residential areas, from 1978 through 1983, EPA provided funding and guidance to the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program (NURP). The NURP included 28 projects across the Nation,

conducted separately at the local level but centrally reviewed, coordinated, and guided.

One focus of the NURP was to characterize the water quality of discharges from separate storm sewers which drain residential, commercial, and light industrial (industrial parks) sites. The majority of samples collected in the study were analyzed for eight conventional pollutants and three metals. Data collected under the NURP indicated that on an annual loading basis, suspended solids in discharges from separate storm sewers draining runoff from residential, commercial and light industrial areas are around an order of magnitude greater than solids in discharges from municipal secondary sewage treatment plants. In addition, the study indicated that annual loadings of chemical oxygen demand (COD) are comparable in magnitude to effluent from secondary sewage treatment plants. When analyzing annual loadings associated with urban runoff, it is important to recognize that discharges of urban runoff are highly intermittent, and that the short-term loadings associated with individual events will be high and may have shockloading effects on receiving water, such as low dissolved oxygen levels. NURP data also showed that fecal coliform counts in urban runoff are typically in the tens to hundreds of thousands per 100 ml of runoff during warm weather conditions, although the study suggested that fecal coliform may not be the most appropriate indicator organism for identifying potential health risks in storm water runoff. Although NURP did not evaluate oil and grease, other studies have demonstrated that urban runoff is an extremely important source of oil pollution to receiving waters, with hydrocarbon levels in urban runoff typically being reported at a range of 2 to 15 mg/l. These hydrocarbons tend to accumulate in bottom sediments where they may persist for long periods of time and exert adverse impacts on benthic organisms.

A portion of the NURP study involved monitoring 120 priority pollutants in storm water discharges from lands used for residential, commercial and light industrial activities. Seventy-seven priority pollutants were detected in samples of storm water discharges from residential, commercial and light industrial lands taken during the NURP study, including 14 inorganic and 63 organic pollutants. Table A-1 shows the priority pollutants which were detected in at least ten percent of the discharge samples which were sampled for priority pollutants.

TABLE A-1.— PRIORITY POLLUTANTS DETECTED IN AT LEAST 10% OF NURP SAMPLES

[In percent]	
	Frequency of detection
Metals and inorganics:	
Antimony.....	13
Arsenic.....	52
Beryllium.....	12
Cadmium.....	48
Chromium.....	58
Copper.....	91
Cyanides.....	23
Lead.....	94
Nickel.....	43
Selenium.....	11
Zinc.....	94
Pesticides:	
Alpha-hexachlorocyclohexane.....	20
Alpha-endosulfan.....	19
Chlordane.....	17
Lindane.....	15
Halogenated aliphatics:	
Methane, dichloro.....	11
Phenols and cresols:	
Phenol.....	14
Phenol, pentachloro.....	19
Phenol, 4-nitro.....	10
Phthalate esters:	
Phthalate, bis(2-ethylhexyl).....	22
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons:	
Chrysene.....	10
Fluoranthene.....	16
Phenanthrene.....	12
Pyrene.....	15

The NURP data also showed a significant number of these samples exceeded various EPA freshwater water quality criteria.

The NURP study provides insight on what can be considered background levels of pollutants for urban runoff, as the study focused primarily on monitoring runoff from residential, commercial and light industrial areas. However, NURP concluded that the quality of urban runoff can be adversely impacted by several sources of pollutants that were not directly evaluated in the study and are generally not reflected in the NURP data, including illicit connections, construction site runoff, industrial site runoff and illegal dumping.

Other studies have shown that many storm sewers contain illicit discharges of non-storm water and that large amounts of wastes, particularly used oils, are improperly disposed in storm sewers. Removal of these discharges present opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of storm water discharges. Storm water discharges from industrial facilities may contain toxics and conventional pollutants when material management practices allow exposure to storm water, in addition to wastes from illicit connections and improperly disposed wastes.

In some municipalities, illicit connections of sanitary, commercial and industrial discharges to storm sewer systems have had a significant impact on the water quality of receiving waters. Although the NURP study did not emphasize the identification of illicit connections to storm sewers (other than to assure that monitoring sites used in the study were free from sanitary sewage contamination), the study concluded that illicit connections can result in high bacterial counts and dangers to public health. The study also noted that removing such discharges presented opportunities for dramatic improvements in the quality of urban storm water discharges.

Studies have shown that illicit connections to storm sewers can create severe, wide-spread contamination problems. For example, the Huron River Pollution Abatement Program inspected 660 businesses, homes and other buildings located in Washtenaw County, Michigan and identified 14% of the buildings as having improper storm drain connections. Illicit discharges were detected at a higher rate of 60% for automobile related businesses, including service stations, automobile dealerships, car washes, body shops and light industrial facilities. While some of the problems discovered in this study were the result of improper plumbing or illegal connections, a majority were approved connections at the time they were built.

Intensive construction activities may result in severe localized impacts on water quality because of high unit loads of pollutants, primarily sediments. Construction sites can also generate other pollutants such as phosphorus and nitrogen from fertilizer, pesticides, petroleum products, construction chemicals and solid wastes. These materials can be toxic to aquatic organisms and degrade water for drinking and water-contact recreation. Sediment loadings rates from construction sites are typically 10 to 20 times that of agricultural lands, with runoff rates as high as 100 times that of agricultural lands, and typically 1,000 to 2,000 times that of forest lands. Even a small amount of construction may have a significant negative impact on water quality in localized areas. Over a short period of time, construction sites can contribute more sediment to streams than was previously deposited over several decades.

II. Water Quality Act of 1987

The WQA contains three provisions which specifically address storm water discharges. The central WQA provision governing storm water discharges is section 405, which adds section 402(p) to

the CWA. Section 402(p)(1) provides that EPA or NPDES States cannot require a permit for certain storm water discharges until October 1, 1992, except: for storm water discharges listed under section 402(p)(2). Section 402(p)(2) lists five types of storm water discharges which are required to obtain a permit prior to October 1, 1992:

(A) A discharge with respect to which a permit has been issued prior to February 4, 1987;

(B) A discharge associated with industrial activity;

(C) A discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 250,000 or more;

(D) A discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 100,000 or more, but less than 250,000; or

(E) A discharge for which the Administrator or the State, as the case may be, determines that the storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to the waters of the United States.

Section 402(p)(4)(A) requires EPA to promulgate final regulations governing storm water permit application requirements for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and discharges from large municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of 250,000 or more), "no later than two years" after the date of enactment (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1989). Section 402(p)(4)(B) also requires EPA to promulgate final regulations governing storm water permit application requirements for discharges from medium municipal separate storm sewer systems (systems serving a population of 100,000 or more but less than 250,000) "no later than four years" after enactment (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1991).

In addition, section 402(p)(4) provides that permit applications for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and discharges from large municipal separate storm sewer systems "shall be filed no later than three years" after the date of enactment of the WQA (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1990). Permit applications for discharges from medium municipal systems must be filed "no later than five years" after enactment (*i.e.*, no later than February 4, 1992).

The WQA clarified and amended the requirements for permits for storm water discharges in the new CWA section 402(p)(3). The Act clarified that permits for discharges associated with industrial activity must meet all of the applicable provisions of section 402 and section 301

including technology and water quality based standards. However, the new Act makes significant changes to the permit standards for discharges from municipal storm sewers. Section 402(p)(3)(B) provides that permits for such discharges:

- (i) May be issued on a system- or jurisdiction-wide basis;
- (ii) Shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers; and
- (iii) Shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, 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.

These changes are discussed in more detail later in today's rule.

The EPA, in consultation with the States, is required to conduct two studies on storm water discharges that are in the class of discharges for which EPA and NPDES States cannot require permits prior to October 1, 1992. The first study will identify those storm water discharges or classes of storm water discharges for which permits are not required prior to October 1, 1992, and determine, to the maximum extent practicable, the nature and extent of pollutants in such discharges. The second study is for the purpose of establishing procedures and methods to control storm water discharges to the extent necessary to mitigate impacts on water quality. Based on the two studies the EPA, in consultation with State and local officials, is required to issue regulations no later than October 1, 1992, which designate additional storm water discharges to be regulated to protect water quality and establish a comprehensive program to regulate such designated sources. This program must, at a minimum, (A) Establish priorities, (B) establish requirements for State storm water management programs, and (C) establish expeditious deadlines. The program may include performance standards, guidelines, guidance, and management practices and treatment requirements, as appropriate.

Section 401 of the WQA amends section 402(1)(2) of the CWA to provide that the EPA shall not require a permit for discharges of storm water runoff from mining operations or oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations or transmission facilities if the storm water discharge is not contaminated by contact with, or does not come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or

waste product located on the site of such operations.

Section 503 of the WQA amends section 502(14) of the CWA to exclude agricultural storm water discharges from the definition of point source.

III. Remand of 1984 Regulations

On December 4, 1987, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated 40 CFR 122.26, (as promulgated on September 26, 1984, 49 FR 37998, September 26, 1984), and remanded the regulations to EPA for further rulemaking (*NRDC v. EPA*, No. 80-1607). EPA had requested the remand because of significant changes made by the storm water provisions of the WQA. The effect of the decision was to invalidate the storm water discharge regulations then found at § 122.26.

Storm water discharges which had been issued an NPDES permit prior to February 4, 1987, were not affected by the Court remand or the February 12, 1988, rule implementing the court order (53 FR 4157). (See section 402(p)(2)(A) of the CWA.) Similarly, the remand did not affect the authority of EPA or an NPDES State to require a permit for any storm water discharge (except an agricultural storm water discharge) designated under section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA. The notice of the remand clarified that such designated discharges meet the regulatory definition of point source found at 40 CFR 122.2 and that EPA or an NPDES State can rely on the statutory authority and require the filing of an application (Form 1 and Form 2C) for an NPDES permit with respect to such discharges on a case-by-case basis.

IV. Codification Rule and Case-by-Case Designations

Codification Rule

On January 4, 1989, (54 FR 255), EPA published a final rule which codified numerous provisions of the WQA into EPA regulations. The codification rule included several provisions dealing with storm water discharges. The codification rule promulgated the language found at section 402(p)(1) and (2) of the amended Clean Water Act at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1). In addition, the codification rule promulgated the language of Section 503 of the WQA which exempted agricultural storm water discharges from the definition of point source at 40 CFR 122.2, and section 401 of the WQA addressing uncontaminated storm water discharges from mining or oil and gas operations at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(2).

EPA also codified the statutory authority of section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA for the Administrator or the State

Director, as the case may be, to designate storm water discharges for a permit on a case-by-case basis at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1)(v).

Case by Case Designations

Section 402(p)(2)(E) of the CWA authorizes case-by-case designations of storm water discharges for immediate permitting if the Administrator or the State Director determines that the storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

In determining that a storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States for the purpose of a designation under section 402(p)(2)(E), the legislative history for the provision provides that "EPA or the State should use any available water quality or sampling data to determine whether the latter two criteria (contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States) are met, and should require additional sampling as necessary to determine whether or not these criteria are met." Conference Report, *Cong. Rec.* S16443 (daily ed. October 16, 1986). In accordance with this legislative history, today's rule promulgates permit application requirements for certain storm water discharges, including discharges designated on a case-by-case basis. EPA will consider a number of factors when determining whether a storm water discharge is a significant contributor of pollution to the waters of the United States. These factors include: the location of the discharge with respect to waters of the United States; the size of the discharge; the quantity and nature of the pollutants reaching waters of the United States; and any other relevant factors. Today's rule incorporates these factors at 40 CFR 122.26(a)(1)(v).

Under today's rule, case-by-case designations are made under regulatory procedures found at 40 CFR 124.52. The procedures at 40 CFR 124.52 require that whenever the Director decides that an individual permit is required, the Director shall notify the discharger in writing that the discharge requires a permit and the reasons for the decision. In addition, an application form is sent with the notice. Section 124.52 provides a 60 day period from the date of notice for submitting a permit application. Although this 60 day period may be appropriate for many designated storm water discharges, site specific factors may dictate that the Director provide

additional time for submitting a permit application. For example, due to the complexities associated with designation of a municipal separate storm sewer system for a system- or jurisdiction-wide permit, the Director may provide the applicant with additional time to submit relevant information or may require that information be submitted in several phases.

V. Consent Decree of October 20, 1989

On April 20, 1989, EPA was served notice of intent to sue by Kathy Williams *et al.* because of the Agency's failure to promulgate final storm regulations on February 4, 1989, pursuant to Section 402(p)(4) of the CWA. A suit was filed by the same party on July 20, 1989, alleging the same cause of action, to wit: the Agency's failure to promulgate regulations under section 402(p)(4) of the CWA. On October 20, 1989, EPA entered into a consent decree with Kathy Williams *et al.*, wherein the Federal District Court, District of Oregon, Southern Division, decreed that the Agency promulgate final regulations for storm water discharges identified in sections 402(p)(2) (B) and (C) of the CWA no later than July 20, 1990. *Kathy Williams et al., v. William K. Reilly, Administrator, et al.*, No. 89-6265-E (D-Ore.) In July 1990, the consent decree was amended to provide for a promulgation date of October 31. Today's rule is promulgated in compliance with the terms of the consent decree as amended.

VI. Today's Final Rule and Response to Comments

A. Overview

Section 405 of the WQA alters the regulatory approach to control pollutants in storm water discharges by adopting a phased and tiered approach. The new provision phases in permit application requirements, permit issuance deadlines and compliance with permit conditions for different categories of storm water discharges. The approach is tiered in that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity must comply with sections 301 and 402 of the CWA (requiring control of the discharge of pollutants that utilize the Best Available Technology (BAT) and the Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) and where necessary, water quality-based controls), but permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems must require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent

practicable, and where necessary water quality-based controls, and must include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers. Furthermore, EPA in consultation with State and local officials must develop a comprehensive program to designate and regulate other storm water discharges to protect water quality.

This final regulation establishes requirements for the storm water permit application process. It also sets forth the required components of municipal storm water quality management plans, as well as a preliminary permitting strategy for industrial activities. In implementing these regulations, EPA and the States will strive to achieve environmental results in a cost effective manner by placing high priority on pollution prevention activities, and by targeting activities based on reducing risk from particularly harmful pollutants and/or from discharges to high value waters. EPA and the States will also work with applicants to avoid cross media transfers of storm water contaminants, especially through injection to shallow wells in the Class V Underground Injection Control Program.

In addition, EPA recognizes that problems associated with storm water, combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and infiltration and inflow (I&I) are all inter-related even though they are treated somewhat differently under the law. EPA believes that it is important to begin linking these programs and activities and, because of the potential cost to local governments, to investigate the use of innovative, non-traditional approaches to reducing or preventing contamination of storm water.

The application process for developing municipal storm water management plans provides an ideal opportunity between steps 1 and 2 for considering the full range of nontraditional, preventive approaches, including municipalities, public awareness/education programs, use of vegetation and/or land conservancy practices, alternative paving materials, creative ways to eliminate I&I and illegal hook-ups, and potentials for water reuse. EPA has already announced its plans to present an award for the best creative, cost effective approaches to storm water and CSOs beginning in 1991.

This rulemaking establishes permit application requirements for classes of storm water discharges that were specifically identified in section 402(p)(2). These priority storm water discharges include storm water discharges associated with industrial

activity and discharges from a municipal separate storm sewer serving a population of 100,000 or more.

This rulemaking was developed after careful consideration of 450 sets of comments, comprising over 3200 pages, that were received from a variety of industries, trade associations, municipalities, State and Federal Agencies, environmental groups, and private citizens. These comments were received during a 90-day comment period which extended from December 7, 1988, to March 7, 1989. EPA received several requests for an extension of the comment period from 30-days up to 90-days. Many arguments were advanced for an extension including: the extent and complexity of the proposal, the existence of other concurrent EPA proposals, and the need for technical evaluations of the proposal. EPA considered these comments as they were received, but declined to extend the comment period beyond 90 days. The standard comment period on proposals normally range from 30 to 60 days. In light of the statutory deadline of February 4, 1989, additional time for the comment period beyond what was already a substantially lengthened comment period would have been inappropriate. The number and extent of the comments received on this proposal indicated that interested parties had substantially adequate time to review and comment on the regulation. Furthermore, the public was invited to attend six public meetings in Washington DC, Chicago, Dallas, Oakland, Jacksonville, and Boston to present questions and comments. EPA is convinced that substantial and adequate public participation was sought and received by the Agency.

Numerous commenters have also requested that the rule be repropounded due to the extent of the proposal and the number of options and issues upon which the Agency requested comments. EPA has decided against a reproposal. The December 7, 1988, notice of proposed rulemaking was extremely detailed and thoroughly identified major issues in such a manner as to allow the public clear opportunities to comment. The comments that were received were extensive, and many provided valuable information and ideas that have been incorporated into the regulation. Accordingly, the Agency is confident it has produced a workable and rational approach to the initial regulation of storm water discharges and a regulation that reflects the experience and knowledge of the public as provided in the comments, and which was developed in accordance with the