

**A Petition by Amigos Bravos  
for a Determination that Storm Water Discharges  
in Los Alamos County  
Contribute to Water Quality Standards Violations  
and Require a Clean Water Act Permit**

June 30, 2014

Ron Curry, Regional Administrator  
EPA Region 6  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202  
gray.david@epa.gov

Dear Administrator Curry,

As the Regional Administrator of EPA Region 6, Amigos Bravos hereby petitions you for a determination, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 122.26(a)(9)(i)(D), that non-de minimis, currently non-NPDES permitted storm water discharges in Los Alamos County are contributing to violations of water quality standards in certain impaired waters throughout the area, and therefore require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit pursuant to Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act and/or designation as a municipal separate storm sewer system. *See* 33 U.S.C. §§ 1342(p)(2)(E), (p)(6); 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.26(a)(1)(v), (a)(9)(i)(D), (f)(2), (f)(4).

**I. Regulatory Framework**

In order to achieve the Clean Water Act's (CWA or the Act) fundamental goal of "restor[ing] and maintain[ing] the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters,"<sup>33</sup> U.S.C. § 1251(a), EPA and states delegated authority to administer the Act must establish minimum water quality standards. 33 U.S.C. § 1313; 40 C.F.R. § 131.2. These standards define "the water quality goals of a water body, or portion thereof, by designating the use or uses to be made of the water and by setting criteria necessary to protect the uses." 40 C.F.R. § 131.2. New Mexico has established, and EPA has approved, water quality standards pursuant to this requirement.

In order to ensure that such water quality standards will be achieved, no person may discharge any pollutant into waters of the United States from a point source without a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a), 1362(12)(A). NPDES permits must impose water quality-based effluent limitations, in addition to any applicable technology-based effluent limitations, when necessary to meet water quality standards. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b).

The Act defines "point source" as "any discernible, confined and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit . . . from which pollutants are or may

be discharged.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14). EPA’s Clean Water Act regulations further specify that “discharge of a pollutant” includes “additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channeled by man.” 40 C.F.R. § 122.2. Consequently, although storm water discharges are often characterized as “non-point” in nature, it is legally well settled that “[s]torm sewers are established point sources subject to NPDES permitting requirements.” *Environmental Defense Center v. EPA*, 344 F.3d 832, 841 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (citing *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Costle*, 568 F.2d 1369, 1379 (D.C. Cir. 1977)). As EPA has stated, “[f]or the purpose of [water quality] 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.” National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for Storm Water Discharges, 55 Fed. Reg. 47,990, 47,991 (Nov. 16, 1990).

Despite the fact that storm water runoff channeled through a conveyance is a point source subject to the Act’s permitting requirements, EPA did not actually regulate storm water through the NPDES program until Congress amended the statute in 1987 to explicitly require it, *see* 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), and EPA promulgated its Phase I and II regulations in 1990 and 1999, respectively.<sup>1</sup> As a result, the Clean Water Act now requires NPDES permits for discharges of industrial and municipal storm water. 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(2). While these are the only categories of storm water discharges called out for regulation in the text of the statute, Congress also created a catch-all provision directing EPA to require NPDES permits for any storm water discharge that the Administrator or the State director determines “contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.” 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(2)(E); 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(a)(1)(v).

This catch-all authority – known as EPA’s “residual designation authority” (RDA) – is a critical tool to ensure that problematic discharges of storm water do not go unregulated. In the preamble to its Phase II Storm water regulations, EPA described the need for this authority: “EPA believes . . . that individual instances of storm water discharge might warrant special regulatory attention, but do not fall neatly into a discrete, predetermined category. Today’s rule preserves the regulatory authority to subsequently address a source (or category of sources) of storm water discharges of concern on a localized or regional basis.”<sup>2</sup>

Citizens may petition EPA for designation of storm water sources for regulation under this authority. 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(f)(2) and (f)(4). In recent years, often acting in response to such petitions, EPA and delegated states have exercised this residual designation authority on multiple

---

<sup>1</sup> National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for Storm Water Discharges, 55 Fed. Reg. 47,990 (Nov. 16, 1990); National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Regulations for Revision of the Water Pollution Control Program Addressing Storm Water Discharges, 64 Fed. Reg. 68,722 (Dec. 8, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Regulations for Revision of the Water Pollution Control Program Addressing Storm Water Discharges, 64 Fed. Reg. at 68,781.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. EPA Region IX, Request for Designation of MS4 Discharges on the Island of Guam for NPDES Permit Application (February 11, 2010), available at <http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/pdfs/MS4GuamRequest.pdf>; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Regulations for Revision of the Water Pollution Control Program Addressing Storm Water Discharges, 64 Fed. Reg. at 68,781.

occasions.<sup>3</sup>

Once EPA has made a finding or determination that a category of discharges meets the statutory criterion of “contribut[ing] to a violation of a water quality standard,” it must designate that category for regulation, and those “operators shall be required to obtain a NPDES permit.” 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(a)(9)(i)(D). In other words, “the Agency’s residual designation authority is not optional.” *In re Storm water NPDES Petition*, 910 A.2d 824, 835-36 (Vt. 2006). As EPA has explained, “designation is appropriate as soon as the adverse impacts from storm water are recognized.” Letter from G. Tracy Mehan III, EPA Assistant Administrator, to Elizabeth McLain, Secretary, Vermont Agency of Natural Resources 2 (Sept. 16, 2003).<sup>4</sup>

EPA has not defined a threshold level of contribution to water quality standards violations that would suffice to make such a determination. However, the agency has advised delegated states that “it would be reasonable to require permits for discharges that contribute more than *de minimis* amounts of pollutants identified as the cause of impairment to a water body.” *Id.*

In New Mexico, EPA Region VI is the permitting agency. Thus, the Region would make a determination under 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(a)(9) whether a storm water discharge is contributing to a water quality standards violation or is a significant contributor of pollutants. Once you receive an RDA petition requesting that EPA exercise this authority, the Agency must make a final decision on the petition within 90 days. 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(f)(5).

In responding to similar petitions filed last year, EPA Regions I, III and IX have indicated that they considered five factors. We do not concede that these five factors are consistent with the relevant provisions of the Clean Water Act or EPA’s implementing regulations; however, they provide a useful framework for this analysis. The factors are:

1. Likelihood of exposure of pollutants to precipitation at sites in the categories identified in the petition;
2. Sufficiency of available data to evaluate the contribution of stormwater discharges to water quality impairment from the targeted categories of sites;
  - a. Data with respect to determining causes of impairment in receiving water quality;
  - b. Data available from establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads;

---

<sup>3</sup> U.S. EPA Region IX, Request for Designation of MS4 Discharges on the Island of Guam for NPDES Permit Coverage (Feb. 2011), available at <http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/npdes/pdf/guam/Guam-ms4-residual-designation-memo.pdf>; Vermont Agency of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Conservation, Final Designation Pursuant to the Clean Water Act for Designated Discharges to Bartlett, Centennial, Englesby, Morehouse and Potash Brooks (Nov. 2009), available at [http://www.vtwaterquality.org/stormwater/docs/swimpairedwatersheds/sw\\_rda\\_permit\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.vtwaterquality.org/stormwater/docs/swimpairedwatersheds/sw_rda_permit_FINAL.pdf); U.S. EPA Region I, Final Determination Under Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act—Long Creek (Oct. 2009), available at <http://www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/stormwater/assets/pdfs/LongCreekFinalResidualDesignation.pdf>; U.S. EPA Region I, Residual Designation Pursuant to Clean Water Act—Charles River (Nov. 2008), available at <http://www.epa.gov/region1/charles/pdfs/RODfinalNov12.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> All documents cited in this Petition and the attached Statement of Facts are provided in the Appendix, which is submitted as part of the Petition.

3. Whether other federal, state, or local programs adequately address the known stormwater discharge contribution to a violation of a water quality standard.<sup>5</sup>

Additional factors can be found in Addendum D to a Region VI document titled “FACT SHEET, August 29, 2003, Proposed Issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water General Permit for Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)” [hereinafter “Region VI Fact Sheet”]. The Region VI Fact Sheet details the results of an effort by EPA to determine the need for MS4 coverage within the region. The factors listed in Addendum D were used to decide which MS4s would be included in the general permit. The factors are:

- 1) Does the MS4 discharge storm water to sensitive waters?

“Sensitive waters” generally include public drinking water intakes and their designated protection areas; swimming beaches and waters in which swimming occurs; shellfish beds; state-designated Outstanding Resource Waters; National Marine Sanctuaries; waters within Federal, State and local parks; and waters containing threatened or endangered species and their habitat. Discharges of storm water to sole-source aquifers will be considered by EPA Region 6 on a case-by-case basis.

- 2) Is the MS4 a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States?

A municipal storm water discharge that has been identified as a “contributing source of pollutants” to a Clean Water Act section 303(d)-listed waterway will be considered a significant contributor of pollutants for purposes of designation decisions. A storm water discharger that is required to reduce loading through an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) analysis shall also be considered a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

- 3) Is the MS4 densely populated?

Population density is related to the level of human activity, and has been shown to be directly linked to total impervious land surfaces; impervious surfaces are directly related to pollutant loadings from storm water runoff. EPA is also taking into consideration whether or not the MS4 serves a larger seasonal or commuter population.

- 4) Has the MS4 experienced high population growth over the last 10 years?

---

<sup>5</sup> Enclosure to Letter from H. Curtis Spalding, Regional Administrator, EPA Region I, to Jeffrey Odefey, Christopher Kilian, and Jon Devine 4 (March 11, 2014); Enclosure to Letter from Shawn M. Garvin, Regional Administrator, EPA Region III, to Jeffrey Odefey, Director of Storm water Programs, American Rivers 6 (March 12, 2014); Enclosure to Letter from Jared Blumenfeld, Regional Administrator, EPA Region IX, to Jeffrey Odefey, Director of Storm water Programs, American Rivers 5 (March 12, 2014) [hereinafter “March 2014 Letters”].

High population growth or growth potential means the local residential population has grown by 10% or more, based upon the latest Census Bureau information. A discussion on selection of 10% as a high growth rate outside urbanized areas was included in the proposed Phase II regulations published January 9, 1998 (63 FR 1561).

5) Is the MS4 contiguously located to an Urbanized Area?

Jurisdictions that are directly adjacent to a U.S. Census Bureau-defined Urbanized Area will be considered to have potential impacts on a neighboring regulated municipality.

6) Is the MS4 physically interconnected to another MS4?

As required by 40 CFR 123.35 (b)(4), an MS4 located outside a UA that contributes substantially to the pollutant loadings of a physically interconnected MS4 already regulated under Phase II must be included in the program. To be “physically interconnected,” the MS4, including roads with drainage systems and municipal streets, is physically connected directly to a municipal separate storm sewer of another entity.

7) Is the storm water runoff from this MS4 effectively addressed by other water quality programs?

EPA will consider, on a case-by-case basis, whether the storm water runoff from a potentially designated MS4 is effectively addressed under other regulations or programs, such as the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments, the National Estuary Program under Clean Water Act section 320, and/or other non-point source programs. Information in support of this criterion should be provided directly to EPA Region 6 by the candidate MS4.

Region VI Fact Sheet at 51-3 (Addendum D). In the Fact Sheet EPA describes the analytical process it used: “water quality considerations and overall impacts of storm water discharges will be given more ‘weight’ than population characteristics in this decision-making process.” *Id.* at 53.

## **II. Factual Background**

A statement that summarizes the undisputed facts and some relevant documents is attached as Exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by reference. A summary of this statement is set forth below:

### **A. LAY OF THE LAND**

Los Alamos County is located in north-central New Mexico, approximately 60 miles north northeast of Albuquerque and 25 miles northwest of Santa Fe. Statement of Facts in Support of Amigos Bravos’ Petition at 1 (Paragraph 1) (Attached as “Exhibit A”) [hereinafter “Statement of

Facts”]. The main population center is called the Los Alamos Townsite. *Id.* (Paragraph 2). The other densely inhabited place in the County is the community of White Rock Canyon. *Id.* Los Alamos County is also home to the 36 square mile Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL or the Laboratory). *Id.* (Paragraph 4).

The Los Alamos Townsite and the urbanized areas of LANL sit on the Pajarito Plateau. *Id.* (Paragraph 5). The Pajarito Plateau consists of a series of finger-like mesas separated by deep east-to-west-oriented canyons cut by streams. *Id.* (Paragraph 6). Most Laboratory and community developments are confined to the mesa tops. *Id.* Urban landscapes at the Townsite and at LANL include parking lots, roads, and structures. *Id.* (Paragraph 7).

LANL property contains all or parts of seven primary watersheds that drain directly into the Rio Grande. *Id.* at 2 (Paragraph 11). Listed from north to south, these watersheds are: Los Alamos, Sandia, Mortandad, Pajarito, Water, Ancho, and Chaquehui Canyons. The Los Alamos Townsite and the urbanized areas of LANL drain into five canyons: Los Alamos, Pueblo, Sandia, Bayo and Mortandad Canyons. *Id.*

## B. WATER IMPAIRMENT

The Statement of Facts provides a detailed discussion of urban-related surface water pollution downgradient from LANL and the Los Alamos Townsite.

### 1. **Several Canyons are Impacted by Runoff Pollution**

Los Alamos Canyon within LANL property is impaired for gross alpha (a measurement of overall radioactivity), PCBs, aluminum, copper, mercury, and zinc. *Id.* (Paragraph 16). New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) data show levels of PCBs in Los Alamos Canyon downgradient from most of the urbanized areas at LANL to be over 11,000 times greater than the New Mexico Human Health water quality criteria and 51 times greater than the New Mexico Wildlife Habitat water quality criteria. *Id.* at 3 (Paragraph 18).

Sandia Canyon is impaired for PCBs, aluminum, copper, gross alpha, and mercury. *Id.* (Paragraph 19). Post-development erosion and sedimentation are listed as sources of impairment in the 2012-2014 State of New Mexico Clean Water Act 303b/305b 2014 Integrated Report [hereinafter “303b/305b Report”]. Statement of Facts at 3 (Paragraph 19). NMED data show levels of PCBs in Sandia Canyon below much of the urbanized areas at LANL to be over 14,000 times greater than the New Mexico Human Health water quality criteria and 66 times greater than the New Mexico Wildlife Habitat water quality criteria. *Id.* (Paragraph 20). In a 2013 request to EPA for alternative compliance with its Clean Water Act discharge permit, LANL explains that copper, zinc, and PCB storm water pollution above New Mexico water quality standards was from urban storm water sources. *Id.* at 7 (Paragraph 56).

Mortandad Canyon is impaired for aluminum, copper and gross alpha. *Id.* at 2 (Paragraph 15). Impervious surface/parking lot runoff, post-development erosion and sedimentation, and watershed runoff following forest fire are listed as sources of impairment in the 303b/305b Report. *Id.*

Pajarito Canyon is impaired for gross alpha, aluminum, PCBs, and copper. *Id.* at 3 (Paragraph 21). Post-development erosion and watershed runoff following forest fire are listed as sources of impairment in the 303b/305b Report. *Id.*

Pueblo Canyon is impaired for gross alpha, PCBs, aluminum, copper, and zinc. *Id.* at 2 (Paragraph 13). Industrial/commercial site storm water discharge, post-development erosion and sedimentation are listed as sources of impairment by the NMED in the 303b/305b Report. *Id.* NMED data show levels of PCBs in Pueblo Canyon right in the middle of the Los Alamos urbanized areas to be over 3,500 times greater than the New Mexico Human Health water quality criteria and 16 times greater than the New Mexico Wildlife Habitat water quality criteria. *Id.* (Paragraph 14).

## **2. Urban Runoff is the Cause**

The data and studies summarized in the Statement of Facts firmly link the water quality impairment downgradient from the Pajarito Plateau to storm water runoff from urban areas.

LANL conducted two detailed studies of storm water runoff from the Pajarito Plateau. One study focused on PCB contamination and the second focused on metals contamination. In these studies LANL collected samples from non-urban, non-laboratory influenced reference sites as well as from sites representing runoff from the urbanized areas of the Los Alamos Townsite. Neither the reference nor the urban sites were influenced by point source discharges from LANL's individual storm water permit. These studies show a significant contribution of both PCBs and metals from urban runoff on the Pajarito Plateau.

The LANL PCB study found 40 of the 41 Los Alamos urban storm water samples were above the New Mexico human health water quality criteria for PCBs and 19 of the 41 Los Alamos urban storm water samples were above the New Mexico wildlife habitat water quality criteria for PCBs. *Id.* at 4 (Paragraphs 33-34). The LANL report concluded that suspended PCBs carried by urban runoff from the Los Alamos Townsite were 10 to 200 times more enriched with PCBs than at non-urban influenced Pajarito Plateau sites. *Id.* at 5 (Paragraph 36).

In 2007 the NMED collected storm water samples from urban sites containing PCBs as high as 255 times the state's PCB human health water quality criteria. *Id.* at 8 (Paragraph 64). NMED sampling data in 2006 and 2007 show levels of PCBs in storm water draining off of urban areas in Los Alamos Townsite to be more than 34,000 times greater than the NM Human Health water quality criteria. *Id.* (Paragraph 65).

A Laboratory study of metals contamination in storm water runoff from urban areas at LANL and the Los Alamos Townsite found exceedances of New Mexico water quality criteria for cadmium, copper, and zinc. *Id.* at 6 (Paragraphs 43-50). In addition, the LANL metals report demonstrated that values for copper, zinc and nickel in urban storm water runoff in Los Alamos County substantially exceeded non-urban influenced Pajarito Plateau storm water concentrations. *Id.* at 6-7 (Paragraphs 49-51).

As noted above, in its 303b/305b Report the State of New Mexico found that water quality in Sandia, Mortandad, Pajarito, and Pueblo Canyons is impaired because of urban-related causes such as impervious surfaces, parking lots, construction and development. *Id.* at 2-3 (Paragraphs 13, 15, 19, 21). NMED data also shows substantial water quality impairment in Los Alamos Canyon downgradient from most of the urbanized areas at LANL. *Id.* at 8 (Paragraph 64).

The LANL studies of PCB and metal contaminated runoff tie these contaminants to the urban areas of the Pajarito Plateau. In LANL's 2013 request to EPA for alternative compliance with its Clean Water Act discharge permit, the Laboratory argues that the cause of its exceedances of New Mexico water quality criteria for zinc and copper is urban runoff from sources such as motor oil accumulation on parking lots, brake pad and tire material released on pavement, galvanized fencing, culverts and other building materials. *Id.* at 5 (Paragraphs 38-41).

### III. Analysis

Los Alamos County and LANL have a storm water pollution problem. The NMED's 2006 and 2007 data shows dramatic exceedances of the state's PCB human health water quality criteria. The state's 303b/305b Report documents many more exceedances of standards – for a variety of pollutants and locations – and identifies storm water runoff as a major cause. LANL's own documents confirm these findings and identify urban runoff as the culprit.

#### A. EVALUATION FACTORS FROM MARCH 2014 LETTERS

The evaluation factors from the March 2104 Letters confirm that this Petition should be granted.

Factor one is the “[l]ikelihood of exposure of pollutants to precipitation at sites in the categories identified in the petition.” The 303b/305b Report and the LANL reports show that exceedances of state water quality criteria are associated with storm water; in other words, precipitation comes in contact with sites within Los Alamos County containing pollutants that end up in the storm water flow.

The Petition also meets the second factor, “sufficiency of available data to evaluate the contribution of stormwater discharges to water quality impairment from the targeted categories of sites.” The first sub-factor is the sufficiency of “[d]ata with respect to determining causes of impairment in receiving water quality.” The 2006/2007 NMED data, the 303b/305b Report, the LANL PCB and metals reports and the LANL requests for alternative compliance all provide data and/or analysis that support the Petition. The second sub-factor, the sufficiency of “[d]ata available from establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads,” is not relevant here as there are no TMDLs for the water-bodies at issue.

Finally, the third factor, “[w]hether other federal, state, or local programs adequately address the known stormwater discharge contribution to a violation of a water quality standard,” is also met. As noted above, there is no TMDL that addresses this storm water-borne pollution. Further, the individual permits for LANL and Los Alamos County do not cover storm water discharges from the urbanized features that generate the pollution. The LANL requests for

alternative compliance repeatedly state that there is no mechanism under the Laboratory's individual storm water permit to control the water quality exceedances found in their sampling because the pollution is caused by runoff from urban features.

EPA's Multi Sector General Permit (MSGP) provides no protection from the sources of pollution involved here. The MSGP applies to operators of storm water discharges associated with thirty different industrial activities, such as scrap recycling facilities, auto salvage yards, and steam electric generating facilities. However, the MSGP does not cover general urban storm water discharges such as the discharges from parking lots and roads that are causing the toxic runoff in Los Alamos County.

## B. FACTORS FROM REGION VI FACT SHEET

Application of the factors in the Region VI Fact Sheet also supports this petition.

Factor one is, “[d]oes the MS4 discharge storm water to sensitive waters?” Sub-factors identified by EPA include public drinking water intakes, swimming areas, federal and state parks and threatened or endangered species. Factor one is met for a variety of reasons.

Regarding intake for public drinking water systems, both Santa Fe's and Albuquerque's public water intakes are potentially affected. The runoff from Los Alamos is enough of a public health concern to the downstream City of Santa Fe that it shuts down its surface water diversion on the Rio Grande (the receiving water for runoff from Los Alamos County) used to supply drinking water when storm water flows from Los Alamos are predicted. Statement of Facts at 8-9 (Paragraph 66). Farther downstream, the City of Albuquerque draws fifty percent or more of its drinking water from a surface diversion on the Rio Grande. *Id.* at 9 (Paragraph 67). Consistent with this, the designated uses to be supported by New Mexico Water Quality Standards for the Rio Grande from the Cochiti Pueblo boundary to north of where runoff from Los Alamos' canyons enters the river include “primary contact” (that is, ingestion) and “public water supply.” *Id.* (Paragraph 68).

Regarding the sub-factor for swimming areas, the Rio Grande feeds Cochiti Lake, which is a very popular swimming location in the summer for residents of Albuquerque and others. *Id.* (Paragraph 69).

Regarding the sub-factor for federal and state parks, the Rio Grande is adjacent to Bandelier National Monument and makes up more than four miles of its eastern boundary. *Id.* (Paragraph 70).

Finally, although they are not threatened or endangered, the Rio Grande provides habitat for re-introduced river otters, which have been observed below the point where the Los Alamos canyons intersect the river. *Id.* (Paragraph 71).

Factor two is, “[i]s the MS4 a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States?” The Region VI Fact Sheet, in explaining this factor notes, “[a] municipal storm water discharge that has been identified as a ‘contributing source of pollutants’ to a Clean Water Act

section 303(d)-listed waterway will be considered a significant contributor of pollutants for purposes of designation decisions.” Region VI Fact Sheet at 52. The 303b/305b Report identifies storm water discharges from Los Alamos County as causes for the impairment to several water courses discharging into the Rio Grande. Further, the LANL PCB and metals reports as well as its request for alternative compliance confirm that exceedances of water quality standards are caused by storm water discharges from Los Alamos County.

Factor three, “**[i]s the MS4 densely populated?**” is met because Los Alamos has been designated as an “urban cluster,” based on the results of the 2010 census. 77 Fed. Reg. 18,651, 18,662 (Mar. 27, 2012). In addition Los Alamos Townsite meets the small MS4 definition as detailed in 40 CFR 122.32 in that it has a population greater than 10,000 and a population density of greater than 1,000 per square mile. Statement of Facts at 1 (Paragraph 2). Adding to the density in Los Alamos County is its growing commuter population. As of the year 2000 the commuter population in the county was 8,673 and had grown steadily from 1980 through 2000. *Id.* (Paragraph 3). By 2010 the commuter population had grown to 9,072. *Id.*

Factor three, “**[h]as the MS4 experienced high population growth over the last 10?**” is not met based on permanent population but the commuter population has grown steadily, as noted above.

Factors five and six – whether contiguous to an urbanized area, and whether physically interconnected to another MS4 -- are not met. However, as the Region VI Fact Sheet explains at page 53: “water quality considerations and overall impacts of storm water discharges will be given more ‘weight’ than population characteristics in this decision-making process.”

Factor seven, “**Is the storm water runoff from this MS4 effectively addressed by other water quality programs?**” is the same as the third factor from the March 2014 Letters. This factor is met as noted above.

### C. THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED

Petitioner Amigos Bravos, and others, have repeatedly requested LANL and Los Alamos County to address this pollution and also requested that EPA Region VI mandate such efforts. MS4 coverage is required to address this pollution.

Based on the well-documented water quality impairment caused by urban runoff from Los Alamos County sites, Amigos Bravos requests that EPA require an individual NPDES permit (or permits)<sup>6</sup> for these discharges into municipal separate storm sewer systems. In the alternative, Amigos Bravos requests that EPA designate the systems through which these discharges travel

---

<sup>6</sup> Because of its existing monitoring infrastructure and baseline studies as well as the unique concerns associated with storm water flows mobilizing historic contamination from the Lab, Amigos Bravos believes LANL should have an individual MS4 permit with appropriate treatment and monitoring requirements. See Letter from Rachel Conn to William Honker (June 30, 2014) (copy provided in the Appendix). However, whatever form the permit takes -- whether general or individual – EPA has a responsibility to protect water quality by subjecting urban stormwater from the Los Alamos to Clean Water Act regulation.

as a municipal separate storm sewer system under the Act and add it to the general permit.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Petition has merit and should be granted.

Sincerely,

/s/ Rachel Conn

Rachel Conn  
Projects Director  
Amigos Bravos

Cc: William K. Honker  
Claudia V. Hosch  
Brent Larsen  
Nancy K. Stoner  
Michael H. Shapiro  
Sarah Holcomb, NMED