NPDES PERMIT NO. NM0031216
FACT SHEET

FOR THE DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

APPLICANT

United States Air Force
377th Air Base Wing
2000 Wyoming Blvd
Kirtland AFB NM 87117

ISSUING OFFICE

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

PREPARED BY

Quang Nguyen
Environmental Engineer
NPDES Permits & Technical Branch (6WQ-PP)
Water Quality Protection Division
VOICE: 214-665-7238
FAX: 214-665-2191
EMAIL: nguyen.quang@epa.gov

DATE PREPARED

March 12, 2019

PERMIT ACTION

Proposed first-time issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Unless otherwise stated, citations to 40 CFR refer to promulgated regulations listed in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, revised as of March 13, 2003.

RECEIVING WATER – BASIN

Tijeras Arroyo - Rio Grande River

DOCUMENT ABBREVIATIONS

In the document that follows, various abbreviations are used. They are as follows:

4Q3	Lowest four-day average flow rate expected to occur once every three-years
BAT	Best available technology economically achievable
BCT	Best conventional pollutant control technology
BPT	Best practicable control technology currently available
BMP	Best management plan
BOD	Biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
BPJ	Best professional judgment
CBOD	Carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (five-day unless noted otherwise)
CD	Critical dilution
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
COE	United States Corp of Engineers
CWA	Clean Water Act
DMR	Discharge monitoring report
DO	Dissolved oxygen
ELG	Effluent limitation guidelines
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
mg/l	Milligrams per liter
ug/l	Micrograms per liter
lbs	Pounds
MG	Million gallons
MGD	Million gallons per day
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMIP	New Mexico NPDES Permit Implementation Procedures
NMWQS	New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Waters
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
MQL	Minimum quantification level
O&G	Oil and grease
POTW	Publically owned treatment works
RP	Reasonable potential
SS	Settleable solids
SIC	Standard industrial classification
s.u.	Standard units (for parameter pH)
SWQB	Surface Water Quality Bureau
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TRC	Total residual chlorine
TSS	Total suspended solids
UAA	Use attainability analysis
USGS	United States Geological Service
WLA	Waste Load allocation
WET	Whole effluent toxicity
WQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

I. CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS PERMIT

This is a first-time issuance.

II. APPLICANT LOCATION and ACTIVITY

Kirtland AFB, as described in the application, is located at 2000 Wyoming Blvd SE, Bernalillo County New Mexico. Under the SIC code 5629, the applicant operates a ground water treatment plant to address a dissolved phase ethylene dibromide plume that was caused by the fuel leak from the Bulk Fuels Facility at Kirtland Air Force Base. The plant is located off Ridgecrest Drive, Southeast (SE) on Kirtland AFB in the former Zia Park housing neighborhood. The plant consists of two treatment trains which include a particulate filter, and equalization tank, a catalyzed sand filter, two 20,000-pound granular activated carbon vessels that operate in series and a second equalization tank and a particulate filter. The plant is designed to treat up to 800 gallons per minute of non-hazardous, contaminated groundwater.

Current facility's deposition methods for the treated water, the facility is using treated effluent for golf course irrigation during warmer months or returning to the regional aquifer under a Class V Underground Injection Control permit. Third option, as a backup option, in the event of the infrastructure failures at the golf course and/or at the injection wells, the permittee is proposing to discharge treated effluent to Tijeras Arroyo (Rio Grande to Four Hills Bridge) Segment 20.6.4.98 that flows into Rio Grande River. The discharge outfall is located at Latitude 35º 1' 28.86" North, Longitude 106º 32' 55.32" West.

III. EFFLUENT CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1 lists submitted data in Form 2D and data collected in December 2016 and September 2017 for the new source:

Table 1:

Parameter	**Max** (mg/l unless noted)	**Avg.** (mg/l unless noted)
pH, standard units (su)	8.16	NA
Flow (gpm)	800	542
Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day ($CBOD_5$)	< 2	< 2
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	266	264
Iron	0.168	0.104
Manganese	0.024	0.008
Nitrogen (NO_3 -NO_2)	0.58	0.52
Barium	0.10	0.0965
Zinc	0.015	0.015
Chromium	0.0021	0.0016
Selenium	0.0041	0.0041
Fluoride	0.33	0.31
Chloride	28.2	25.5
Sulfate	50.4	47.2
Mercury	0.0002	0.0002
Toxaphene	1 ug/L	1 ug/l
Heptachlor	0.04 ug/L	0.04 ug/L
Heptachlor epoxide	0.02 ug/L	0.02 ug/L

Parameter	**Max** (mg/l unless noted)	**Avg.** (mg/l unless noted)
Aldrin	0.2 ug/L	0.2 ug/L
Dieldrin	0.2 ug/L	0.2 ug/L
Beryllium	0.002	0.002
Sodium	45	33.5
Copper	0.0051	0.00355
Silver	0.005	0.005
Thallium	0.001	0.001
Arsenic	0.001	0.001
Gross Alpha	2.45 +/- 1.72 pCi/L	---
Gross Beta	2.47 +/- 0.394 pCi/L	---
Radium-226	0.259 +/- 0.293 pCi/L	---
Radium-228	0.793 +/- 0.48 pCi/L	---
Radon	89.4 +/- 30.3 pCi/L	---
Uranium	0.0018	0.00165
Surfactants	0.058	0.058

From that list, the pollutants in Table 1 were either tested above the minimum quantification levels (MQLs) or were tested at levels above EPA MQL and reported as being non-detect. When a pollutant was tested at a detection level that was greater than the EPA MQL then for screening purposes that pollutant was assumed to have a concentration at that detection level. For toxics that were tested at the minimum quantification level and reported as less than the MQL, those pollutants are not shown. Note that effluent data from the treatment facility is already available and was used in assessment of effects of the discharge on surface waters. Consistent with permitting procedures in the state, the operator will be required to submit a sample for all applicable pollutants typically required in NMED NPDES permit applications for industrial dischargers when the first discharge from Outfall 001 is sampled as soon as access to the site allows.

IV. REGULATORY AUTHORITY/PERMIT ACTION

In November 1972, Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act establishing the NPDES permit program to control water pollution. These amendments established technology-based or end-of-pipe control mechanisms and an interim goal to achieve “water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water”; more commonly known as the “swimmable, fishable” goal. Further amendments in 1977 of the CWA gave EPA the authority to implement pollution control programs such as setting wastewater standards for industry and established the basic structure for regulating pollutants discharges into the waters of the United States. In addition, it made it unlawful for any person to discharge any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters, unless a permit was obtained under its provisions. Regulations governing the NPDES permit program are generally found at 40 CFR §122 (program requirements & permit conditions), §124 (procedures for decision making), §125 (technology-based standards) and §136 (analytical procedures). Other parts of 40 CFR provide guidance for specific activities and may be used in this document as required.

The application was dated October 2, 2018. It is proposed that the permit be reissued for a 5-year term following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.46(a).

V. DRAFT PERMIT RATIONALE AND PROPOSED PERMIT CONDITIONS

A. OVERVIEW of TECHNOLOGY-BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

Regulations contained in 40 CFR §122.44 NPDES permit limits are developed that meet the more stringent of either technology-based effluent limitation guidelines, numerical and/or narrative water quality standard-based effluent limits.

Water quality-based effluent limitations are established in the proposed draft permit for pH.

B. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS/CONDITIONS

1. General Comments

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44 (a) require technology-based effluent limitations to be placed in NPDES permits based on ELGs where applicable, on BPJ in the absence of guidelines, or on a combination of the two. In the absence of promulgated guidelines for the discharge, permit conditions may be established using BPJ procedures. EPA establishes limitations based on the following technology-based controls: BPT, BCT, and BAT. These levels of treatment are:

BPT - The first level of technology-based standards generally based on the average of the best existing performance facilities within an industrial category or subcategory.

BCT - Technology-based standard for the discharge from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants, including BOD, TSS, *E. coli* bacteria, pH, and O&G.

BAT - The most appropriate means available on a national basis for controlling the direct discharge of toxic and non-conventional pollutants to navigable waters. BAT effluent limits represent the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category or subcategory.

2. Effluent Limitation Guidelines

There are no ELG's established at 40 CFR for this type of facility. Permit limits are proposed based on BPJ and consistent with treatment standards and ELG for other industries. Limits in the draft permit will be expressed in terms of daily maximum and monthly average concentrations, as allowed by 40 CFR 122.45(e) and (f). Concentration limits will be protective of the stream uses. The proposed limitations are the following: BOD (48 mg/L daily maximum and 26 mg/L monthly average), total suspended solids (33 mg/l daily maximum and 21 mg/l monthly average), and oil and grease (15 mg/L daily maximum and 8 mg/l monthly average). Because a discharge of treated effluent to surface waters occurs in the event of the infrastructure failures at the golf course and/or at the injection wells, it is not a continuous discharge. Mass limitations are not established in the draft permit.

Flow reporting requirements are established consistent with technology-based considerations. The EPA, also, requires the facility to monitor its flows to the on-base golf course and to the regional aquifer since discharging treated effluent to Tijeras Arroyo (Rio Grande to Four Hills Bridge) is a backup option.

C. WATER QUALITY BASED LIMITATIONS

1. General Comments

Water quality based requirements are necessary where effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits are necessary to maintain or achieve federal or state water quality limits. Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on Federal or State/Tribe WQS. Effluent limitations and/or conditions established in the draft permit are in compliance with applicable State/Tribal WQS and applicable State/Tribe water quality management plans to assure that surface WQS of the receiving waters are protected and maintained or attained.

2. Implementation

The NPDES permits contain technology-based effluent limitations reflecting the best controls available. Where these technology-based permit limits do not protect water quality or the designated uses, additional water quality-based effluent limitations and/or conditions are included in the NPDES permits. State/Tribe narrative and numerical water quality standards are used in conjunction with EPA criterion and other available toxicity information to determine the adequacy of technology-based permit limits and the need for additional water quality-based controls.

3. State Water Quality Standards

The general and specific stream standards are provided in NMWQS (20.6.4 NMAC approved on June 5, 2013). General criteria are applicable as specified in 20.6.4.13 NMAC. Human health-organism only criteria for toxic pollutants, as identified in Subsection J of 20.6.4.900 NMAC are applicable as specified in Subsection G of 20.6.4.11 NMAC (i.e., only human health criteria for persistent pollutants are applicable). The permittee is proposing to discharge to Tijeras Arroyo (Rio Grande to Four Hills Bridge) Segment 20.6.4.98. The designated uses of the receiving water are livestock watering, wildlife habitat, marginal warmwater aquatic life and primary contact. General criteria of 20.6.4.13 NMAC apply. All human health criteria of 20.6.4.900 (whether persistent or not) apply to 20.6.4.98 (see Subsection G of 20.6.4.11 NMAC).

4. Pueblo of Isleta Water Quality Standards

The Pueblo of Isleta has been approved to have treatment in the same manner as a state as contained in 40 CFR 131.8. The general and specific stream standards for the Pueblo of Isleta (PI) are provided in Surface Water Quality Standards (PIWQS) amended March 18, 2002, Tribal Resolution 02-064, approved by EPA on July 22, 2005. The designated uses of the Rio Grande, according to PIWQS, Section V.A, are warmwater fishery use, primary contact ceremonial use, primary contact recreational use, agricultural water supply use, industrial water supply use and wildlife usage.

The facility discharges the treated effluent into Tijeras Arroyo (Rio Grande to Four Hills Bridge) Segment 20.6.4.98, which has the 4Q3 of 0 cfs and the harmonic mean flow of 0 cfs obtained from USGS 08330600 Tijeras Arroyo near Albuquerque, NM. No mixing zone will be allowed. The discharge must meet end-of-pipe applicable criteria. Because the facility is expected to be an infrequent discharger; its effluent marginally gets to Rio Grande River; and the discharge point is approximately

thirteen-miles upstream of the Pueblo of Isleta boundary, the permit writer believes the facility is compliant with permit limitations and conditions protecting of NMWQS will not have a significant impact on the Pueblo of Isleta waters.

5. Permit Action - Water Quality-Based Limits

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR §122.44(d) require limits in addition to, or more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines (technology based). State or Tribal WQS that are more stringent than effluent limitation guidelines and the most stringent limitations are chosen as follows:

a. pH

Criteria for pH is listed in 20.6.4.900.H.(6) for primary contact and marginal warmwater aquatic life within the range of 6.6 su to 9.0 su. EPA proposes the pH limits of 6.6 to 9.0 su for Outfall 001.

b. TRC

The facility uses chlorine based-products to disinfect/maintenance. The EPA proposes TRC limit of 11 µg/l (for wildlife habitat; 20.6.4.900.G NMAC and warmwater fishery use; PIWQS Section IV.C) in the draft permit with once per week monitoring frequency when discharging occurs.

c. Toxics

The CWA in Section 301(b) requires that effluent limitations for point sources include any limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Federal regulations found at 40 CFR §122.44(d) state that if a discharge poses the reasonable potential (RP) to cause an in-stream excursion above a water quality criterion, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant.

Iron, Manganese, Nitrogen (NO3 -NO2), Barium, Zinc, Chromium, Selenium, Fluoride, Chloride, Sulfate, Gross Alpha, Gross Beta, Radium-226, Radium-228, Radon, Uranium, Surfactants, Sodium, and Copper were found to be above minimum MQL. Meanwhile, Mercury, Toxaphene, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide, Aldrin, Dieldrin, Beryllium, Silver, Thallium, and Arsenic were tested at levels above EPA MQL and reported as being non-detect. The EPA evaluated these data for reasonable potential (RP) to cause or contribute to State/Tribal WQS exceedances. If RP exists, the screen calculates the appropriate permit limit needed to be protective of such designated uses.

The data shown above was evaluated for Kirtland AFB which according to the NMIP allows no mixing zone; the discharge must meet end-of-pipe applicable criteria. The preliminary toxic analysis shows RPs exist for Toxaphene, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide, Aldrin, and Dieldrin. Because the permittee has not met the sufficient sensitive test requirement per 40 CFR 122.21(e)(3), EPA proposes facility to monitor for these parameters along with the following chemicals: Antimony (dissolved (D)), Mercury, Arsenic (D), Nickel (D), Selenium (D), Thallium (D), Zinc (D), 2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin), Benzo(a)pyrene, Chlordane, 4, 4’-DDT and derivatives, Tetrachloroethylene, Hexachlorobenzene, PCBs, and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) 3 per week in this draft permit. In addition, as the function of the treatment plant is to remove Ethylene dibromide, monitoring for that pollutant shall occur 3 per week to verify treatment is operating properly.

d. Salinity/Mineral Quality (Chlorides, and Sulfates)

The EPA conducted RP for both chlorides and sulfates as discharges may reach segment 20.6.4.105 of the Rio Grande. To determine if a pollutant has a reasonable potential to exceed a water quality criterion, the following calculation is performed with a steady-state mass balance model in the NMIP:

Instream concentration = $((FQ_a \times C_a) + (Q_e \times C_e \times 2.13)) \div (FQ_a + Q_e)$

Where:
C_e is the average effluent concentration, 28.2 mg/L and 50.4 mg/L (Chlorides and Sulfates, respectively)
C_a is the geometric mean ambient concentration upstream of discharger, 0 ug/L
Q_e is the effluent flow rate, 1.7856 cfs (1.152 MGD)
Q_a is the 4Q3 flow rate, 0 cfs
F is the fraction of stream allowed for mixing, 1.0

Parameter	**NMWQS;** 20.6.4.105, mg/L	**Effluent Conc.,** mg/L	**Ambient Conc.,** mg/L	**Calculated Instream Concentration,** mg/L	**RP Excursion**
Chlorides	250	28.2	0	60.066	No
Sulfates	500	50.4	0	107.35	No

The results of the RP analysis do not show any RP for both Chlorides and Sulfates pollutants. The draft permit will not establish limits for the protection water quality criteria based on this result.

D. MONITORING FREQUENCY FOR LIMITED PARAMETERS

Regulations require permits to establish monitoring requirements to yield data representative of the monitored activity, 40 CFR §122.48(b), and to assure compliance with permit limitations, 40 CFR §122.44(i)(1). Sample frequency is based on the March 15, 2012, NMIP.

When discharging occurs, monitoring frequencies for pH and Temperature are daily; for TSS and BOD are 3 per week, and for Chemical Oxygen Demand, TRC, Total Organic Carbon, and Ammonia (as N) are once per week with grab samples. Since there are no mass load limits, flow may be estimated, using sound analytical methods such as pump flow rate charts. Monitoring requirements for the following parameters shall be 3 per week. Grab samples shall be used for all pollutants. A reopener clause will allow the permits to be reopened and additional limitations placed in the permit if these results indicate that a reasonable potential exists to exceed applicable WQS. Those pollutants are: Antimony (dissolved (D)), Arsenic (D), Nickel (D), Selenium (D), Thallium (D), Zinc (D), Mercury (T), 4, 4'-DDT and derivatives, Toxaphene, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide, Aldrin, Dieldrin, 2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin), PCBs, Benzo(a)pyrene, Chlordane, Hexachlorobenzene, Ethylene dibromide, per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and Tetrachloroethylene.

E. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY

The State has established narrative criteria, which in part state that:

"...surface waters of the state shall be free of toxic pollutants from other than natural causes in amounts, concentrations or combinations that affect the propagation of fish or that are toxic to humans, livestock or other animals, fish or other aquatic organisms, wildlife using aquatic environments for habitation or aquatic organisms for food, or that will or can reasonably be expected to bioaccumulate in tissues of fish, shellfish and other aquatic organisms to levels that will impair the health of aquatic organisms or wildlife or result in unacceptable tastes, odors or health risks to human consumers of aquatic organisms...." (NM WQS Section 20.6.4.13.F.)

Procedures for implementing WET terms and conditions in NPDES permits are contained in the NMIP. Table 11 (page 42) of the NMIP outlines the type of WET testing for different types of discharge. Based on the nature of the discharge, an industrial facility, the design flow of 800 GPM (1.152 MGD), and the nature of the receiving water, intermittent or ephemeral with the critical dilution of 100%, the NMIP directs the WET test to be a 48-hour acute test using *Daphnia pulex*. During the period beginning the effective date of the permit and lasting through the expiration date of the permit, the permittee is authorized to discharge from Outfall 001 - the discharge to Tijeras Arroyo thence to Rio Grande River. Discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

The proposed permit requires five (5) dilutions in addition to the control (0% effluent) to be used in the toxicity tests based on a 0.75 dilution series. These additional effluent concentrations shall be 32%, 42%, 56%, 75%, and 100%. The low-flow effluent concentration (critical low-flow dilution) is defined as 100% effluent.

Discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing

WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (48-Hour Static Renewal) (*1)(*2)	**30-DAY AVG MINIMUM**	**48-HOUR MINIMUM**	**MEASUREMENT FREQUENCY**	**SAMPLE TYPE**
Daphnia pulex	Report	Report	Once/year (*3)	Grab

FOOTNOTE:
*1 When discharging occurs.
*2 Monitoring and reporting requirements begin on the effective date of this permit. See Part II, Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements for additional WET monitoring and reporting conditions.
*3 The test shall take place between November 1 and April 30. This permit does not establish requirements to automatically increase the WET testing frequency after a test failure, or to begin a toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) in the event of multiple failures. However, upon failure of any WET test, the permittee must report the results to EPA and NMED, Surface Water Quality Bureau, in writing, within 5 business days of notification of the test failure. EPA and NMED will review the test results and determine the appropriate action necessary, if any.

VI. 303(d) LIST/TMDL REQUIREMENTS

The receiving water segment Tijeras Arroyo (Rio Grande to Four Hills Bridge) is not on the 303(d) list. However, Tijeras Arroyo is a tributary to segment 20.6.4.105 NMAC Rio Grande (Isleta Pueblo boundary to Tijeras Arroyo) has been listed in 303(d) List. The receiving water is not supporting the uses of marginal warmwater aquatic life and primary contact. Causes are PCB in fish tissue, DO and E.

coli. The latest TMDL for E. coli was issued in 2010. TMDLs for other causes were scheduled for 2016 but are not issued yet. The information in the submitted permit application indicated no E coli and PCBs are presence in the effluent. The permit has a standard reopener clause that would allow the permit to be changed if at a later date, additional requirements on new or revised TMDLs are completed.

VII. ANTIDEGRADATION

The NMAC, Section 20.6.4.8 "Antidegradation Policy and Implementation Plan" sets forth the requirements to protect designated uses through implementation of the State water quality standards. The limitations and monitoring requirements set forth in the proposed permit are developed from the State water quality standards and are protective of those designated uses.

Furthermore, the policy sets forth the intent to protect the existing quality of those waters, whose quality exceeds their designated use. The permit requirements and the limits are protective of the assimilative capacity of the receiving water, which is protective of the designated uses of that water, NMAC Section 20.6.4.8.A.2.

VIII. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS

The January 17, 2019 clearance letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that no potential significant adverse impacts to biological resources are anticipated from the proposed project.

IX. HISTORICAL and ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS

The January 8, 2019 clearance letter from the State Historic Preservation Office indicates that no potential significant adverse impacts to archaeological, historical, architectural, or cultural resources are anticipated from the proposed project.

X. PERMIT REOPENER

The permit may be reopened and modified during the life of the permit if NMWQS are promulgated or revised. In addition, if the State develops a TMDL, this permit may be reopened to establish effluent limitations for the parameter(s) to be consistent with that TMDL. Modification of the permit is subject to the provisions of 40 CFR §124.5.

XI. VARIANCE REQUESTS

None

XII. CERTIFICATION

The permit is in the process of certification by the State Agency following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 124.53. A draft permit and draft public notice will be sent to the District Engineer of COE, to the Regional Director of FWS and to the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to the publication of that notice.

XIII. FINAL DETERMINATION

The public notice describes the procedures for the formulation of final determinations.

XIV. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

A. APPLICATION(s)

EPA Application Form 1and 2D dated October 2, 2018. Additional data submitted on January 18, 2019.

B. 40 CFR CITATIONS

Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, 136.

C. STATE OF NEW MEXICO REFERENCES

New Mexico State Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Water, 20.6.4 NMAC; WQCC effective March 2, 2017; EPA approved on August 11, 2017.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Report for the Middle Rio Grande Watershed, approved by EPA, June 30, 2010.

State of New Mexico 303(d) List for Assessed Stream and River Reaches, 2016-2018.

D. MISCELLANEOUS

“Pueblo of Isleta Water Quality Standards”, Amended March 18,2002, Tribal Resolution 02-064, and approved by EPA July 22, 2005.