

Iowa Antidegradation Implementation Procedure



Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Water Resources Section

February 17, 2010

Table of Contents

Glossary.....	1
1. Purpose and Overview	3
1.1 Summary of Applicable Laws and Regulations on Antidegradation.....	3
1.2 Assigning Tier Protection Levels	4
1.3 Revising Tier Review Levels.....	6
2. Iowa’s Antidegradation Implementation Procedure.....	8
2.1 Relationship of Antidegradation to Beneficial Uses and Classifications.....	8
2.2 Determining the Appropriateness of Degradation	8
2.3 Determining Existing Water Quality	9
2.4 Temporary and Limited Degradation.....	9
3. Pollution Control Alternatives to Degradation.....	10
3.1 Identifying Non-Degrading and Less-Degrading Pollution Control Measures.....	10
3.2 Evaluating and Selecting Alternatives.....	10
3.3 Determining Social and Economic Importance of the Preferred Alternative.....	13
3.4 Summary of the Alternatives Analysis and Social and Economic Importance Process	14
4. Public and Interagency Participation in Antidegradation Reviews	15
4.1 Public Notification Requirements.....	15
4.2 Intergovernmental Coordination and Review	15
5. Antidegradation Review Decisions.....	16
6. Permit Considerations.....	17
6.1 General Permits	17
6.2 Individual Permits	18
6.3 §401 Certifications.....	18
6.4 Activities Covered by NPDES Storm Water Permits.....	18
6.5 CAFO Considerations	19
7. Monitoring, Assessment, & TMDL Considerations.....	21
Applicability to §305(b) Report and §303(d) List	21
8. Implementation of Controls for Nonpoint Pollution Sources	22
Appendix A - Antidegradation Review Flow Chart.....	A-1
Appendix B - Outstanding Iowa Waters.....	B-1
Appendix C - Outstanding National Resource Waters.....	C-1

Glossary

Alternatives Analysis: An evaluation of reasonable alternatives for regulated activities that might degrade water quality, including less-degrading alternatives, non-degrading alternatives, and no-discharge alternatives, such as treatment process changes, relocated discharge facilities, land application, reuse, and subsurface discharges.

Antidegradation: A regulatory policy and implementation procedure to protect existing uses of surface waters and to specify how DNR will determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether and to what extent, existing water quality may be lowered in a surface water.

Assimilative Capacity: The amount of contaminant load that can be discharged to a specific water body without exceeding the numeric water quality criteria associated with a pollutant of concern (POC). Assimilative capacity is used to define the ability of a water body to assimilate a discharged substance without impairing beneficial uses.

Beneficial Uses: All existing and designated uses on or in surface waters of the state.

Degradation: A decline in the chemical, physical, or biological conditions of a surface water as measured on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

Designated Use: A beneficial use assigned to a water of the state as shown in the Water Quality Standards - (IAC 567 - 61.3(1)).

Existing Use: Beneficial uses actually attained in a surface water on or after November 28, 1975, whether or not the uses are designated in the water quality standards.

Existing Water Quality: A characterization of selected pollutants of concern in a surface water as measured and expressed during a specified time period.

Less-Degrading Alternative: A reasonable alternative to a proposed discharge or change to an existing discharge that would result in less degradation to water quality than an alternative that protects existing uses.

Minimum Level of Pollution Control: Controls required to protect existing uses and to achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for the waters under evaluation.

“Necessary”: No reasonable alternative(s) exist to prevent degradation.

Non-Degrading Alternative: A reasonable alternative to a proposed or existing discharge that would not result in degradation of water quality as characterized by the existing water quality assessment.

Outstanding Iowa Water (OIW): A surface water that DNR has classified as an outstanding state resource water in the water quality standards. An OIW receives Tier 2 ½ protection.

Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW): A surface water that DNR has classified as an outstanding national resource water in the water quality standards. An ONRW receives Tier 3 protection.

Pollutant of Concern: Pollutants of concern for antidegradation reviews include only those pollutants which are reasonably expected to be present in the discharge and may reasonably be expected to negatively affect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Regulated Activity: includes any activity that requires a permit or a water quality certification pursuant to the following federal laws: 1) CWA § 402 NPDES permits, 2) CWA § 404 dredge and fill permits, 3) any activity requiring a CWA § 401 certification.

Social and Economic Importance (SEI): The social and economic benefits to the community that will occur from any activity resulting in a new or expanded discharge.

Temporary and Limited Degradation: Degradation that is not permanent. The effects can be regarded as temporary and limited following a review of all of the following factors, if applicable:

1. length of time during which water quality will be lowered
2. percent change in ambient conditions
3. pollutants affected
4. likelihood for long term water quality benefits to the water body
5. degree to which achieving the applicable Water Quality Standards during the proposed activity will be at risk
6. potential for any residual long-term effects on existing uses

Tier 1 Review: Policies and procedures that prohibit degradation which results in the loss or impairment of a beneficial use or violation of water quality criteria and that prohibit degradation of existing water quality where pollutants of concern are at or violating applicable water quality standards. Tier 1 protection applies to all surface waters regardless of existing water quality as the minimum protection level.

Tier 2 Review: Policies and procedures that prohibit degradation of a surface water unless a review of reasonable alternatives and social and economic considerations justifies a lowering of water quality or the lowering of water quality is temporary and limited. Tier 2 protection level applies to all surface waters where existing water quality is better than applicable water quality standards as determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

Tier 2 ½ Review: Policies and procedures that prohibit any lowering of water quality in unique waters as identified in the water quality standards unless the lowering is temporary and limited, results from expansion of existing sources, or serves to maintain or enhance the value, quality, or use of the OIW, as determined by the Director of DNR on a case-by-case basis.

Tier 3 Review: Policies and procedures that prohibit any lowering of water quality in unique waters as identified in the water quality standards unless it is temporary and limited, as determined by the Director of DNR on a case-by-case basis. Any proposed activity that would result in a permanent new or expanded source of pollutants is prohibited.

Water Quality Criteria: Elements of water quality standards that are expressed as pollutant concentrations, levels, or narrative statements representing a water quality that supports a designated use.

1. Purpose and Overview

These procedures provide guidance to persons who are responsible for the regulated activities that may degrade water quality in Iowa. Regulated activities include any activity that requires a permit or a water quality certification pursuant to the following federal laws: 1) CWA § 402 NPDES permits, 2) CWA § 404 dredge and fill permits, 3) any activity requiring a CWA § 401 certification.

The following procedures implement Iowa's antidegradation rule found at 567 Iowa Administrative Code Chapter 61.2(2) and federal antidegradation policy at Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section §131.12. The Iowa Department of Natural Resources (department) is required by 40 CFR §131.12(a) to develop and adopt a statewide antidegradation policy and to identify procedures for implementing that policy. Implementation includes:

- identifying the antidegradation review levels (i.e., the "tiers") that apply to a surface water;
- assessing and determining water quality degradation;
- identifying and assessing less-degrading or non-degrading alternatives;
- determining the importance of economic or social development to justify degradation of waters; and
- establishing intergovernmental coordination and public participation processes.

1.1 Summary of Applicable Laws and Regulations on Antidegradation

Iowa Code sections 455B.171 - 455B.183 establish requirements for the protection and management of surface water quality. The Environmental Protection Commission, with the assistance of the department, promulgates administrative rules on water quality. Iowa's Water Quality Standards (WQS) are specified in 567 IAC Chapter 61 - Water Quality Standards. The specific portion of the regulation prescribing the policy on antidegradation is 567 IAC Chapter 61.2(2).

The antidegradation rule is one of three required regulatory elements of the WQS. The other two elements include the assignment of beneficial uses, and water quality criteria (narrative and numeric). All of these review elements must be administered as a whole. All surface waters of the state are subject to the antidegradation rules and these procedures.

The designated uses and the applicable water quality criteria can be found in 567 IAC Chapter 61. All waters of the state are subject to general criteria contained in 567 IAC Chapter 61.3(2). All waters listed in the Surface Water Classification have beneficial uses and are subject to the specific (i.e., numeric) water quality criteria contained in 567 IAC Chapter 61.3(3) - Table 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 3c and the Bacteria Criteria Table.

Beneficial uses may vary in a water body and may change at various locations. Most waters have more than one beneficial use. Where more than one use exists, or has been designated for a water body, the use with the most stringent water quality requirements must be maintained and protected.

An antidegradation review shall be performed for the entire segment (or multiple segments) of a water body that could be degraded by a new or expanded discharge. The review may extend into more than one designated segment depending on the pollutant load within the discharge and the distance to and assimilative capacity of waters down gradient of the discharge point. The review must extend down gradient as far as degradation could occur regardless of the classification status of the receiving waters. If the potential degradation is confined within a single segment, the review may be limited to only the portion of the segment to be affected.

Waters listed in appendices B & C of this document are considered outstanding and warrant special protection. These include the state's Outstanding Iowa Waters (OIW) and the Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRW). The degradation of water quality in an OIW or ONRW is prohibited except under specific circumstances described in Section 1.2.

All surface waters of the state are protected under at least one of four tiers of the antidegradation rule. Subsection 1.2 of this document describes these tiers and explains how the protection levels are assigned to each water. Subsection 1.3 of this document explains how the tier protection level may be revised.

1.2 Assigning Tier Protection Levels

The following four levels (or tiers) are designed to protect water quality from degradation in all surface waters of the state on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. Under this approach, surface water quality might degrade for one or more pollutants of concern but be unaffected by other pollutants. The tiers are specified in rule at 567 IAC Chapter 61.2. as follows:

61.2 Antidegradation policy. It is the policy of the state of Iowa that:

- a. *Tier 1 protection.* Existing surface water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses will be maintained and protected.
- b. *Tier 2 protection.* Where the quality of the waters exceeds levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water, that quality shall be maintained and protected unless the department finds, after full satisfaction of the intergovernmental coordination and public participation provisions, that allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located. In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the department shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully. Further, the department shall assure the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control before allowing any lowering of water quality.
- c. *Tier 2 ½ protection - Outstanding Iowa waters.* Where high quality waters constitute an outstanding state resource, such as waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance, that water quality shall be maintained and protected.
- d. *Tier 3 protection - Outstanding national resource waters.* Where high quality waters constitute an outstanding national resource, such as waters of National and State parks and wildlife refuges and waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance, that water quality shall be maintained and protected. Any proposed activity that would result in a permanent new or expanded source of pollutants in an Outstanding National Resource Water is prohibited.
- e. The four levels of protection provided by the antidegradation policy in subsections (a) through (d) of this section shall be implemented according to procedures hereby incorporated by reference and known as the "Iowa Antidegradation Implementation Procedure," effective (insert effective date). This document may be obtained on the Department's website at <http://www.iowadnr.com/water/standards/index.html>.

The protections created by this rule, in combination with the policies and procedures outlined in this document, can be comprehensively summarized as follows:

Tier 1

Applies to all surface waters as a minimum level of protection and requires that the level of water quality necessary for existing uses be maintained and protected. Tier 1 requires that the Water Quality Standards be achieved. Tier 1 review shall prohibit degradation that may cause or contribute to the impairment of a beneficial use or violation of water quality criteria. Tier 1 protection applies to all surface waters, regardless of the existing water quality.

Assigning Tier 1 Review

Prior to allowing any new or expanded discharges of a pollutant, a Tier 1 review must be conducted and demonstrate that the discharge would not result in the loss or impairment of a beneficial use or violate the water quality criterion for that pollutant. Those pollutants that are documented as already being at or violating Water Quality Standards will receive only a Tier 1 review.

Tier 2

Tier 2 protection applies on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis to all surface waters where existing water quality is better than applicable water quality standards as determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. Tier 2 protection does not apply to intermittent watercourses and those watercourses which typically flow only for short periods of time following precipitation and whose channels are normally above the water table. These waters do not support a viable aquatic community during low flow and do not maintain pooled conditions during periods of no flow. Tier 2 review shall prohibit the degradation of water quality of a surface water unless a review of reasonable alternatives and social and economic

considerations justifies the degradation in accordance with the procedures presented in this document.

Assigning Tier 2 Review

A Tier 2 review shall be conducted for new and expanding discharges to all surface waters of the state where existing water quality is better than applicable water quality standards as determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, unless one of the following conditions apply:

- the water is an OIW or ONRW to which Tier 2 ½ & Tier 3 protection applies or,
- existing water quality is worse than the applicable water quality criteria for the pollutants of concern.

Tier 2 ½

Policies and procedures that prohibit the degradation of water quality of the Outstanding Iowa Waters (OIWs) as identified in Appendix B. In general, degradation of OIWs from new sources is prohibited. Temporary and limited degradation of OIWs or degradation caused by the expansion of existing sources may be allowed by the department on a case-by-case basis as explained in Subsections 1.2 & 2.4 of this document.

Assigning Tier 2 ½ Review

The department may allow limited degradation of Outstanding Iowa Waters in three situations:

1. The degradation will be “temporary and limited” as defined in Section 2.4 of this document;
2. The applicant documents that less-degrading alternatives are not available, that effects on existing water quality be minimal, and that the project will, overall, serve to enhance the value, quality, or use of the OIW (For example, a new or expanded source of wastewater treatment effluent associated with a visitor center may be authorized where reasonable non-degrading or less degrading treatment alternatives to allowing a new or expanded source are not available as determined through the alternatives analysis as outlined in Section 3); or
3. The degradation is caused by the expansion of an existing source and the applicant has conducted an alternatives analysis, selected the least degrading alternative that is “affordable” within the meaning of Section 3.2 of this document, and demonstrated the socioeconomic importance of the project as described in Section 3.3 of this document after full opportunity for public comment. In all cases, current treatment levels for existing sources should be enhanced, where possible.

Decisions regarding whether to allow degradation in an OIW under these limited situations will be made on a case-by-case basis using appropriate techniques and best professional judgment of department staff.

Tier 3:

Policies and procedures that prohibit any degradation of water quality of Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRWs) as identified in Appendix C. Temporary and limited degradation of water receiving Tier 3 protection may be allowed by the department on a case-by-case basis as explained in Section 1.2 & 2.4 of this document. Any proposed activity that would result in a permanent new or expanded source of pollutants to an ONRW is prohibited.

Assigning Tier 3 Review

Degradation of water quality in an ONRW is prohibited except from short-term effects of temporary degradation as defined. Any proposed activity that would result in permanent new or expanded source of pollutants to any segment which has been classified as ONRW is prohibited. This prohibition applies to new sources, and expansion of existing sources that degrade water quality.

Temporary Lowering of Water Quality for Tier 2 ½ and Tier 3

Factors that may be considered in judging whether to allow temporary degradation of OIW & ONRW waters include:

- Percent change in ambient conditions predicted at the appropriate critical flow conditions;
- Percent change in loading (i.e. the new or expanded loading compared to total existing loading to the segment);
- Percent reduction in assimilative capacity;
- Nature, persistence, and potential effects of the parameter;
- Potential for cumulative effects; and
- Degree of confidence in the various components of any modeling technique utilized (e.g. degree of confidence associated with the predicted effluent variability).

Pollutant-by-Pollutant Basis

The level of protection afforded a water body determines the type of antidegradation review required when new or expanded discharges are proposed. Because the Tier 1 and 2 reviews are conducted on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, this document refers to these reviews as a review of a "pollutant" as opposed to a review of the overall quality of a "water body."

For example, where a perennial surface water is impaired for one or more pollutants, and where existing water quality for other parameters is better than water quality standards, the surface water will be afforded both Tier 1 and Tier 2 protection on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. That is, Tier 1 protection is afforded for the pollutants that are at or violating water quality standards and both Tier 1 and Tier 2 protection is afforded for pollutants for which water quality is better than the water quality standards. Tier 2 ½ & Tier 3 protection will be afforded for all pollutants of concern in Outstanding Iowa Waters (OIW) and Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRW). *Where waters have not been listed as impaired on the §303d list or as an OIW and ONRW, the presumed antidegradation protection level is Tier 2 for all pollutants of concern.*

Because Tier 1 and 2 reviews are conducted on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis as opposed to on a water body-by-water body approach, the allowance for degradation of water quality through a discharge of a pollutant depends on the existing level of that pollutant within the receiving water (i.e., the existing water quality), and the probability of promptly restoring the quality where pollutants levels are elevated. The pollutants of concern may be discharged to the water body if:

1. the activity would not cause or contribute to a violation of the WQS or the loss or impairment of a beneficial use;
2. all other applicable state and federal permitting requirements are met (e.g., technology-based requirements are met);
3. the permit is issued reflecting the highest statutory and regulatory requirements; and
4. all requirements of the antidegradation policy have been met.

In the absence of information on existing water quality, waters shall automatically receive Tier 2 review prior to allowing any additional pollutants of concern that might result in a degradation of the water quality. OIWs and ONRWs that shall always be afforded Tier 2 ½ & Tier 3 protection, respectively.

1.3 Revising Tier Review Levels

The default tier review will change from Tier 2 ½ or Tier 3 to Tier 2 if the water body is no longer categorized through rule making as an OIW or ONRW. The change in a review level of an OIW or ONRW will require an opportunity for public review as outlined in Section 6 of this document.

Any person may nominate a surface water to be afforded Tier 2 ½ or 3 level of protection by filing a nomination with the department. The department considers nominations during the triennial review of surface water quality standards. The nominating party is responsible for establishing the basis for classifying a surface water as an OIW or ONRW. The nomination shall include a map and description of the surface water; a statement in support of the nomination, including specific reference to the applicable criteria for Tier 2 ½ or 3 water classification; supporting evidence that the applicable criteria are met; and available, relevant water quality data for establishing existing water quality. The department may utilize its own data when reviewing any submitted nomination.

Using a weight of evidence approach, the department may classify a surface water as an OIW or ONRW based on a combination of the following criteria:

- Location of the surface water (e.g. on federal or state lands such as national parks or national wildlife refuges);
- The surface water has exceptional water quality as demonstrated by credible chemical data, the documented maintenance of pollutant intolerant species, or other data available to the department;
- The surface water is of exceptional ecological significance because of its unique attributes as demonstrated through detailed aquatic community assessments, population surveys, or other data available to the department;

- The surface water is of exceptional recreational significance because of its unique attributes as demonstrated by detailed information highlighting economic benefits, number of users relative to other similar waters, and exceptional water quality demonstrated by credible water quality data, or other data available to the department;
- The surface water supports threatened or endangered species or provides critical habitat for a state or federally threatened or endangered fish, mussel, or aquatic invertebrate species; and/or
- The surface water is highly aesthetic; has archeological, cultural, or scientific importance;
- or provides a special educational opportunity.

If the department determines that the classification of a surface water as an OIW and ONRW may be appropriate based upon the criteria described above, the department will then consider the following factors when making a decision whether to classify a nominated surface water as OIW or ONRW:

- Whether there is the ability to effectively manage the OIW or ONRW and its watershed to maintain and protect existing water quality;
- The social and economic impact that will result from Tier 2 ½ or 3 antidegradation protection;
- Public comments in support or opposition to the OIW or ONRW classification;
- The timing of the OIW or ONRW nomination relative to the triennial review of surface water quality standards;
- The consistency of an OIW or ONRW classification with applicable water quality management plans;
- Whether the nominated surface water is located within a national or state park, national monument, national recreation area, wilderness area, riparian conservation area, wildlife management area, area of critical environmental concern, or has another special use; and
- Any other factors the department considers relevant when making a decision whether to classify a nominated surface water as OIW or ONRW.

The criteria and factors listed above to classify and reach a decision for OIW and ONRW nominated waters are the same. However, the weight of each criteria and factor will be considered differently depending on which Tier (OIW or ONRW) the nomination specifies since the corresponding protection levels are different. In the case of an ONRW nomination, more information will be required in addition to the requirements listed above to demonstrate the water body's importance to the nation, not just Iowa. Comparison of ONRWs from across the country including highly detailed data for water quality, ecological significance, recreational significance, criteria used for ONRW categorization, and any other unique factor appropriate in demonstrating national significance must be submitted.

If the department concurs with the nomination of an OIW or ONRW, the department shall hold at least one public meeting in the local area of a nominated OIW or ONRW to solicit public comment. The nomination and all other information or input collected during the nomination and consideration process will be made part of the public record. Any changes to the list of OIW or ONRW waters need to proceed through the rule making process as prescribed in the Administrative Procedures Act.

2. Iowa's Antidegradation Implementation Procedure

This portion of the document outlines the procedure for determining whether or not degradation is allowed in surface waters of the state from regulated activities. The antidegradation review procedure is based on:

- the level of protection (i.e., Tier 1, 2, 2 ½, or 3) assigned to the pollutants of concern within the water receiving the discharge,
- the type of receiving water,
- existing water quality of the receiving water,
- the necessity of degradation, and
- the social and economic importance of the regulated activity.

All new or expanded regulated activities are subject to antidegradation review requirements. Regulated activities include any activity that requires a permit or a water quality certification pursuant to the following federal laws: 1) CWA § 402 NPDES permits, 2) CWA § 404 dredge and fill permits, 3) any activity requiring a CWA § 401 certification.

Tier 2 antidegradation reviews are required when proposed new or expanded activities will degrade water quality. In addition to reviewing the necessity for a regulated activity and the social and economic importance of the activity, the department and applicants must ensure that proposed activities fully protect beneficial uses, and achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements (such as application of appropriate federal effluent limitation guidelines for certain industries, secondary treatment standards for domestic wastewater and appropriate water quality based effluent limitations, where appropriate). The department must also assure that activities within the watershed are implementing cost-effective, reasonable best management practices to control nonpoint source pollution (see Section 8). Determinations issued under these provisions must be made in accordance with the public notification process described in Section 4 of this document. A decision diagram of the antidegradation review process is provided as **Appendix A** of this document.

2.1 Relationship of Antidegradation to Beneficial Uses and Classifications

This antidegradation implementation procedure applies to all surface waters of the state regardless of use designations or water classification. An antidegradation review must not result in the impairment of an existing or designated use.

Outstanding National Resource Waters and Outstanding Iowa Waters are antidegradation categories consistent with the implementation of the antidegradation policy in Chapter 61. These categories are separate and independent of designated and existing use provisions as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations.

2.2 Determining the Appropriateness of Degradation

To determine the required scope of an antidegradation review, the applicant shall first determine whether or not the regulated activity will result in degradation for a pollutant of concern. Pollutants of concern for antidegradation reviews include those pollutants which are reasonably expected to be present in the discharge and may be reasonably expected to negatively affect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Subject to the situations below, a regulated activity shall be considered to result in degradation if it authorizes a new or increased loading of any pollutant of concern.

A regulated activity shall not be considered to result in degradation, if:

- The proposed activity would neither result in a net increase in mass loading or an increase ambient water quality concentration for a pollutant of concern after mixing; or
- The activity is occurring within the design capacity of the treatment plant as specified in the existing construction permit; or
- The activity will result in only temporary and limited degradation of water quality as defined in the glossary and further described in Sections 1.2 and 2.4; or
- A permit for an existing facility proposes neither less stringent permit limits or increased treatment plant design capacity; or
- Additional treatment is added to an existing discharge and the facility retains their current permit limits and

- design capacity; or
- Treatment is added to a previously unpermitted discharge resulting in improvements to the receiving water, such as an unsewered community; or
- The department concludes that the proposed activity will not cause degradation based upon the specifics of any watershed-based trading that has been agreed to by the project applicant. NOTE: Because Iowa does not currently have a watershed-based trading program in place, the applicant might experience some permitting delays in pursuing this exemption unless the department is given significant advanced notice of the applicant's proposal; or
- The activity is a thermal discharge that has been approved through a Clean Water Act 316(a) demonstration.

If a determination is made that degradation will occur, or it is assumed, the department will determine from information provided by the discharger, obtained from the public, or available to the department from its own sources, whether or not the degradation is necessary to allow important economic and social development in the geographic areas in which the waters are located (See Section 3 of this document).

2.3 Determining Existing Water Quality

Existing water quality determinations will take place primarily during Tier 2 ½ and Tier 3 reviews to determine the percent change in ambient conditions that may result from potential degradation. The department encourages applicants conducting Tier 2 reviews to proceed directly into defining the “necessity” (i.e., performing the alternatives analysis) of the discharge under Section 3 of this document assuming (instead of demonstrating) that the proposed activity will result in any degradation for each of the pollutants of concern.

Any applicant considering a new or expanded activity to an OIW shall coordinate any planning effort to determine the existing water quality with the department. The department will provide the necessary guidelines and steps for an appropriate, scientifically defensible determination.

In general, existing water quality will be based upon existing assessments conducted under department monitoring and assessment programs. Existing water quality assessments will seek to gather information only on the pollutants reasonably expected to be in discharges.

The preferred approach for assessing existing water quality is to use previously collected data where available or use statewide default background levels established by the department. Where adequate data are not available, the second preferred approach is to collect water quality data. The third preferred approach for assessing existing water quality is to use appropriate reference data where it can be shown that the reference data is likely to reflect conditions in the water body in question. Sometimes more than one approach may be needed to characterize existing water quality for all pollutants of concern.

The department can advise the applicant on what approaches may be most appropriate to establish the existing water quality. If a data collection effort is chosen, the department can advise the applicant on what data are needed and can provide guidance on how to collect and report the needed information to the department.

2.4 Temporary and Limited Degradation

Activities resulting in temporary and limited degradation will receive a Tier 1 review. The department will determine if degradation from an activity is temporary and limited following a review of information provided by the applicant. The information provided by the applicant must include:

- a. length of time during which water quality will be lowered,
- b. percent change in ambient conditions,
- c. pollutants affected,
- d. likelihood for long-term water quality benefits to the water body (e.g., as may result from dredging of contaminated sediments),
- e. degree to which achieving the applicable Water Quality Standards during the proposed activity may be at risk, and
- f. potential for any residual long-term effects on existing uses.

3. Pollution Control Alternatives to Degradation

An applicant proposing any regulated activity that would degrade water quality is required to prepare an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed activity. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether or not the proposed degradation is “*necessary, that is, no reasonable alternative(s) exist to prevent degradation.*” These alternatives are compared (in terms of practicability, economic efficiency and affordability) to the controls required to protect existing uses and to achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements (i.e., the more stringent between the water quality-based effluent limits to protect an existing use and the applicable technology-based effluent limits).

Following the evaluation of pollution control alternatives, the least degrading alternative that is practicable, economically efficient, and affordable should be considered the preferred pollution control alternative. If this alternative results in degradation, the applicant must then document the social and economic importance (SEI) of the activity according to the guidelines in Section 3.3 of this document.

3.1 Identifying Non-Degrading and Less-Degrading Pollution Control Measures

For any proposed activity, there may be a number of pollution control measures that prevent or minimize water quality degradation. For activities likely to cause degradation, applicants must provide an analysis of non-degrading and less-degrading alternatives to the minimum level of pollution control. The minimum level of pollution control is the control required to protect existing uses and to achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements.

The applicant shall evaluate a range of non-degrading or less-degrading pollution control alternatives with the intent of identifying reliable, demonstrated processes or practices that can be reasonably expected to achieve greater pollution reduction. The following alternatives are examples that may be considered depending upon applicability:

- Land application
- Subsurface irrigation
- Waste transport
- Groundwater recharge
- Improvements in the collection system
- Recycling or reuse (i.e., closed loop system)
- Discharge to a regional wastewater collection and treatment system
- Improved operation and maintenance of existing treatment system
- Alternative discharge locations
- Installation of biological/physical/chemical treatment processes that provide higher levels of treatment
- Seasonal or controlled discharges to avoid critical water quality periods

If experimental or unproven methods are proposed, the department may request information on previous applications of the method, effectiveness, transferability (if applicable), costs and other information as appropriate. Applications containing proposals for new or experimental methods will be required to append information regarding demonstrated performance results. Such applications may be approved at the discretion of the department with the condition that if the proposed technology does not meet project pollutant control targets, the applicant must adopt conventional or other pollution control measures that meet state antidegradation requirements.

The department may require that the applicant evaluate additional alternatives if an appropriate range of alternatives was not evaluated. Department staff and the applicant should meet to discuss these and other issues early in the process. The applicant shall also document any less- degrading alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and provide a basis for the conclusion.

3.2 Evaluating and Selecting Alternatives

Following the evaluation of possible alternatives, the applicant must select the least degrading and reasonable alternative and provide the basis for its selection. A reasonable alternative is one that is practicable, economically efficient, and affordable. The applicant may bypass further evaluation of practicability, cost-effectiveness and affordability by selecting the least degrading alternative available.

Practicability

The practicability of alternatives is considered by evaluating the effectiveness, reliability, and potential impacts on the overall natural environment (i.e., land, air, water and energy use) resulting from implementation of the alternatives. Non-degrading and less-degrading alternatives shall be considered practicable unless an evaluation to the contrary is provided. The following are examples of the factors that may be evaluated during this process:

1. Effectiveness and Reliability
 - Certainty of achieving technology-based requirements and water quality criteria to protect existing uses
 - Technical feasibility of alternatives (e.g., feasibility of no-discharge options for large volumes of wastewater within dense urban areas)
 - System or technology reliability, potential for upsets/accidents
 - Nature of pollutants discharged
 - Discharge timing and duration
 - Need for low-flow augmentation
 - Dilution ratio for pollutants discharged
2. Potential Environmental Impacts
 - Sensitivity of stream uses
 - Sensitivity of groundwater uses in the area
 - Effect on endangered species
 - Potential to generate secondary water quality impacts (storm water, hydrology)
 - Secondary pollutants created by products of treatment

Review of these factors may be on a qualitative or quantitative basis, as appropriate. Other secondary environmental impacts should also be considered, such as the potential impact of alternatives on odor, noise, energy consumption, air emissions, solid waste and sludge generation. Other practicability factors that should be considered during the review include the technical, legal, and local considerations of the various alternatives examined. The schedule and the estimated time of completion of the project should also be provided for each alternative discussed.

Economic Efficiency

Alternatives that are deemed practicable must undergo a direct cost comparison and alternatives that impose a cost that is disproportionate to the possible environmental gain may be eliminated from further consideration. An analysis of pollution control costs, or economic efficiency, is appropriate when the applicant desires to optimize the balance between water quality benefits and project costs. General cost categories that should be considered include:

- Capital costs
- Annual operating and maintenance costs (including cost escalation)
- Other costs (one-time costs, savings, opportunity cost, salvage value)

Opportunity costs may be considered in the estimate of overall cost, as appropriate. For example, lost opportunity costs for lots in a proposed subdivision that would be used for land application rather than housing, or losses related to process changes that results in missed production runs are legitimate and may be considered if adequately documented.

In order to develop a standardized framework for projecting, evaluating, and comparing costs associated with various pollution control alternatives, applicants should use a present worth framework for reporting cost information. However, applicants may propose alternate economic demonstrations if appropriate. Alternative direct cost comparisons may be presented if the present worth calculation is complicated by the amount of difference in the effective design lives of the alternatives examined. The following calculation may be used to determine present worth:

$$P = C + O + [A \times P/A, d, n] - S$$

Where:

P = Present worth

C = Capital cost

O = Other costs (expressed as present worth)

A = Average annual operating cost (alternatively a gradient factor may be applied to account for cost escalation)

d = Discount rate n = Useful life

S = Salvage value of facilities and land (expressed as net worth)

$(P/A, d, n) = \text{Equal series present worth factor} = [(1 + d)^n - 1] / [d(1 + d)^n]$

The cost of each alternative is then compared to the base cost of pollution control. The base cost of pollution control is the cost of the controls required to protect existing uses and to achieve the highest statutory and regulatory requirements, i.e., the more stringent of water quality based effluent limits for existing use protection or technology-based effluent limits.

As a *non-binding guideline*, alternatives less than 115 percent of the base cost of the minimum level of pollution control are presumed to be economically efficient. Alternatives greater than 115 percent of the base costs should also be considered if implementation of the alternative would produce a substantial improvement in the resulting discharge. Conditions that might warrant consideration of alternatives of greater cost (above 115 percent) are the effectiveness, reliability, and environmental factors identified above. The base cost of the minimum level of pollution control is the cost of the controls required to protect beneficial uses and/or technology-based effluent limits, whichever is more expensive.

Applicants performing the direct cost comparison approach should evaluate the economic efficiency of the treatment options for each of the primary pollutants of concern related to the proposed discharge. For example, the primary pollutants of concern for domestic wastewater discharges include biochemical oxygen demand (influencing in-stream dissolved oxygen concentration), ammonia, bacteria, and other pollutants for which a waste load allocation can be reasonably determined. An applicant may need to evaluate the costs associated with one pollutant of concern if additional treatment process alternatives do not affect treatment for other pollutants of concern. An applicant can bypass the cost comparison step by choosing to implement the least degrading alternative for each pollutant of concern.

This quantitative water quality analysis is not needed when the receiving water quality is not a significant factor for a specific alternative (e.g., in-stream dissolved oxygen concentrations in relation to a no-discharge alternative). Since all alternatives analyses use qualitative and quantitative assessments of water quality benefits and treatment costs and feasibility, best professional judgment is of the utmost importance when evaluating alternatives.

Affordability

Following an analysis of practicability and economic efficiency, the affordability of the least degrading alternative may be assessed at the applicant's discretion. This assessment may be used to determine if the alternative is too expensive to reasonably implement. This approach results in the selection of the least degrading alternative, while maintaining affordability to the public or private entity. *Alternatives identified as most practicable and economically efficient are considered affordable if the applicant does not supply an affordability analysis.*

The determination of affordability for public and private entities is an emerging issue nationally. As such, federal guidance has not yet been finalized. Until such time, the applicant should use the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's water quality standards handbook - "*Interim Economic Guidance for Water Quality Standards*," EPA-823-B-95-002 (1995). This guidance document presents one set of public and private sector approaches. This interim guidance is not binding and may be replaced or supplemented with other methods of analysis, if sufficiently justified.

If the applicant determines that the least degrading remaining alternative is affordable, then it is the preferred alternative. If it is not affordable, then the affordability of the next alternative should be evaluated until an alternative is chosen that is practicable, economically efficient and affordable.

A demonstration that an alternative is not affordable should be clearly documented and should show that the alternative has a substantial adverse economic impact that would preclude the use of the alternative for the activity under review.

3.3 Determining Social and Economic Importance of the Preferred Alternative

If the preferred alternative identified will result in degradation to the receiving waters, then the applicant must demonstrate that the preferred alternative (or “project”) will allow important economic and social development. **Social and Economic Importance** is defined as the social and economic benefits to the community that will occur from any activity resulting in a new or expanded discharge. The applicant should use the following three steps to demonstrate the SEI:

- Identify the affected community
- Identify relevant factors that characterize the social and economic conditions of the affected community
- Describe the important social and economic development associated with the project

1. Identify the affected community:

The affected community is considered as the community in the geographical area in which the waters are located. The affected community should include those living near the site of the proposed project as well as those in the community that are expected to directly or indirectly benefit from the project.

2. Identify relevant factors that characterize the social and economic conditions of the affected community:

In order to describe the economic and social development associated with the proposed project, the applicant will first need to determine the social and economic factors that best characterize the affected community. Examples of social and economic factors include:

- Rate of employment
- Personal or household income
- Poverty level
- Population trends
- Increasing production
- Housing starts, median values, etc.
- Community tax base
- Available public services (e.g., fire department, school, infrastructure)
- Current or potential public health, safety or environmental problems

The social and economic measures identified above do not constitute a comprehensive list. Each situation and community is different and will require an analysis of unique social and economic factors. The applicant is encouraged to consider analyzing additional factors that characterize the specific community under consideration.

3. Describe the important social and economic development associated with the project:

Following the identification of appropriate social and economic measures, the applicant must describe the expected change in these factors that is associated with the project. The purpose of this step is to demonstrate whether or not important social and economic development will result from the project. The applicant should first describe the existing condition of the affected community. This base condition should then be compared to the predicted change (benefit or loss) in social and economic condition after the activity is allowed. The area’s use or dependence upon the water resource affected by the proposed discharge must be included in the analysis. In doing so, the applicant shall evaluate any associated environmental related benefits or costs, such as:

- Promoting/impacting fishing, recreation, tourism or other economic benefits for the community
- Reserving assimilative capacity for future industry and development

Upon the consideration of all relevant factors, the project constitutes important social and economic development if the applicant demonstrates that the project will lead to overall beneficial changes in the factors presented (i.e., increased jobs, employment, housing or other appropriate factors balanced against the benefits associated with maintaining a higher level of water quality). This determination will be made on a case-by-case basis using information provided with the application and/or obtained from the public.

When information available to the department is not sufficient to make a determination regarding the social and economic benefits or environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity, the department may request that the applicant submit additional information.

If the department determines, after appropriate discussions with the discharger, that the SEI of the proposed activity has not been demonstrated the department shall deny the proposed activity. This decision is part of the Administrative Record of Decisions regarding antidegradation.

3.4 Summary of the Alternatives Analysis and Social and Economic Importance Process

The preceding discussion describes the approach that shall be followed by the applicant for determining whether or not less- or non-degrading alternatives to the proposed activity will be required to prevent degradation of Iowa surface waters. The following steps summarize the alternatives analysis process and other relevant actions during antidegradation reviews for Tier 2 and Tier 2 ½ protection levels:

- If it is determined that degradation would likely occur due to the proposed activity, an analysis of less degrading and non-degrading alternatives to the proposed activity will be required.
- The applicant will be required to analyze cost information for minimum level of pollution control associated with the proposed activity, alternative pollution control measures that would result in no degradation, and for other less or non-degrading alternatives as appropriate.
- The applicant shall evaluate the proposed activity, the less and non-degrading alternatives, and the practicability, economic efficiency and affordability associated with each option or mix of options.
- The applicant shall identify the least degrading alternative - or mix of alternatives - that is practicable, economically efficient, and affordable as described in this section. This will be the preferred option.
- If the preferred option (i.e., pollution control alternative or mix of alternatives) will not result in degradation of the receiving water segment, permitting of the activity may proceed.
- If the preferred option (i.e., pollution control alternative or mix of alternatives) will result in degradation of the receiving water, the applicant will be required to conduct an analysis of economic and social benefits.

4. Public and Interagency Participation in Antidegradation Reviews

Public participation is a component of the antidegradation review process. Public notice of antidegradation review findings, solicitations of public comment and maintenance of antidegradation review documents as part of the public record help ensure that interested parties can be engaged and involved throughout the review process. In addition, intergovernmental coordination and review is required prior to any action that allows degradation of water quality in a surface water afforded Tier 2 and Tier 2 ½ protection.

This section outlines the public participation and the intergovernmental coordination and review requirements for applicants.

4.1 Public Notification Requirements

The applicant will provide public notice and opportunity for public comment on the alternatives analysis and the social and economic importance review.

Before the alternatives analysis is finalized, a public notice must be issued by the applicant. The public notice will include a notice of availability of:

- determination of projected impacts on existing water quality;
- findings and determinations from the alternatives analysis;
- the conclusions of any social and economic evaluation of the proposed activity, where necessary;
- a description of the surface water that is subject to the antidegradation review;
- the time frame for submitting comments; and
- the methods by which comments may be submitted and to whom comments must be directed.

The public notice must be circulated by the applicant within the geographical area of the proposed activity by posting the notice in the post office and other public places for at least 30 days and by publishing the notice at least one time in local newspapers and periodicals, or, if appropriate, in a newspaper of general circulation for the county where the activity will occur. The notice will identify the action being considered, list all beneficial uses identified for the surface water and call for comments from the public regarding the proposed activity. The applicant shall submit to the department a summary of public comments received and the applicant's responses at the time the applicant requests authorization for the activity under review.

A copy of the public notice outlined in Section 4.1 shall be sent to interested and potentially interested persons and other government agencies, including:

- EPA Region VII;
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service;
- the regional Iowa DNR Field Office;
- any applicable industrial contributor to the publicly owned treatment works;
- the county department of environmental health or comparable department in the county to which the facility discharges;
- any other state whose waters may be affected by the issuance of the permit; and
- any interested person or organization upon request.

4.2 Intergovernmental Coordination and Review

In conjunction with the public comment period, intergovernmental coordination is required by the applicant prior to approving a regulated activity that would degrade a surface water of the state. This requirement seeks to ensure that all relevant public entities at the local, state and federal levels are aware of any proposal to degrade water quality and are provided with an opportunity to review, seek additional information and comment on the proposal. The intergovernmental coordination and review process occurs prior to finalizing the alternatives analysis and social and economic importance review and may occur in tandem with public notice procedures outlined in the previous section. The time period for government agencies to submit comments will be the same as for public comments specified in section 4.1.

5. Antidegradation Review Decisions

Once the intergovernmental coordination and public notice requirements outlined above are satisfied, the applicant shall submit the alternatives analysis, the social and economic importance review, and the results of the public comment and intergovernmental review process to the department.

Regulated activities that may result in degradation of waters can only be approved after the department makes all of the following findings:

- The level of water quality necessary to protect applicable beneficial uses is fully maintained. Water quality shall not be degraded to a level that does not comply with the applicable Water Quality Standards (WQS).
- The highest statutory and regulatory requirements for new and existing point sources are achieved.
- All cost-effective and reasonable BMPs for nonpoint source pollution control are implemented (see Section 8).
- Allowing degradation of water quality is necessary and accommodates important economic or social development in the area where the surface water is located.

The department shall then make a final determination concerning the proposed activity. If the antidegradation review is accepted, implementation of the preferred alternative will be required in the permit. When information submitted to the department is not sufficient to approve the proposed activity, the department may request additional information.

All determinations, including determinations to deny the activity shall be documented by the department and made part of the Administrative Record of Decision. *Review documents, including existing water quality assessments, determination of degradation, analysis of public comments, alternatives analyses, demonstration of social and economic importance and any other decisions or findings, will be made available to the public.*

The applicant may appeal the department's final decision pursuant to IAC Chapter 561-7, as adopted by reference at 567 IAC 7.1.

To the extent Iowa's statutes allow, any information submitted pursuant to the "Iowa Antidegradation Implementation Procedure" or other rules of the Environmental Protection Commission that contains confidential business information shall be kept confidential by the commission and employees and agents of the department if a timely request for confidentiality is made pursuant to IAC Chapter 561-2, as adopted by reference at 567 IAC 2.1, by the person submitting the information and such request is approved by the Department.

6. Permit Considerations

Permit requirements can have a significant impact on the treatment processes, it is important that the department be notified early as to the nature of the proposed activity, the discharge location and effluent characteristics. Developing permit effluent limits requires collection of a considerable amount of information on the receiving water, the applicant's proposed activity and other activities in the drainage area. Early notification will ensure that the information collection process begins well before the applicant needs a permit to conduct planning activities, design facilities or proceed with project construction. In cases where the applicant intends to collect data on existing water quality in preparation for an antidegradation review, the department recommends that the applicant meet with the department in a pre-application conference prior to the expected date of application submittal.

Early notification and consultation between the applicant and the department will help ensure that the permitting process proceeds efficiently. Regulated activities that may temporarily degrade waters protected at the Tier 2 ½ & 3 level must comply with the antidegradation requirements applicable to that review level (i.e., provide proof that the degradation is only temporary and limited) before a permit will be granted. *Any regulated activity that may temporarily degrade an Outstanding National Resource Water or Outstanding State Resource Water will require an individual NPDES permit or individual §401 certification to ensure that impacts will be temporary and limited and that the public can participate in the decision.*

6.1 General Permits

A number of discharges to surface waters are authorized under general NPDES permits issued by the department. These include storm water runoff from municipalities and industries, mining and processing facilities, private on-site wastewater treatment systems and construction sites one acre or larger.

Except as described below, regulated activities authorized by general permits are not required to undergo a Tier 2 antidegradation review as part of the Notice of Intent process. However, new and reissued general permits must be evaluated to consider the potential for degradation as a result of the permitted discharges.

All NPDES general permits require that permit conditions be met, including the general requirement that permitted discharges must ensure that water quality standards are not violated and best management practices contained in the permit are implemented. Compliance with the terms of the general permits issued by the department is required to maintain authorization to discharge under the general permit. Discharges covered by a general permit that cannot comply with general permit conditions or antidegradation requirements will be required to seek coverage under an individual permit. The following sections describe the general antidegradation implementation provisions for various types of activities covered by general permits.

Overview of the Antidegradation Review Procedure for General Permits

Antidegradation reviews for discharges authorized by general permits will occur for the entire class of general permittees when the general permit is issued by the department. Antidegradation reviews will focus on pollutants of concern that may contribute to water quality degradation.

Individual activities authorized by general NPDES permits may be subject to a full antidegradation review through the individual permit process if the Director determines that the cumulative degradation resulting from multiple discharges to a water body, degradation from a single discharge over time, or other individual circumstances warrant a full antidegradation review at the time the Notice of Intent is submitted

Information regarding the existence, effectiveness, or costs of control practices for controlling flows, reducing pollution, and meeting the water quality and antidegradation requirements for activities authorized by some general permits (e.g. storm water from construction activity) is still emerging. For permittees covered under general permits #1 through #5, the antidegradation requirements of this section can be considered met where there is a permit requirement to select, develop, adopt, and refine control practices (i.e., design, installation, and maintenance) for protecting water quality. This adaptive management process must ensure that information is developed and used to revise permit or program requirements.

6.2 Individual Permits

Following the effective date of this document, all applications for new or expanded regulated activities shall undergo an antidegradation review if degradation is likely in the receiving water or downstream waters. In these cases, site-specific permit requirements will be based upon applicable effluent guidelines, water quality standards, the characteristics of the discharge and the alternatives analysis. In addition, the permit must ensure that beneficial uses are maintained and protected in the receiving waters and downstream waters.

Applicants for an individual permit may be required to provide or collect existing water quality information on any pollutants of concern reasonably expected to be in the discharge, if that information is not already available. Data collection requirements may depend on the nature of the proposed discharge and the pollutants reasonably expected in the discharge.

6.3 §401 Certifications

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates the placement of dredged or fill material into the “waters of the United States,” including small streams and wetlands adjacent or connected to “waters of the United States.” The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) administers the §404 permit program dealing with these activities (e.g., wetland fills, in-stream sand/gravel work, etc.) in cooperation with the EPA and in consultation with other public agencies.

In order to ensure that antidegradation and other water quality protection requirements are considered, reviewed and met in a comprehensive and efficient manner, these requirements will be addressed and implemented through the §404 permitting and §401 water quality certification processes. Under this approach, applicants who fulfill the terms and conditions of applicable §404 permits and the terms and conditions of the corresponding §401 water quality certification will have fulfilled the antidegradation requirements. Additional antidegradation considerations may be incorporated into §404 permits and the corresponding §401 certifications at the time of permit issuance. The department shall not issue a §401 certification where degradation resulting from the project is not necessary to accommodate important social or economic development.

For minor activities covered under §404 general permits (e.g., road culvert installation, utility line activities, bank stabilization, etc.), antidegradation requirements will be considered to be met if all appropriate and reasonable BMPs related to erosion and sediment control, project stabilization and prevention of water quality degradation (e.g., preserving vegetation, stream bank stability and basic drainage) are applied and maintained. Applicants desiring to fulfill antidegradation review requirements under this approach will be responsible for ensuring that permit requirements and relevant water quality certification conditions are met.

Iowa manages its §401 water quality certification program to ensure that the placement of dredged or fill material into surface waters do not create any unmitigated water quality impairments or degradation of surface waters. Under the BMP-based approach adopted by Iowa, regulated activities for which mitigation has been certified by the state pursuant to §401 of the Clean Water Act will not be required to undergo a separate Tier 2 review in accordance with this document.

Activities specifically described in Section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act will be considered to be in compliance with antidegradation requirements if conducted in conformance with guidelines defining and interpreting such activities as adopted and implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

6.4 Activities Covered by NPDES Storm Water Permits

Urban areas with populations greater than 100,000 based on the 1990 census (Phase I MS4 communities) were required to obtain an individual NPDES permit. Many urban areas with populations less than 100,000 determined from 2000 census data are considered Phase II MS4 communities. Storm water discharges from Phase II MS4s are authorized by individual storm water permits. Phase I or Phase II MS4s authorized under individual storm water permits are required to meet antidegradation requirements.

However, antidegradation reviews for individual NPDES storm water permits will be based on an adaptive management approach. This approach may include routine monitoring of storm water quality at representative outfalls to adequately

characterize storm water discharges. The MS4 will then evaluate, through effectiveness monitoring, whether storm water quality is being maintained, improving, or degrading and whether BMPs identified in the MS4's storm water pollution prevention plan are effective at controlling the discharge of pollutants. Antidegradation reviews of individual NPDES storm water permits will consist of an analysis of the effectiveness of the BMPs and compliance with the requirements of the storm water permit. The department shall not issue an individual NPDES storm water permit where the degradation resulting from the project is not necessary to accommodate important social or economic development.

6.5 CAFO Considerations

A Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) must comply with the antidegradation policy when applying for or renewing a NPDES permit. However, the antidegradation requirements only apply to permits for new or expanded discharges. Discharges from confinement feeding operations are prohibited, so the antidegradation policies only apply to CWA regulated open lot CAFOs.

An expanded discharge from a CAFO includes adding more animals or increasing the size of the feeding areas or the areas that contain manure. Adding pollution controls to an existing CAFO is not degradation if the operation is not expanded at the same time. Permitting an existing CAFO that never had a NPDES permit is not degradation if the permit application does not include an expansion of the operation (see Section 2.2).

Tier 2 Analysis

When requesting a new or expanded discharge from a CAFO, an applicant must submit an antidegradation analysis similar to the process described in Chapter 3. An analysis of less degrading alternatives is not required, however, because CAFO NPDES permits are required by Chapter 567 IAC 65 to implement controls on their discharge. The control requirements in Chapter 567 IAC 65 are identical to the controls required in 40 CFR 401.31 which are listed as the "best practical control technology currently available".

Social and Economic Importance

Applicants must submit information listed in Section 3.3 in order to demonstrate that the degradation will accommodate important economic and social development.

Public Notice

A separate notice period for public comment for the antidegradation review is not necessary. It can be combined with the notice period for public comment for the nutrient management plan required by Subrule 567 IAC 65.112(7). A combined notice period for public comment for the antidegradation review and nutrient management plan must meet the requirements listed below.

The owner of the open feedlot operation shall publish a notice for public comment in a newspaper having a general circulation in the county where the open feedlot operation is or is proposed to be located and in the county where manure, process wastewater, or open feedlot effluent which originates from the open feedlot operation may be applied under the terms and conditions of the nutrient management plan.

The notice for public comment shall include all of the following:

1. The name of the owner of the open feedlot operation submitting the nutrient management plan.
2. The name of the township where the open feedlot operation is or is proposed to be located and the name of the township where manure, process wastewater, or open feedlot effluent originating from the open feedlot operation may be applied.
3. The animal unit capacity of the open feedlot operation.
4. The time when and the place where the nutrient management plan may be examined as provided in Iowa Code section 22.2.
5. Procedures for providing public comment to the department. The notice shall also include procedures for requesting a public hearing conducted by the department. The department is not required to conduct a public hearing if it does not receive a request for the public hearing within ten days after the first publication of the notice for public comment. If such a request is received, the public hearing must be conducted within 30 days after the first date that the notice for public comment was published.

6. A statement that a person may acquire information relevant to making comments under this subrule by accessing the department's Internet Web site. The notice for public comment shall include the address of the department's Internet Web site as required by the department.
7. The conclusions of any social and economic evaluation of the proposed activity.
8. A description of the surface water that is subject to the antidegradation review and list all beneficial uses identified for the surface water.

The discussion of the social and economic importance of the project and proof of public notice for the antidegradation analysis - either combined with the NMP notice or separate - must be submitted with the NPDES permit application.

Standard text for a notice period for public comment for CAFOs is available from the department.

Intergovernmental Coordination and Review

For CAFOs, the intergovernmental coordination requirements discussed in Chapter 4 will be completed by the department in the process of renewing or issuing the NPDES permit.

7. Monitoring, Assessment, & TMDL Considerations

Applicability to §305(b) Report and §303(d) List

Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires each state to prepare and submit to EPA a biennial report describing water quality of all surface waters in the state. Each state must monitor water quality and review available data to determine the degree to which Water Quality Standards are being met. From this review, waters that do not fully meet WQS are identified. These waters are known as impaired waters. Those impaired waters that are impaired by a discrete pollutant or chemical condition, do not yet have sufficient water quality protection measures in place, and do not yet have an approved TMDL are placed on the state's §303(d) list. Identification of a surface water as impaired may be based on violations of numeric or narrative WQS.

To coordinate antidegradation reviews with the §305(b) and §303(d) listing process, the department will implement the following procedures:

Tier 1 Protection (applicable to all waters):

No further degradation of existing water quality for a pollutant of concern is allowed in a surface water where the existing water quality for the pollutant of concern does not meet the applicable WQS. Waters assessed as not meeting applicable WQS are candidates for addition to Iowa's §303(d) List and for TMDL development.

Tier 2 Protection:

If performed properly, Tier 2 reviews will not result in degradation sufficient to cause designated use impairment. If a §305(b) water quality assessment shows that significant degradation of a surface water is occurring such that impairment and addition to the state's §303(d) List is likely in the near future (within a two to three-year period) the department may conduct a special study of the extent and source(s) of degradation to determine the cause for the adverse trend and identify appropriate antidegradation actions to reverse any preventable trends.

The plan may include providing technical and other assistance to address probable sources of degradation and implement appropriate management practices. Other possible options include awarding priority points for grant or other funding programs targeted at water quality protection, amending permits or water quality certification conditions and working with stakeholders to support actions needed to protect and restore water quality.

Tier 2 ½ & 3 Protection:


No degradation, except for temporary degradation or from the expansion of existing sources, is allowed in the unique waters afforded Tier 2 ½* & 3 protection. If a §305(b) assessment shows that long-term degradation (i.e., not temporary degradation) of an Outstanding National Resource Water or Outstanding Iowa Water is occurring, the department may conduct a special study of the extent and source(s) of degradation to determine likely trends and explore possible antidegradation actions needed to reverse the trend, similar to what was described for ensuring Tier 2 protection. Such a study is justified even though the water may continue to fully meet state WQS and is not a likely candidate for addition to the state's §303(d) list (*Tier 2 ½ does allow degradation in limited instances as identified in Section 1.2 and 2.4.).

8. Implementation of Controls for Nonpoint Pollution Sources

Antidegradation review applies only to activities that require a permit or a water quality certification pursuant to federal law (CWA § 402 NPDES permits, CWA § 404 dredge and fill permits, and any activity requiring a CWA § 401 certification). Nonpoint discharges do not currently require a permit pursuant to these federal provision or Iowa law. States may adopt regulatory programs to address nonpoint sources of pollution. Unless Iowa imposes a regulatory framework upon nonpoint sources of water pollution there is no mechanism available for the imposition of antidegradation review in regard to these discharges and such review cannot occur.

When applying Tier 2 review to a proposed regulated activity the department shall assure the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost- effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control before allowing any lowering of water quality. To the extent that existing programs establish best management practice requirements for entities contributing to nonpoint pollution those requirements establish the maximum regulatory requirements that can be required pursuant to rule 61.2“b” and 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2). In many cases the Department lacks the authority to require entities that contribute to nonpoint pollution to implement all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices. In either situation, additional best management practices or regulatory requirements must be imposed through modification of statutes or rules outside of the antidegradation review

Appendix A - Antidegradation Review Flow Chart



Appendix B - Outstanding Iowa Waters

STREAMS	DESCRIPTION	Length (Miles)
Baron Springs	Mouth (S2, T91N, R6W, Clayton Co.) to spring source (S4, T91N, R6W, Clayton Co.)	1.99
Bear Creek	From road crossing in SW ¼, NW1/4, S11, T86N, R10W, Benton Co. to E line, S25, T87N, R10W, Buchanan Co.	5.2
Bloody Run	From (W. line of Section 22, T95N, R4W, Clayton Co.) to the confluence with Unnamed Creek (NAD83) UTM Coordinates X(Easting) 645284.89 Y(Northing) 4766657.44	8.59
Brownfield Creek	Mouth (Clayton Co.) to spring source (S31, T91N, R3W, Clayton Co.)	.94
Clear Creek	Mouth (Allamakee Co.) to W. line of Section 25, T99N, R4W, Allamakee Co.	3.79
Deer Creek	Road crossing in SE¼, S35, T100N, R19W, Worth Co. to the N. line of S7, T100N, R19W, Worth Co.	7.29
Dousman Creek	Mouth (S33, T96N, R3W, Allamakee Co.) to Allamakee-Clayton Co. line	3.44
Duck Creek	From the mouth (S14, T100N, R06W Allamakee Co.) to the Iowa-Minnesota state line.	1.98
Ensign Creek (aka Ensign Hollow)	Mouth (S28, T92N, R6W, Clayton Co.) to spring source (S29, T92N, R6W, Clayton Co.)	1.05
Unnamed Creek (a.k.a. Erickson Spring Branch)	Mouth (S23, T98N, R4W, Allamakee Co.) to W. line of S23, T98N, R4W, Allamakee Co.	.91
French Creek	Mouth (Allamakee Co.) to E. line of Section 23, T99N, R5W, Allamakee Co.	5.58
Grannis Creek	Mouth (S30, T95N, R7W, Fayette Co.) to W. line of S36, T93N, R8W, Fayette Co.	3.56
Jones Creek	From the mouth (S19, T98N, R04W Allamakee Co.) to bridge crossing at Clonkitty Rd. (S14, T98N, R05W Allamakee Co.)	5.75
Kleinlein Creek	Mouth (Clayton Co.) to spring source (South Spring) (S10, T91N, R6W, Clayton Co.)	3.96
Lime Creek	From confluence with unnamed tributary in NE ¼, NW ¼, S34, T87N, R10W, Buchanan Co. to N. line of S23, T87N, R10W, Buchanan Co.	3.0
Little Paint Creek	Mouth to N. line of Section 30, T97N, R3W	1.92
Ludlow Creek	Mouth (S2, T96N, R6W, Allamakee Co.) to confluence with an unnamed tributary (S33, T97N, R6W, Allamakee Co.)	2.00
Mill Creek (aka Big Mill Creek)	Confluence with Little Mill Cr. to confluence with Unnamed Cr. (S1, T86N, R3E, Jackson Co.)	8.04
Mossey Glen Creek	Mouth (S3, T91N, R5W, Clayton Co.) to S. line of S10, T91N, R5W, Clayton Co.	1.96
North Bear Creek	Mouth (S25, T100N, R7W, Winneshiek Co.) to Iowa-Minnesota state line	6.39
Pine Creek (aka South Pine Creek)	Mouth (S26, T99N, R7W, Winneshiek Co.) to N. line of S21, T99N, R7W, Winneshiek Co.	2.80
Smith Creek (aka Trout River)	Mouth (S21, T98N, R7W, Winneshiek Co.) to S. line of S33, T98N, R7W, Winneshiek Co.	3.42
South Canoe Creek	From the mouth (S22, T99N, R08W Winneshiek Co.) to the bridge crossing at Winn Rd. (S21, T99N, R08W Winneshiek Co.)	1.90
Spring Branch Creek	Mouth (S10, T88N, R5W, Delaware Co.) to spring source (S35, T89N, R5W, Delaware Co.)	2.83
Storybook Hollow	Mouth (S7, T86N, R4E, Jackson Co.) to S. line of S12, T86N, R3E, Jackson Co	1.37
Trout Run	Mouth (S16, T98N, R4W, Allamakee Co.) through one mile reach	1.0
Twin Springs Creek	Mouth (S17, T98N, R8W, Winneshiek Co.) to springs in Twin Springs Park (S20, T98N, R8W, Winneshiek Co.)	0.61
Unnamed Creek (aka Cold Water Cr.)	Mouth (S32, T100N, R9W, Winneshiek Co.) to N. line of Section 31, T100N, R9W, Winneshiek Co.)	2.46
Unnamed Creek (aka S. Fk. Big Mill)	Mouth (S8, T86N, R4E, Jackson Co.) to W. line of S17, T86N, R4E, Jackson Co.	0.97

STREAMS	DESCRIPTION	Length (Miles)
Village Creek	Mouth (Allamakee Co.) to W. line of S19, T98N, R4W, Allamakee Co.	13.32
Waterloo Creek	Mouth (S35, T100N, R6W, Allamakee Co.) to Iowa-Minnesota state line	9.39
West Branch French Creek	From the mouth (S23, T99N, R05W, Allamakee Co.) to the confluence with Unnamed Creek (S26, T99N, R05W, Allamakee Co.)	.67
<u>Grand Total</u>		<u>118.08</u>

LAKES	Description (Section, Township, Range)	Size (Acres)
Big Spirit Lake SGMA	S33, T100N, R36W	5684
West Okoboji Lake SGMA	S20, T99N, R36W	3,847

