

---

**AZPDES**

**Industrial Stormwater Permit  
MSGP 2009**

---

**Part 3 – Corrective Actions**

**Dennis L. Turner**  
**Surface Water Consultant**

---

## Part 3 – Corrective Actions

- Conditions Requiring Review and Revision to Eliminate Problem
  - Conditions Requiring Review to Determine if Modifications Are Necessary
  - Corrective Action Deadlines
  - Corrective Action Report
  - Effect of Corrective Action
  - Substantially Identical Outfalls
-

---

## Part 3 – Cont'd

- Overall purpose: assess why the problem(s) occurred and eliminate them (modify control measures to resolve deficiencies)
  - MSGP 2000 was vague in requiring “follow-up actions” although it was always expected that operators make some determination why a particular problem was occurring and whether improvements could be made in the quality of the discharge
-

---

## 3.1 Conditions Requiring Review and Revision to Eliminate Problem

- It is unclear what actually triggers corrective action requirements
  - Requirement to conduct corrective action in the event of any “unauthorized release or discharge” regardless of location or impact is overly broad
  - The requirement to conduct corrective action based on an inspection or evaluation by ADEQ or local, state entity, determines that modification to the control measure is necessary to meet non-numeric effluent limitations should be removed
-

---

## Part 3.1 – Cont'd

- Delete reference to tribal entity – what other entity besides ADEQ or state would have qualifications to do this?
  - The requirement to conduct corrective action in the event that a CM is not properly operated or maintained is unnecessary. A distinction needs to be made between routine maintenance and a fundamental failure of a CM – only a failure should trigger corrective action.
  - Corrective action is mandated if it is determined that “the CMs are not stringent enough for the discharge to meet WQS”. It is unclear how this determination is made.
-

---

## 3.2 Conditions Requiring Review to Determine if Modifications Are Necessary

- Proposed for deletion – reason(s) not given
-

---

## 3.6 Substantially Identical Outfalls

- The language is overly broad and should be removed. It assumes the potential issues associated with one outfall will trigger the need to review the need for corrective action at other outfalls
  - **Moved to (new) Section 3.2**
-

---

## 3.3 Corrective Action Deadlines

- The 24-hr timeframe to document the discovery of any of the 3.1 or 3.2 conditions is unreasonable and does not account for off-duty weekends, holidays, inclement weather.
  - The 14 day timeframe to determine whether CA is needed and if so, what form is too short. At a large mine site, it may be difficult to identify potential source areas given that contributing watershed may be large.
  - Corrective action timeframes should be extended for Sector S (Air Transportation), since many times the corrective actions may be needed for a tenant at the site and may take longer to facilitate.
  - Airports ... could have dozens of corrective actions within 14 days. Would ADEQ consider specific requirements for individual sectors?
-

---

## 3.4 Corrective Action Report

- Several minor language corrections
  - Delete requirement to write Corrective Action Report and place in SWPPP
  - Delete requirement for dischargers to impaired and OAWs to submit corrective action documentation in Annual Report
-

---

## 3.5 Effect of Corrective Action

- The language regarding the effect of corrective action is confusing and the potential effect of non-compliance with permit conditions is already addressed in 1.2. Language should be removed.
-