| | CRITERIA: NPDES Permit Program (1 point per criterion)[1] | PTS | SB | RB1 | RB2 | RB3 | RB4 | RB5 | RB6 | RB7 | RB8 | RB9 | AVG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **QUALITY** | **8** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | PQR action items adequately addressed (if N/A, give 1). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | RPA results in WQBELs developed consistent with WQS. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | WLAs properly applied to wastewater, stormwater, and industrial permits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | RPA conducted for WET and limits established consistent with WQS and monitoring requirements included in permits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Antidegradation and anti-backsliding analyses conducted consistent with WQS and documented in the factsheet. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Mixing zones calculated properly and in accordance with WQS. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Compliance schedules established properly and in accordance with WQS. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Pretreatment requirements applied appropriately in permits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATION** | **5** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Rules reflect Clean Water Act requirements (i.e. E-Reporting, including biosolids use and disposal, SSM Rule, NPDES updates, public notice, dental amalgam, etc.). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | NPDES permits are updated to meet new requirements (i.e. updating WLA-based limit after TMDL approved, updating trash/toxicity/etc. to be in accordance with new policy, etc.). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Program adheres to MOA conditions, including providing EPA proper time to review permits and providing appropriate forms to EPA (e.g. biosolids/pretreatment, if applicable). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Permit writers provided with basic and advanced technical training. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Permit writers able to defend permits petitioned to State Board or litigated in court. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ISSUANCE** | **5** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Permit renewal % current improved from previous two years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Permit renewal % current consistent with national objective (>83%). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Permit renewal % current consistent with regional objective (>78%). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Meets state-proposed and EPA-agreed upon permit issuance 106 Work Plan commitments and committed priority permits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Contractor/In-kind supported permits issued in a timely manner (approx. 6 months). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **INNOVATION (Any four of the following scores 4/4).** | **Max of 4** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Program demonstrates improvement in receiving water quality as a result of NPDES program (e.g. 303(d) de-listing or any other improvement in receiving water). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Permit program supports technical, managerial and financial capacity (TMF) of small systems through outreach and training. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Asset management planning required for wastewater or stormwater permits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Permits find innovative ways to encourage water reuse. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Permit implements innovative monitoring program (i.e. special studies for CECs, watershed monitoring, etc.). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Permit writers coordinate with related programs (i.e. TMDLs, enforcement, etc.). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | MS4 permits include numeric WLAs as effluent limits. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Total/Overall Score[2]:** | **22** | | | | | | | | | | | |

1 Unless noted: miss on any criteria, lose a point; miss on two criteria, lose two points, etc.

2 Overall score will be used to assess whether program is either Exemplary (≥19 pts), Satisfactory (≥15 pts), or Needs Improvement (<15 pts).