

Appendix 2: List of Changes in the 2019 PAG 208 Plan Update

According to federal regulations, Areawide Water Quality Management Plans (208 Plans) must be updated “as needed.” An up-to-date 208 Plan is necessary to ensure efficient permitting decisions that rely on 208 Plan consistency. The previous 208 Plan update was completed in 2006. Changes in 2019 were made to update data for required components and/or to streamline the plan, including efficiency of procedures. DPAs are required to maintain a minimum of a 20-year planning horizon and keep water quality conditions up to date. Multiple amendments since the adoption of the 2006 Plan regarding Designated Management Agencies (DMAs) and wastewater facilities also warranted a comprehensive update.

Streamlining was the guiding principal for the 208 Plan update. PAG’s goal in streamlining the 2019 update was to create efficiency in the permit consistency review and regional coordination processes, modernize access to information, reduce redundant text, organize for ease of navigation through the plan, and clarify strategies to direct funding and efforts where they are most valuable. The objective was to make the plan more efficient and effective at maintaining the purpose of regional coordination and water quality benefits.

With adoption of the 2019 PAG 208 Plan Update, the following changes will go into effect.

1. New Supportive Resources

- Adopted Procedures Flow Charts: New diagrams simplify navigation for wastewater permit applicants through 208 consistency processes.
- Modernized Access through an Interactive Online Facility Inventory Portal: A new, interactive and online geodatabase portal that includes detailed facility descriptions, allows faster data updates and generates printable facility reports. Data searches are made simpler and facilities can be sorted by DMA or watershed, depending on management needs. Access to updated information eases consistency review processes.
- Additional Resources Appendix: Checklists, template letters and forms will be available in application packets to support consistency processes and submission of data updates.

2. Changes to Adopted Procedures

- a. Plan Updates: The proposed Plan Update procedures allow policies and procedures to remain under Regional Council purview and data updates to be made as needed.
 - The Strategic Action Plan and Adopted Procedures will continue to require Regional Council approval (minor changes are exempt, such as typos and edits that do not change the meaning of the text)

- The appendices can be updated administratively after 2019 Plan approval. These sections include water quality conditions, DMA boundary maps, facility descriptions, projections, methodology, public participation records, application materials and supplemental resources. Amendment and 208 Coordination Processes must be followed prior to updates of content that require those processes. The Appendices will be updated administratively thereafter, reducing the need for a full plan update approval.
 - Every 5 years, or as needed, ADEQ and EPA will be provided notification of updates with a compilation of the revised document.
- b. Fees: An increase to fees and details of what is covered with the fees is described in the Plan Implementation section. Fees had not been increased since 1984 when it was \$3,500 for an amendment. Fees were increased using an inflation calculation for equivalent buying power and compared to other DPA rates. These new fees allow true cost recovery.
- Proposed rates are now \$8,000 for significant Amendments for public and private facilities.
 - To encourage regionalization, a simpler process for public facilities is warranted in certain scenarios, named the Public Facility Coordination Process (Process B), where the \$3,500 fee will remain.
 - Clarification is provided for additional fees of \$1,000 per step for extended circumstances.
 - Previously unfunded Consistency Reviews will now require a fee of \$1,000, which will count toward the Amendment or Public Facility Coordination Process if those processes are required.
- c. Procedure Triggers: The criteria that trigger PAG 208 Amendment Procedures have changed for public and private WRFs. (See Table 1 below for a comparison of each trigger in this 208 Plan update to the 2006 Plan.)
- Guiding Principles: Regional Council Resolutions including the 2017 [Heritage Waters](#) and 2015 [Green Infrastructure](#) recommendations were used to update Guiding Principles for consistency determinations and recommendations.
 - The 208 Plan no longer requires a 208 Amendment process for new or expanding public WRFs that are greater than 5 MGD. Facilities with those criteria may now participate in a streamlined Coordination Process (Process B). The 5 MGD threshold was used to align with ADEQ's pretreatment requirement for wastewater treatment facilities 5 MGD or greater which ADEQ can ensure through their permitting process. PAG's change meets the intention of 208 planning to encourage public regional facilities by easing their 208 process and allows DMAs to follow through with their capability to manage responsibilities within their areas.

- Existing and new public facilities each with less than 5 MGD and with capacities below the Consistency Factor calculation previously required a PAG Consistency Report process. The Consistency Report process will no longer exist. Existing facilities with these criteria now only require a shorter Consistency Review and Data Update (Process A). All new public facilities, will be required to participate in a streamlined Coordination Process (Process B)..
- To align with state regulations regarding systems less than 0.024 MGD under Individual Aquifer Protection Permit, PAG has changed this threshold for PAG Amendments for small private facilities to 0.024 MGD instead of 0.020 MDG listed in the 2006 Plan.
- Consistency Reports were the process required in the 2006 Plan (Section 9.3) for very small, isolated wastewater treatment facilities (less than 0.02 MGD) meeting a number of conditions. This requirement was removed and a PAG process is no longer required. On-site systems less than 0.024 MGD under Aquifer Protection Program's Individual Permit and septic systems less than 0.003 MGD (3000 GPD) which apply under APP 4.23 General Permit are reviewed by Pima County Department of Environmental Quality (PDEQ), which has been delegated review authority by ADEQ. A description of the approval process and application materials are available on [PDEQ's website](#)¹.
- The Consistency Factor allows determinations of consistency if expanded flows are no more than 25 percent above projected flows for public facilities. The Consistency Factor has been updated to 25 percent, from the 20-80 percent used in the 2006 Plan.
- Procedures have also been clarified if a municipality or private facility desires to gain DMA responsibilities. New DMAs must undergo a 208 Amendment process (Process C). DMA modifications must undergo a Coordination Process (Process B). Following the example of other DPA plans in the state, private facilities may now become WMUs (Process C).
- The 208 Plan no longer requires Regional Council approval to initiate a 208 process or collection of fees. DMA agreement letters help ensure agreement by key nearby stakeholders.
- Clarification was provided that DMA modifications undergo the Coordination Process (Process B).

3. Procedure Steps: The following changes to steps in the procedures are intended to streamline and clarify.

- i. DMAs' "decline-to-serve" and Jurisdictional "sponsorship" letters may be merged when it is the same entity.
- ii. For Process B, if a DMA is within 3 miles of a proposed project, DMAs write letters to support or agree to participate prior to initiating 208 procedures. This reduces the number of stakeholder meetings, while PAG can demonstrate consensus to ADEQ, and creates a regional coordination point where relevant.

¹<https://webcms.pima.gov/cms/one.aspx?portallid=169&pagelid=63828>

- iii. Clarification was provided for coordination within JPAs and with other DPAs where relevant.
- iv. A Task Force is not required for any PAG 208 process. Instead, relevant stakeholders, including DMAs, are to be invited to the WPS/EPAC meeting which can be held jointly.
- v. The Statewide WQMWG, EPAC and WPS may now each be scheduled at a timely date, rather than requiring action items to wait until quarterly meetings.
- vi. Clarification is provided about how and which committees can deny an application, which decisions allow PAG Executive Director discretion, and how an applicant can proceed with an appeal process.
- vii. PAG, the DMAs and the Joint Committee reserve the right to require a Coordination Process (Process B) or a PAG 208 Amendment (Process C) for any facility should conditions dictate.
- viii. In addition to the above changes, the Amendment process (Process C) was also streamlined in that the Public Hearing may be held with other committee meetings.
- ix. In addition to the above changes, the Coordination Process for public facilities (Process B) offers streamlined procedures in comparison to Amendments by no longer requiring a public hearing. The Coordination Process also offers streamlined procedures in comparison to the previous Consistency Report process by no longer requiring mailings to property owners. Although mailings to property owners within a 1/2 mile of the site are no longer required for public facilities that qualify for the abbreviated Coordination Process, this step may be utilized as needed or if recommended.

4. Organizational Changes and Reduction of Text

- a. Reduction and Automation: The Watershed Approach section (chapter 8 of the 2006 Plan) was briefly summarized since this is not currently a required element of 208 planning and primarily consisted of 208 Plan contents organized per watershed. A function was created in the online Facility Inventory Portal to sort facilities by watershed and allow this management perspective.
- b. Links: Water quality data tables that can quickly become outdated were replaced with links to online databases to maintain current information from best available sources.
- c. Consolidation: Background information was consolidated for concise reading with current policies and regulations up-front and history of past changes available in an appendix.
- d. Strategic Action Plan Format: Water quality issues are now associated with their related descriptions of past progress and future recommendations. Organized strategies help to clarify PAG staff and committees' roles in regional coordination, such as driving EPAC's Top Issues list and directing funding sources to areas of importance.

5. Data Updates

- a. Water Quality Conclusions: Summaries of water quality issues were updated to reflect the most current information.
- b. DMA and Facility Descriptions: Descriptions were updated to current information using data available in Consistency Reviews and Amendments since 2006 and were reviewed by the DMAs for accuracy.
- c. Projections: Population and flow projections were updated for planned service areas. The 208 Plan is required to maintain a minimum 20-year planning horizon. The previous PAG 208 Plan in 2006 projected through 2030. This update to the 208 Plan includes projections of future wastewater volumes, using Regional Council approved population projections in the last PAG Regional Mobility and Accessibility Plan, through 2045.
- d. Service Area Maps: Boundaries were updated to reflect where there is current infrastructure and were reduced where no current infrastructure exists and to be consistent with local ordinances. Although PAG is not responsible for the accuracy of facility boundaries, to create a regionwide inventory, datasets shown on PAG 208 maps are as reported by DMAs.

6. Folded into this Update

Additional changes that were made which may have triggered a Consistency Review or Amendment during the update of this PAG 208 Plan were limited to the following.

- a. The required public notice and approval by PAG Management Committee and Regional Council has been folded in as part of this PAG 208 Plan Update process for approval.
- b. The Marana DMA boundary was extended to include Saguaro Bloom, by joint request of Marana and Pima County on the signed DMA maps. The maps in the 208 Plan reflect this change to the Marana DMA and Pima County DMA.
- c. A formalized process was developed for coordination with other DPAs where wastewater service crosses county boundaries. A Consistency Review for Pima County to serve a development at Eagle Crest created a need to extend the Pima County DMA into Pinal County.
- c. Updates to the Future Conditions section for facilities in the 208 Plan can ease future consistency reviews if a new facility becomes proposed in the future that was already anticipated and described in the approved 208 Plan.

Table 1a. COMPARISON OF 208 PLAN PROCESSES

CONDITION	2006 PAG 208 PLAN			2019 PAG 208 PLAN		
	Consistency Review	Consistency Report	Amendment	Consistency Review (Process A)	Coordination Process (Process B)	Amendment (Process C)
PRIVATE FACILITIES						
Change to an existing private facility currently in the PAG 208 Plan.			X			X
A new septic or on-site private facility with a capacity greater than 0.024 MGD (0.02 MGD for 2006 Plan).			X			X
Expansion of a private facility service area with a capacity greater than 0.024 MGD (0.02 MGD for 2006 Plan)			X			X
Expansion of a private facility service area that crosses a DMA, DPA, or JPA.			X			X
Very small, isolated wastewater treatment facilities (less than less than 0.024 MGD (0.02 MGD for 2006 Plan) MGD) meeting a number of conditions (Section 9.3) including: no commercial or industrial waste, no public service available within 10 years, will connect when DMA becomes available, no discharge to waters of the US, financial and technical capacity demonstrated, no jurisdiction or water provider objects, no odor or water quality impact, all property owners within 1/2 mile notified.		determined "not inconsistent" if followed Consistency Report Process		None needed. Pima County review of APP 4.23 General Permits (for septic and onsite facilities from 0.003- 0.024 MGD) and R18-9-A309 (5) (a) (iii) aligns with PAG 208 planning recommendations for connection to sewerage collection system.		
A new WMU (new category in 2019).	-	-	-			X

Table 1b. COMPARISON OF 208 PLAN PROCESSES

CONDITION	2006 PAG 208 PLAN			THIS PAG 208 PLAN		
	Consistency Review	Consistency Report	Amendment	Consistency Review (Process A)	Coordination Process (Process B)	Amendment (Process C)
PUBLIC FACILITIES						
Changes to an existing public facility with a capacity less than 5 MGD and below the Consistency Factor calculation for maximum flows, with no changes to the DMA.		X		X		
A new or existing public facility that requires a change to an existing DMA or JPA boundary (such as expansion of service area).			X		X	
A new public facility within an existing DMA.		X, if capacity is less than 5 MGD	X, if capacity is greater than 5 MGD		X	
Changes to an existing public facility with a capacity of less than 5 MGD and capacity is above the Consistency Factor* calculation.		X			X	
Expanding an existing public facility to a capacity greater than 5 MGD.			X	X, if capacity is no more than the Consistency Factor* calculation	X, if capacity is greater than the Consistency Factor* calculation	
A new DMA.			X			X
Changes to an Existing DMA Boundary.			X		X	

* Consistency Factor is a term for PAG's assigned factor that allows a 25 percent variation above the future flow projections.