

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has been promoting the integration between Clean Water Act (CWA) and Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Programs for some time now. As highlighted in the FY14/15 National Water Program Guidance, States are strongly encouraged to take collaborative actions that integrate CWA and SDWA source water protection (SWP) activities to advance public health and environmental protection objectives at the state, interstate and local levels.

The recently released CWA/SDWA Toolkit—[*“Opportunities to Protect Drinking Water and Advance Watershed Goals through the Clean Water Act: A Toolkit for State, Interstate, Tribal and Federal Water Program Managers”*](#)—was the result of a multi-year effort by state and U.S. EPA clean water and safe drinking water programs. This Toolkit is designed to enable state and U.S. EPA water quality practitioners to better protect drinking water supplies using regulatory and non-regulatory provisions of the Clean Water Act and achieve mutual goals—better protected sources of drinking water and improved water quality. While the Toolkit provides numerous examples of activities that can be integrated, a number of Region 5 states believed another tool was needed to evaluate the extent to which state programs were integrated. Based upon that input, Region 5 has developed a draft CWA/SDWA Integration Guide in the form of a checklist.

II. PURPOSE OF THE CWA/SDWA INTEGRATION GUIDE

The Region 5 Water Division CWA/SDWA Integration Team has developed this draft CWA/SDWA Integration Guide for consideration for use by states to self-assess CWA/SDWA integration efforts and to identify opportunities to improve state collaboration.

Region 5 also intends to use a regional version of this guide to identify where to focus efforts within the Water Division to improve collaboration and communication, as well as to bridge the gaps between CWA and SDWA programs at the state and regional levels. For example, the guide may help us to identify where we can share information and influence each other’s (i.e., CWA and SDWA) programs to better protect water resources. States that intend to use this may want to reach out to their state CWA and SDWA counterparts to discuss the answers to these questions. The Region 5’s CWA/SDWA Integration Team or SWP staff are available to help answer any questions or facilitate this process, too.

III. CWA/SDWA INTEGRATION GUIDE QUESTIONS

The Integration Guide checklist below covers 10 potential program self-assessment areas, which include:

1. Water quality standards (WQS) for drinking water use
2. Monitor/assess WQS attainment for drinking water use

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

3. List impaired waters for drinking water use impairments
4. TMDL development for drinking water use impairments and in source waters
5. Integrated watershed planning/implementation
6. Control nonpoint sources
7. Control point sources with permits
8. Enforcement
9. Special initiatives and continuing planning process
10. SWP program

If the answer to a question is “yes”, a description can be added that describes what integration is already occurring. If the answer is “no,” an explanation can be added that explains what the barriers might be (e.g., other priorities are taking precedence). Further, the description/explanation area can be a place to describe any possible areas of improvement or new integration opportunities.

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
1. WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR DRINKING WATER USE <i>The purpose of the following questions is to gather information about what water quality standards (WQS) the state has adopted to protect the drinking water (also often called public water supply) use.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Are waterbodies used for drinking water designated as such? If yes, describe the geographic component—that is, what part of the waterbody is designated for the drinking water use (e.g., the watershed, a certain area surrounding the intake, etc.). Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are drinking water uses supported by comprehensive numeric/narrative criteria? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for water quality standards? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
2. MONITOR/ASSESS WQS ATTAINMENT FOR DRINKING WATER USE <i>The purpose of the following questions is to determine whether the state is monitoring and assessing waterbodies for drinking water use as described in the monitoring strategy and assessment methodology.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Are parameters and/or indicators being monitored for waterbodies designated for the drinking water use? Please describe. <i>Note: If states are considering “conventional treatment” in their drinking water use impairment decisions, we may need to discuss the definition of “conventional treatment.”</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are the parameters/indicators monitored for drinking water use designations based on certain sampling locations? Please describe. <i>Question: Are various assessment methodology sampling designs appropriate for assessing the drinking water use (e.g., fixed network, watershed, or random/probabilistic)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Are the parameters monitored for drinking water use designations at appropriate sampling frequencies? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Is the state monitoring ground waters used for drinking water? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Are other local, state, or non-governmental entities collecting monitoring data? If yes, please describe what other entities are collecting data, and whether the data are leveraged to make drinking water use impairment decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Does the state monitoring strategy describe monitoring of drinking water sources, including the above questions? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for monitoring or assessing water quality standards? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
3. LIST IMPAIRED WATERS FOR DRINKING WATER USE IMPAIRMENTS <i>The purpose of the following questions is to determine whether the state is making drinking water use impairment determinations.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Is the state listing drinking water use impairments with associated pollutants and causes/sources of impairments? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Does the state assessment methodology describe a process for making assessment decisions about drinking water use support? Please describe. <i>Note: If a state does not have an assessment methodology for the drinking water use, the region could provide recommendations to the state before the next two-year 303(d) list review cycle.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Are assessments of the drinking water use occurring? If yes, please describe at what frequency.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for listing impaired waters? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. TMDL DEVELOPMENT FOR DRINKING WATER USE IMPAIRMENTS AND IN SOURCE WATERS <i>The purpose of the following questions is to determine whether and how the drinking water program is involved in the development of TMDLs or other pollution control plans needed to address: (1) drinking water use impairments and (2) other types of impairments in sources of drinking water.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. If a TMDL or another type of pollution control plan is needed to address <u>drinking water use impairments</u> , is the state drinking water program involved in this planning process (e.g., public water systems (PWSs) in the watershed have been notified). Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. If a TMDL or another type of pollution control plan is needed to address <u>another use impairment</u> (e.g., recreation, aquatic life) in a waterbody also used as a drinking water source, is the state drinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
water program involved in this planning process (e.g., PWSs in the watershed have been notified). Please describe.			
c. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for TMDL development? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. INTEGRATED WATERSHED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTATION <i>The purpose of the questions below is to determine whether and how source water, ground water, and water quantity considerations are incorporated into integrated watershed planning (or integrated water resource management or IWRM¹) initiatives, where they exist.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Where integrated watershed planning processes exist in SWP areas, is the state drinking water program involved (e.g., to incorporate the source water assessment or any SWP plans)? Please describe. <i>Question: How does the state find out about these plans (e.g., through the state 319 program)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Where integrated watershed planning processes exist in SWP areas, are ground water quality, surface/ground water quantity, water efficiency, and storm water incorporated? Please describe. <i>Note: For example, see the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) GO TO 2040 comprehensive regional plan for northeast Illinois developed with some CWA funding, which includes these elements.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Is it a state requirement for watershed-based plans to consider SWP? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Does the state have watershed planning guidance that recommends prioritizing SWP areas? Please describe. <i>Note: U.S. EPA issued</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

¹ The [National Water Program 2012 Strategy: Response to Climate Change](#) “... uses IWRM to describe opportunities for state, interstate, tribal, and local officials to voluntarily collaborate at watershed or aquifer scales, with support from federal agencies, to protect and preserve freshwater resources through mutually beneficial solutions. IWRM calls for intersector planning (e.g., between the energy, water, and agricultural sectors) to sustainably manage water resources. A shorthand way to think of IWRM is ‘one water.’ To be most effective, IWRM should take into account water quantity and quality, surface water and ground water, salinity of coastal estuaries, land use, floodplain management, point and nonpoint sources of pollution, green and grey infrastructure, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.”

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
<i>watershed planning guidance at http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/handbook_index.cfm.</i>			
e. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for integrated watershed planning? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. CONTROL NONPOINT SOURCES <i>The purpose of the questions below are to determine whether SWP is incorporated into the state CWA Section 319 and Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) programs, where appropriate.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Do the state CWA Section 319 program assessment and management plans mention SWP? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Does the state's Section 319 grant solicitation process mention SWP? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. As the state revises their Section 319 management plans, is the source water protection program routinely providing review and comment on the plan? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. Has the state recently updated their plan, and does it include SWP? Please describe. <i>Note: In general, states revise their plans every five years, and each Region 5 state is on a different schedule. Any activity funded by Section 319 funds must be discussed in these plans.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Is the state drinking water program involved in the review of Section 319 grant applications in SWP areas? Please describe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Does the state prioritize funding for controlling nonpoint sources in source waters through the CWSRF program and intended use plan (IUP)? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Do the state's NPS and SWP programs coordinate with the CWSRF program? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
g. Do any state program-specific (Section 319 or CWSRF) checklists/SOPs/methodologies/etc. exist that incorporate SWP for non-point source control? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. CONTROL POINT SOURCES WITH PERMITS <i>The purpose of the following questions is to determine how SWP can be integrated into and prioritized within the permitting process.</i> State program contact(s): please list any names here as appropriate			
a. Do state permit writers consider downstream impacts on drinking water sources? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are point sources permitted in SWP areas (e.g., injection wells, concentrated animal feeding operations, municipal separate storm sewer systems)? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Is the five-year NPDES permit review/renewal process structured such that reviews are prioritized based on proximity to SWP areas? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Does the state prioritize funding for controlling point sources in source waters through the CWSRF program and IUP? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Does the state consider underground sources of drinking water when approving implementation of green infrastructure practices to ensure that the siting and design of such practices does not contaminate ground water? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Do any state program-specific (NPDES or CWSRF) checklists/SOPs/methodologies/etc. exist that incorporate SWP for point source control? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
8. ENFORCEMENT <i>The purpose of the questions below is to determine how SWP areas can be prioritized in state enforcement programs.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Does the state enforcement program have a policy or strategy that gives priority to SWP areas? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Based on the state's definition of "waters of the state," does the state's surface water team take enforcement/compliance actions for groundwater contamination? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Does the surface water team have and/or use maps of areas susceptible to source water contamination (e.g., karst topography) in targeting priority areas? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Does the state consider underground sources of drinking water when approving implementation of green infrastructure practices to ensure that the siting and design of such practices does not contaminate ground water? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for enforcement? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state SWP programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. SPECIAL INITIATIVES AND CONTINUING PLANNING PROCESS² <i>The purpose of the questions below is to determine whether additional opportunities exist to more effectively integrate SWP into CWA and SDWA programs—either through special initiatives, the continuing planning process, or tracking project outcomes.</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Does the state's nutrient reduction strategy address SWP? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Do other CWA or SDWA initiatives or opportunities exist to integrate SWP (e.g., headquarters-sponsored SWP workshops) at the state level? Please describe. <i>Question: In general, how could we use the outcomes that are tracked in each of the programs (e.g., decrease in</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

² [CWA Section 303\(e\)](#) indicates that each state shall have a "continuing planning process" that will result in plans including effluent limitations; Section 208 areawide waste management plans; TMDLs; adequate implementation, including compliance schedules for revised or new WQS, etc.

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
<i>point and nonpoint source loadings, reduced drinking water treatment costs, impairment delistings) to inform the continuing planning process?</i>			
c. Does the state's continuing planning process and water quality management plan address SWP (e.g., see CWA Sections 208 and 303(e) and 40 CFR Part 130)? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/methodologies/ etc. exist that incorporate SWP for other special initiatives or the continuing planning process? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. SWP PROGRAM³ <i>The purpose of the questions below is to document the status of the state SWP program. Question: Are there any other questions we could ask of the state SWP programs to evaluate integration (e.g., to track which state-specific documents the state SWP program has recently reviewed, to ensure the usefulness of the information the state SWP program is providing to state CWA programs)?</i> State program contact(s): Please list any names here as appropriate.			
a. Is the state drinking water program updating source water assessments, working to make sure that protection plans are in place, and tracking implementation, etc.? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. Are CWA programs part of the state review of these documents? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are there any state-specific funding sources that can be used by programs to fund on-the-ground activities or provide technical assistance in SWP areas? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Does the state SWP program designate certain SWP areas as state priorities? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, please describe how this information is communicated to state CWA programs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

³ See attachment A for SWP-related information that the Region 5 GWDWB SWP program can provide to Region 5 CWA programs, which the state SWP programs could revise to provide information about the services that they can provide to CWA programs.

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide
DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

PROGRAM- AND STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	YES	NO	DESCRIPTION/ EXPLANATION:
d. Do any state program-specific checklists/SOPs/ methodologies/etc. exist that document how to conduct SWP-related reviews?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. If so, have these documents been shared with state CWA programs? Please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

ATTACHMENT A: What information can the Region 5 GWDWB SWP program provide to Region 5 CWA programs?

NOTE: State source water protection (SWP) programs could revise this section to provide information about the services that they can provide to CWA programs.

In addition to providing SWP-related comments on state-specific documents, the Region 5 Ground Water and Drinking Water Branch (GWDWB) SWP program may be able to provide the following types of information that could be useful to Region 5 CWA programs to protect source waters:

- (1) Locations of SWP areas and public water systems (PWSs), although this information is sensitive, so the exact locations are kept “close hold.” However, information about the number of PWSs in a particular location (e.g., by watershed, county) can be aggregated so that it can be made available more broadly. (Source: Safe Drinking Water Information System/Federal version (SDWIS/Fed), which can be accessed by some GWDWB and Water Division staff. In addition, aggregated PWS data are available via the [Drinking Water Mapping Application to Protect Source Waters \(DWMAPS\)](#), [MyWATERS Mapper](#), and [Nitrogen and Phosphorus Pollution Data Access Tool \(NPDAT\)](#).)
- (2) Information from a PWS source water assessment, which includes a description of the SWP area, an inventory of potential contaminant sources within the SWP area, a susceptibility analysis, and protective strategies. (Sources: Some states post these assessments online or via password-protected websites, and if not, this information could be requested from the state SWP programs.)
- (3) Information from a PWS’s SWP plan (SWPP), if one exists. (Source: The state SWP program may have access to SWPPs and may have additional information about a particular SWP area, such as whether there have been special investigations conducted.)
- (4) PWS health-based SDWA violations in the last 10 years. (Source: [Envirofacts](#).)
- (5) Contaminant detects and treatment used. Some states ([IL](#), [IN](#), and [WI](#)) make PWS monitoring data publicly available, which includes detects in finished water, as well as some raw (ambient) water quality data (e.g., total organic carbon). Consumer confidence reports (CCRs), if available online, are prepared by community water systems each year by July 1st and include detects of contaminants and can include other useful information (e.g., the type of treatment used, such as activated carbon for taste and odor issues, which can be related to nitrogen and phosphorus pollution). The type of treatment used by PWSs can also be found in SDWIS/Fed, but this information may not be the most up-to-date. Some larger PWSs have websites with treatment and other useful information, too. The state drinking water program also may be able to obtain information. (Sources: The web, SDWIS, or state drinking water programs.)
- (6) Proximity of the SWP area to a designated sole source aquifer (SSA), which indicates that the ground water resource is recognized by U.S. EPA as sensitive and critical and warrants special attention. (Source: Bill Spaulding is the regional SSA coordinator.)
- (7) Ambient ground water quality data that states and USGS are collecting. (Sources: state SWP programs (e.g., [IL](#), [IN](#), [OH](#), [MN](#), [WI](#)) and USGS websites.)

U.S. EPA Region 5 Water Division—CWA/SDWA Integration Guide

DRAFT—STATE VERSION—MARCH 30, 2015

- (8) Potential stakeholders, such as any PWSs or other entities mentioned in the source water assessment or SWP plan. (Sources: PWS source water assessments, SWP plans, and PWS websites.)