

STATE OF COLORADO

Bill Ritter, Jr., Governor
James B. Martin, Executive Director

Dedicated to protecting and improving the health and environment of the people of Colorado

4300 Cherry Creek Dr. S.
Denver, Colorado 80246-1530
Phone (303) 692-2000
TDD Line (303) 691-7700
Located in Glendale, Colorado

Laboratory Services Division
8100 Lowry Blvd.
Denver, Colorado 80230-6928
(303) 692-3090

<http://www.cdphe.state.co.us>



Colorado Department
of Public Health
and Environment

April 14, 2009

David Heyl, R.A.
Heyl, LLC
6560 County Road 335
New Castle, CO 81647

Certified Mail Number: 7007 0220 0001 0160 0295

RE: Service of Notice of Violation, Number: SN-090414-4

Dear Mr. Heyl:

Heyl, LLC is hereby served with the enclosed Notice of Violation (the "NOV"). This NOV is issued by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's Water Quality Control Division (the "Division") pursuant to the authority given to the Division by §§25-8-602 and 25-8-605, C.R.S. of the *Colorado Water Quality Control Act*, (the "Act"). The Division bases this NOV upon findings that Heyl, LLC has violated the Act, and/or [COR-03B428] regulations promulgated pursuant to the Act, as described in the enclosed NOV.

Pursuant to §25-8-603, C.R.S., Heyl, LLC is required, within thirty (30) calendar days of issuance of this NOV, to submit to the Division an answer admitting or denying each paragraph of the Findings of Fact and responding to the Notice of Violation.

This action could result in the imposition of civil penalties. The Division is authorized pursuant to §25-8-608, C.R.S. to impose a penalty of \$10,000 per day for each day during which such violation occurs.

Please be advised that the Division is continuing its investigation into this matter and the Division may identify supplementary violations that warrant amendments to this NOV or the issuance of additional enforcement actions.

Should you or representatives of Heyl, LLC desire to discuss this matter informally with the Division, or if you have any questions regarding the NOV, please do not hesitate to contact Danelle Morgan of this office by phone at (303) 692-3176 or by electronic mail at danelle.morgan@state.co.us.

Sincerely,



Kristi-Raye Beaudin, Legal Assistant
Compliance Assurance Section
Enforcement Unit
WATER QUALITY CONTROL DIVISION

- cc: Consumer Protection Division, CDPHE
MS-3 File
- ec: Aaron Urdiales, EPA Region VIII
Mark Kadnuck, Engineering Section, CDPHE
Dick Parachini, Watershed Program, CDPHE
Gary Beers, Permits Unit, CDPHE
Carolyn Schachterle, OPA

Enclosure(s)



COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION
WATER QUALITY CONTROL DIVISION

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

NUMBER: SN-090414-4

IN THE MATTER OF: HEYL, LLC
CDPS PERMIT NO. COR-030000
CERTIFICATION NO. COR-03B428
GARFIELD COUNTY, COLORADO

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's (the "Department") Division of Administration by §§25-1-109 and 25-8-302, C.R.S., which authority has been delegated to the Department's Water Quality Control Division (the "Division"), and pursuant to §§25-8-602, C.R.S., the Division hereby makes the following Findings of Fact and issues the following Notice of Violation:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. At all times relevant to the alleged violations identified herein, Heyl, LLC ("Heyl") was a Colorado corporation in good standing and registered to conduct business in the State of Colorado.
2. Heyl is a "person" as defined under the Water Quality Control Act, §25-8-103(13), C.R.S. and its implementing permit regulation, 5 CCR 1002-61, §61.2(73).
3. On or about February 20, 2007, Heyl initiated construction of a single family residential development on 29.881 acres of property located at or near 1st Street and Harness Lane, in or near the Town of Silt, Garfield County, Colorado (the "Project").
4. On February 13, 2007, the Division received an application from Heyl for Project coverage under the Colorado Discharge Permit System ("CDPS") General Permit, Number COR-030000, for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (the "Permit").
5. On February 20, 2007, the Division provided Heyl Certification Number COR-03B428 authorizing Heyl to discharge stormwater from the construction activities associated with the Project to the Colorado River under the terms and conditions of the Permit. Certification Number COR-03B428 became effective February 20, 2007 and remained in effect until it was inactivated at the request of Heyl on January 8, 2009.

6. The Colorado River is “state waters” as defined by §25-8-103(19), C.R.S. and its implementing permit regulation, 5 CCR 1002-61, §61.2 (102).
7. Pursuant to 5 CCR 1002-61, §61.8, a permittee must comply with all the terms and conditions of a permit and violators of the terms and conditions specified in a permit may be subject to civil and criminal liability pursuant to §§25-8-601 through 612, C.R.S.
8. On May 24, 2007, a representative from PG Environmental, LLC (the “Inspector”) conducted an on-site inspection of the Project on behalf of the Division, pursuant to the Division’s authority under §25-8-306, C.R.S., to determine Heyl’s compliance with the Water Quality Control Act and the Permit. During the inspection, the Inspector interviewed Project representatives, reviewed the Project’s stormwater management system records, and performed a physical inspection of the Project.

Deficient and/or Incomplete Stormwater Management Plan

9. Pursuant to Part I. B. of the 2002 Permit, Heyl is required to prepare and maintain a Stormwater Management Plan (“SWMP”) that identifies Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) that, when implemented, will meet the terms and conditions of the Permit. The SWMP is required to identify potential sources of pollution, which may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges associated with construction activity from the Project. In addition, the plan is required to describe and ensure the implementation of BMPs, which would be used to reduce the pollutants in stormwater discharges associated with construction activity.
10. Pursuant to Part I. B. of the 2002 Permit, each project’s SWMP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:
 - a. Site Description - Each plan shall provide a description of the following:
 - i. A description of the construction activity.
 - ii. The proposed sequence for major activities.
 - iii. Estimates of the total area of the site, and the area of the site that is expected to undergo clearing, excavation or grading.
 - iv. An estimate of the runoff coefficient of the site before and after construction activities are completed and any existing data describing the soil, soil erosion potential or the quality of any discharge from the site.
 - v. A description of the existing vegetation at the site and an estimate of the percent vegetative ground cover.
 - vi. The location and description of any other potential pollution sources, such as vehicle fueling, storage of fertilizers or chemicals, etc.
 - vii. The location and description of any anticipated non-stormwater components of the discharge, such as springs and landscape irrigation return flow.
 - viii. The name of the receiving water(s) and the size, type and location of any outfall or, if the discharge is to a municipal separate storm sewer, the name of that system, the location of the storm sewer discharge, and the ultimate receiving water(s).
 - b. Site Map - Each plan shall provide a generalized site map or maps which indicate:
 - i. Construction site boundaries.

- ii. All areas of soil disturbance.
- iii. Areas of cut and fill.
- iv. Areas used for storage of building materials, soils or wastes.
- v. Location of any dedicated asphalt or concrete batch plants.
- vi. Location of major erosion control facilities or structures.
- vii. Springs, streams, wetlands and other surface waters.
- viii. Boundaries of 100-year flood plains, if determined.

c. BMPs for Stormwater Pollution Prevention - The plan shall include a narrative description of appropriate controls and measures that will be implemented before and during construction activities at the facility.

- i. Erosion and Sediment Controls - A description of structural site management controls (Structural Practices) which will minimize erosion and sediment transport and a description of interim and permanent stabilization practices (Non-Structural Practices), including the site-specific scheduling of the implementation of the practices.
- ii. Phased BMP Implementation-The SWMP shall clearly describe the relationship between the phases of construction and the implementation and maintenance of BMP's.
- iii. Material Handling and Spill Prevention - The SWMP shall identify any procedures or significant materials handled at the site that could contribute pollutants to runoff.
- iv. Dedicated Concrete or Asphalt Batch Plants – The SWMP shall clearly describe and locate BMPs to control stormwater pollution from dedicated concrete batch plants or dedicated asphalt batch plants.

d. Final Stabilization and Long-Term Stormwater Management - Description of the measures used to achieve final stabilization and measures to control pollutants in stormwater discharges that will occur after construction operations have been completed.

e. Other Controls - Description of other measures to control pollutants in stormwater discharges, including plans for waste disposal and limiting off-site soil tracking.

f. Inspection and Maintenance - Description of procedures to inspect and maintain in good and effective operating condition the vegetation, erosion and sediment control measures and other protective measures identified in the SWMP.

11. The Division has determined that Heyl failed to prepare and maintain a complete and accurate SWMP for the Project, as described in paragraphs 11(a-n) below:

- a. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Site Description did not provide an adequate description of the proposed sequence of major activities at the site as required by Part I.B.1.b of the Permit.
- b. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Site Description did not provide an estimate of the total area of the site and the area of the site that was expected to undergo clearing, excavation or grading, as required by Part I.B.1.c of the Permit.

- c. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Site Description did not provide an estimate of the runoff coefficient of the site before and after construction activities are completed and any existing data describing the soil, soil erosion potential or the quality of any discharge from the site, as required by Part I.B.1.d of the Permit.
- d. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Site Description did not provide an adequate description of the existing vegetation at the site and an estimate of the percent vegetative ground cover as required by Part I.B.1.e of the permit.
- e. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Site Description did not provide the name of the receiving water(s) and the size, type and location of any outfall or, if the discharge is to a municipal separate storm sewer, the name of that system, the location of the storm sewer discharge, and the ultimate receiving water(s) as required by Part I.B.1.h of the permit.
- f. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not clearly identify the construction site boundaries as required by Part I.B.2 of the Permit. Specifically, the Site Map did not identify the construction site boundaries in a legend or callout.
- g. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not clearly identify all areas of soil disturbance as required by Part I.B.2 of the Permit. Specifically, the Site Map did not depict that the entire site would be exposed at the time of inspection.
- h. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not clearly identify all areas of cut and fill as required by Part I.B.2 of the Permit. Specifically, the Site Map did not clearly identify the existing and proposed contours of the site.
- i. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not identify all areas used for storage of building materials, soils or wastes as required by Part I.B.2 if the Permit. Specifically, the Site Map did not include the fuel storage located at the northeast corner of the site, the soil stockpile located at the south side of the site, and the portable toilets located at the northeast corner of the site.
- j. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not identify the location of major erosion control facilities or structures as required by Part I.B.2 of the Permit. Specifically, the Site Map identified silt fence BMPs along the eastern perimeter of the site; however, this silt fence had not been implemented on the site.
- k. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the Site Map did not identify the location of nearby springs, streams, wetlands, or other

surface waters as required by Part I.B.2 of the Permit. Specifically, the wetland area located at the southeast corner of the site near the intersection of First Street and Harness Lane was not identified on the Site Map.

- l. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on BMPs for Stormwater Pollution Prevention did not include a description of all structural site management practices of BMPs implemented at the facility that will minimize erosion and sediment transport as required by Part I.B.3.a.1 of the permit. For example, straw bales were implemented in the drainage swale adjacent to First Street on the east side of the facility and were not identified in the SWMP.
- m. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on BMPS for Stormwater Pollution Prevention did not clearly identify procedures or significant materials (see definitions at Part I.D of the Permit) that could contribute pollutants to runoff. For example, vehicle fueling was generally referred to in the SWMP but spill prevention and response procedures were not described.
- n. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the inspector reviewed the Project's SWMP and identified that the section in the SWMP on Final Stabilization and Long-Term Stormwater Management did not include a description of the measures used to achieve final stabilization and measures to control pollutants in stormwater discharges that will occur after construction operations have been completed, as required by Part I.B.4 of the Permit.

**Failure to Implement and/or Maintain
Best Management Practices to Protect Stormwater Runoff**

12. Pursuant to Part I. B. 3. a. (1) of the 2002 Permit and Part I. C. 3. c. (1) of the 2007 Permit, Heyl was required to minimize erosion and sediment transport from the Project. The Permit specifies that structural site management practices may include, but are not limited to: straw bales, silt fences, earth dikes, drainage swales, sediment traps, subsurface drains, inlet protection, outlet protection, gabions, and temporary or permanent sediment basins.
13. Pursuant to Part I. B. 3. a. (2) of the 2002 Permit and Part I. C. 3. c. (2) of the 2007 Permit, Heyl was required to implement interim and permanent stabilization practices, including site-specific scheduling of the implementation of the practices. The Permit specifies that site plans should ensure existing vegetation is preserved where possible and that disturbed areas are stabilized. The Permit specifies that non-structural practices may include, but are not limited to: temporary seeding, permanent seeding, mulching, geotextiles, sod stabilization, vegetative buffer strips, protection of trees and preservation of mature vegetation.
14. The Division has determined that Heyl failed to implement and/or maintain functional BMPs at the Project as described in paragraphs 14(a-i) below:
 - a. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that offsite areas beyond the southern project boundary, silt fence BMPs were disturbed and unstabilized, as a result, there were offsite disturbed areas and unstabilized sediment beyond the project boundary, as provided by Rob

Bercher (Estimator/Project Manager, Heyl, LLC.)

- b. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not adequately implemented and maintained at the vehicle tracking control pad, located at the eastern construction entrance off of First Street, a public street. Sediment was visible in the rock pad, and the rock had become thin and sparse in areas. Additionally, adequate BMPs were not implemented to control entry and exit onto the project from First Street. As a result, there was a potential for the transport and discharge of sediment to First Street, a public street.
- c. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not adequately maintained along the western portion of the site. Specifically, a length of silt fence at the detention basin's western toe of slope had sediment and debris accumulated to half the exposed silt fence height. Furthermore, no run-on and slope controls had been implemented on the west side of the detention basin. As a result, there was a potential for the discharge of sediment from this location to the adjacent natural drainage swale.
- d. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not adequately maintained at the southern perimeter of the construction site. Specifically, the silt fence was not properly entrenched in the ground to retain sediment. In addition, the silt fence had gaps and was torn.
- e. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not implemented to prevent the discharge of sediment from a disturbed slope located adjacent to the southern perimeter of the site. Drainage from this area was directed along a silt fence installed at the southern perimeter and the disturbed slope was not stabilized.
- f. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not implemented to prevent the discharge of sediment from the large soil stockpile located just west of the east construction entrance off of First Street roadway. BMPs were not implemented to prevent erosion from water run-on to the stockpile slopes, and no temporary stabilization BMPs had been implemented although the stockpile had been in place for 2 months, as provided by Rob Bercher (Estimator/Project Manager, Heyl, LLC.) Furthermore, little to no ponding volume was available at the toe of the soil stockpile and the silt fence. As a result, there was a potential for the discharge of sediment to First Street roadway and the subsequent adjacent roadway drainage swale.
- g. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not implemented to prevent the discharge of sediment from the disturbed slope area up-gradient from the east construction entrance off of First Street roadway. As a result, there was a potential for the discharge of sediment to the First Street roadway and subsequent adjacent roadway drainage swale.
- h. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that BMPs were not implemented to prevent the discharge of sediment from the disturbed up slope areas north of the eastern construction entrance into the adjacent roadway drainage swale. The straw bales utilized along the west side of First Street roadway in the adjacent roadway drainage swale were not installed in accordance with specifications and design criteria meeting best engineering practice requirements.

Specifically, the straw bales were not properly entrenched into the ground to retain sediment and prevent failure, and were secured using metal form stakes instead of wood stakes. As a result, there was a potential for discharge of sediment from the disturbed up slope areas north of the eastern construction entrance to the adjacent First Street roadway drainage swale.

- i. During the May 24, 2007 inspection, the Inspector observed that an above ground fuel storage tank located just west of the northeast construction entrance was stored without adequate protection to prevent and contain potential spills from contributing pollutants to stormwater runoff. Secondary containment was not apparent for the above ground fuel storage tank. Additionally, adequate perimeter controls had not been implemented to prevent the above ground fuel storage tank from being run into of damaged.
15. Heyl's failure to implement and maintain functional BMPs to protect stormwater quality during construction activities at the Project constitutes violations of Part I. B. 3. a. of the Permit.

Failure to Conduct Inspections of Stormwater Management System

16. Pursuant to Part I. C. 5. a. of the Permit, for active sites where construction has not been completed, Heyl was required to make thorough inspections of its stormwater management systems at least every 14 days, or as indicated in the stormwater management plan, and after any precipitation or snowmelt event that causes surface erosion.
17. Pursuant to Part I. C. 5. b. of the Permit, for sites where all construction activities are completed but final stabilization has not been achieved, Heyl was required to make thorough inspections of its stormwater management systems at least once every month, or as indicated in the stormwater management plan.
18. The Division has determined that Heyl failed to properly conduct inspections of its stormwater management systems at the projects described in paragraphs 18a below:
- a. During the May 24, 2007 inspection of the project, the Inspector reviewed the stormwater management system inspection records and found them to be inadequate as they were not documented as being conducted at a 7 day frequency as indicated in the SWMP.

Heyl's failure to conduct inspections in accordance with its stormwater management plan at the project constitutes violations of Part I. C. 5. of the Permit.

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

19. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, you are hereby notified that the Division has determined that Heyl has violated the following sections of the Colorado Water Quality Control Act's implementing permit regulations.

Part I. B. of the 2002 Permit, which states in part, "The SWMP shall be prepared in accordance with good engineering, hydrologic and pollution control practices. The main objective of the plan shall be to identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) which when implemented will meet the terms and conditions of this permit. The plan shall identify potential sources of pollution (including sediment)

which may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges associated with construction activity from the facility. In addition, the plan shall describe and ensure the implementation of BMPs which will be used to reduce the pollutants in stormwater discharges associated with construction activity. Construction operations must implement the provisions of the SWMP required under this part as a condition of this permit.”

Part I. B. 3. a. of the 2002 Permit, which outlines in part that BMPs for Stormwater Pollution Prevention shall address erosion and sediment controls, including “structural site management practices which will minimize erosion and sediment transport,” and “interim and permanent stabilization practices, including site specific scheduling of the implementation of the practices. Site plans should ensure that existing vegetation is preserved where possible and that disturbed areas are stabilized.”

Part I. C. 5. a. of the 2002 Permit, which states in part, “For active sites where construction has not been completed, the permittee shall make a thorough inspection of their stormwater management system at least every 14 days and after any precipitation or snowmelt event that causes surface erosion.”

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTION

Based upon the foregoing factual and legal determinations and pursuant to §25-8-602, C.R.S., Heyl is hereby ordered to:

20. Within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of this Order, Heyl shall submit to the Division a detailed written statement outlining the standard procedures Heyl will undertake to ensure that functional stormwater management systems are fully implemented at its Colorado construction sites.

NOTICES AND SUBMITTALS

For all documents, plans, records, reports and replies required to be submitted by this Notice of Violation, Heyl shall submit an original and an electronic copy to the Division at the following address:

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Water Quality Control Division / WQCD-B2
Compliance Assurance and Data Management Section
Attention: Danelle Morgan
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South
Denver, Colorado 80246-1530
danelle.morgan@state.co.us

For any person submitting documents, plans, records and reports pursuant to this Notice of Violation , that person shall make the following certification with each submittal:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel

properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.”

OBLIGATION TO ANSWER AND REQUEST FOR HEARING

Pursuant to §25-8-603, C.R.S. and 5 CCR 1002, §21.11 you are required to submit to the Division an answer affirming or denying each paragraph of the Findings of Fact and responding to the Notice of Violation. The answer shall be filed no later than thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of this action.

Section 25-8-603, C.R.S. and 5 CCR 1002, §21.11 also provide that the recipient of a Notice of Violation may request the Division to conduct a public hearing to determine the validity of the Notice, including the Findings of Fact. Such request shall be filed in writing with the Division and include the information specified in 5 CCR 1002, §21.4(B)(2). Absent a request for hearing, the validity of the factual allegations and the Notice of Violation shall be deemed established in any subsequent Department proceeding. The request for hearing, if any, shall be filed no later than thirty (30) calendar days after issuance of this action. The filing of an answer does not constitute a request for hearing.

FALSIFICATION AND TAMPERING

Be advised, in accord with §25-8-610, C.R.S., that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained under the Colorado Water Quality Control Act or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this article is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

POTENTIAL CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES

You are also advised that any person who violates any provision of the Colorado Water Quality Control Act (the “Act”), §§25-8-101 to 703, C.R.S., or of any permit issued under the Act, or any control regulation promulgated pursuant to the Act, or any final cease and desist order or clean-up order issued by the Division shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than ten thousand dollars per day for each day during which such violation occurs. Further, any person who recklessly, knowingly, intentionally, or with criminal negligence discharges any pollutant into any state waters commits criminal pollution if such discharge is made without a permit, if a permit is required by the Act for such discharge, or if such discharge is made in violation of any permit issued under the Act or in violation of any Cease and Desist Order or Clean-up Order issued by the Division. By virtue of issuing this Notice of Violation, the State has not waived its right to bring an action for penalties under §§25-8-608 and 609, C.R.S., and may bring such action in the future.

RELEASE OR DISCHARGE NOTIFICATION

Pursuant to §25-8-601, C.R.S., you are further advised that any person engaged in any operation or activity which results in a spill or discharge of oil or other substance which may cause pollution of the waters of the state, shall notify the Division of the discharge. If said person fails to so notify, said person is guilty of a misdemeanor, and may be fined or imprisoned or both.


EFFECT OF ORDER

Nothing herein contained, particularly those portions requiring certain acts to be performed within a certain time, shall be construed as a permit or license, either to violate any provisions of the public health laws and regulations promulgated thereunder, or to make any discharge into state waters. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to preclude other individuals, cities, towns, counties, or duly constituted political subdivisions of the state from the exercise of their respective rights to suppress nuisances or to preclude any other lawful actions by such entities or the State.

For further clarification of your rights and obligations under this Notice of Violation you are advised to consult the Colorado Water Quality Control Act, §§25-8-101 to 703, C.R.S., and regulations promulgated thereunder, 5 CCR 1002.

Issued at Denver, Colorado, this 14th day of April, 2009.

FOR THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT



Lori M. Gerzina, Section Manager
Compliance Assurance Section
WATER QUALITY CONTROL DIVISION