

July 8, 2014

Jeff Killelea
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

RE: Port of Vancouver, USA Comments on the Draft NPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit

Dear Mr. Killelea:

The Port of Vancouver, USA (port) would like to provide comment on the draft NDPEs 2015 - 2020 Industrial Stormwater General Permit (draft permit) released for comment May 7th, 2014. The port takes environmental stewardship seriously, and it is our commitment to strive for programs and policies that allow nature and industry to successfully coexist. The port appreciates the State of Washington Department of Ecology's (Ecology) efforts to limit changes to the existing ISGP. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft permit and we look forward to the response to comments for further clarification.

- Condition S3.B.1.j – All areas of existing and potential soil erosion must be identified on the site map in the SWPPP. The current permit only requires identifying areas subject to erosion “in a significant amount”. We recommend retaining the “in a significant amount” language in the permit since it is impractical to locate all areas with any potential for erosion. With the proposed language, if an area with a minor or insignificant amount of erosion is not identified, it could be a violation of the permit.
- Condition S6.C – Additional Sampling Requirements and Effluent Limits for Discharges to Certain 303(d)-listed Impaired Waters and Puget Sound Cleanup Sites. While not currently directly applicable to POV, this proposal may establish a precedent that could be extended to other urban areas in the future. While the TSS effluent limits proposed when discharging to a water body impaired for any sediment-quality parameter at a Puget Sound Sediment Cleanup Site and additional sampling and cleaning requirements are not directly applicable to the port, we are concerned that these additional requirements are not warranted. First, Permittees already must sample their discharge for turbidity. While a direct correlation between turbidity and TSS is not always possible, it is likely that if a Permittee can achieve the 25 NTU benchmark, its discharge will contain less than 30 mg/L of TSS. In addition, measurement of TSS in stormwater has no relationship to the potential for causing contamination in receiving water sediments. If solids

comprising the TSS are relatively clean, sediments in the receiving water will not be impacted, yet a permit violation could occur if TSS levels are above the effluent limit. If Ecology believes that monitoring of TSS is necessary, we suggest Ecology establish a TSS benchmark to dischargers into Puget Sound Sediment Cleanup Sites, requiring Permittees that exceed the benchmark to follow the corrective action process if the benchmark is exceeded. An effluent limit is not required for these facilities unless the discharges are into a Category 5 impaired water body. Finally, requiring sampling of sediments in storm drains for pollutants of concern does not appear warranted because material captured by the storm drain system are not indicative of discharges to receiving waters. Capture of solids is a function of the storm drain system. When storm drains are properly maintained (which is currently a requirement of the permit), solids would be periodically removed and properly disposed of, resulting in no impact to receiving waters. In this case, the measurement of storm drain sediment pollutant levels would provide no useful information.

- Condition S9.E – Permittees must submit a detailed written report to report permit violations to Ecology within 5 days, instead of within 30 days, as required by the existing permit. Changing the requirement to provide a detailed written report of permit violations to Ecology within 5 days is unreasonable, particularly if the 5 days could include a weekend or holiday. Fully characterizing the problem and developing a solution may require more time. In addition, obtaining appropriate internal review and proper signatures for the report will likely require more time than 5 days.
- Appendix 4 – This appendix now lists dischargers into Category 4A and 4B water bodies, yet Condition S6.C states that the additional sampling requirement and effluent limits only apply to dischargers to Category 5 waters. The permit also states that the dischargers subject to the additional sampling and effluent limits are listed in Appendix 4. The permit language and appendix should be revised so that additional sampling and effluent limits only for dischargers to Category 5 waters.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,



Phillip Martello
Environmental Specialist
Port of Vancouver, USA