

October 13, 2005

Karen Dinicola
Water Quality Program
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47696
Olympia, WA 98504-7696

Submitted by email to kdin461@ecy.wa.gov on October 15, 2005

We appreciated the opportunity to ask questions and get a better understanding of the draft permit at the workshop presented by Ecology staff in Spokane last month.

Spokane County's Comments on Draft of Phase 2 Permit for Eastern Washington

Page 9 of 37 S5.B.1. Would ecology be willing to develop the multimedia approach and other information for dissemination by permittees? It seems impractical and redundant for every jurisdiction to develop what should be almost identical presentations and educational information.

Page 10 of 37 S5.B.1.a "...identify and characterize target audiences.." and "...develop and implement a public education and outreach strategy." These requirements seem vague and very open to interpretation. Is this criteria developed more fully elsewhere? If not can it be?

Page 11 of 37 S5.B.3.b.iii. Asking people not to wash their cars does not seem reasonable... Does Ecology truly believe that education of the public regarding stormwater pollution will make them not want to wash their cars. Enforcement of such a restriction is also not likely to be politically acceptable to our elected officials. The ability to wash your car is right up there with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I would suggest softening the language to "Care should be taken to prevent car wash water from entering MS4's."

Wash water is integral to our street sweeping process. Normally, the dirt and debris is washed to the gutter and then picked up by sweepers. The washing is necessary both to consolidate the dirt and debris in the gutter and also to control dust during the sweeping operation. I would suggest that the language to revised to state, "Permittee must minimize the amount of street wash water used to avoid washing pollutants into the MS4."

How do we keep flows from riparian habitats and wetlands out of MS4's when they are typically coming from private, undeveloped and unmaintained property? Additionally, water from riparian and wetland areas are not generally considered significant sources of pollutants. We would suggest deleting this bullet.

Similarly, the water from foundation drains, footing drains, water from crawlspaces, and uncontaminated groundwater infiltrating into separate storm sewers are not typically considered significant sources of pollutants. Generally speaking if we are using storm sewers it is because we are in an area that experiences seasonally high groundwater and the only reasonable place to discharge the groundwater from footing drains and sump pumps is in the storm sewers. The separate storm sewer system for groundwater mentioned in the workshop is not economical and would require additional maintenance.

Is there any flexibility in the way that “illicit discharge” is defined? If a local jurisdiction permits a groundwater discharge from footing drains and sump pumps to the storm sewer system and ensures the discharge is appropriately treated prior to discharge to surface water, can it then be considered a “permitted” discharge? Local jurisdictions could be required to keep records of these permitted discharges and to disclose the information in the annual reports.

We would suggest either deleting the bullet, modifying it to only include groundwater with significant pollutants or revising it to allow local jurisdictions to permit such discharges as long as those discharges are tracked and reported. At a minimum, any existing discharges of groundwater from footing drains and sump pumps should continue to be allowed.

Page 14 of 37, lines 32 – 36 Does this mean the local jurisdiction will need to obtain a copy of the Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans for private construction sites? If the local jurisdiction’s stormwater manual is equivalent to the Eastern WA Stormwater Manual, in terms of site plan review, is it also necessary to look at the SWPPP? If the site developer does not have a SWPPP, is the local jurisdiction required to inform Ecology? Please clarify the local jurisdiction’s responsibilities.

Page 15 of 37, S5.B.5 While ongoing maintenance of BMPs is important, we are concerned that it may be difficult for local jurisdictions to get access to some sites after construction is completed. We suggest allowing 3rd party/owner certification by Qualified Personnel of the ongoing BMPs’ continued operation and maintenance.

Appendix 5. We like the way the appendix is laid out to serve as a checklist of the tasks that need to be performed yearly. It is clear and easy to follow.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Spokane County Engineers

Matt Zarecor, P.E.
Development Services Manager

Brenda Sims
Stormwater Utility Manager