

City of Olympia

The City of Olympia appreciates the opportunity to comment on the 2019 Draft NPDES Permits. The City of Olympia continues to implement Stormwater Management practices designed to improve water quality throughout the City. The City welcomes clarity with the NPDES Permits, thereby allowing for best achievable compliance with requirements and standards while improving water quality.

City of Olympia comments on 2019 Draft Phase II Permit November 14, 2018				
Name	Document	Section	Page	Comment
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S1.D.2.a.iii	9 of 92	Suggest reviewing this section and updating the list of secondary permittees names. Washington State General Administration is now Department of Enterprise Services (DES)
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S3.A.2.	12 of 92	It appears the reference to <i>56 Stormwater Management Program for Cities, Towns, and Counties</i> is incorrectly referenced in this section and should actually be <i>55</i> .
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.A.5.C.1	17 of 92	The language may not capture all jurisdictions. Many jurisdictions do annual or semi-annual updates of their Comprehensive Plans, but updates are only <i>required</i> by Commerce every 8 years. Refer to https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/s/ih7k99b6ars6lsgdje9czjmeq4zk1jjw
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S.5.C.1.c.i,	19 of 92	Recommend a separate timeline for permittees choosing to meet the SMAP requirement as a regional effort. A regional effort will require a substantial increase in time and resources for coordination (MOU/Interlocal Agreement and charter creation) and lining up values. Also funding outside of jurisdictional boundaries will be more burdensome, adding to potential barriers.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2	21 of 92	The following language is unclear " <i>If a Permittee chooses to adopt one or more elements of a regional program, the Permittee shall participate in the regional group and implement the regional program in the local jurisdiction</i> ". What is the intent? It seems to suggest that program elements shouldn't be shared unless there is full participation. If the intent is to require participation to receive credit, it should be stated that way. The language potentially makes it extremely burdensome and costly to a jurisdiction with interest in a single regional campaign and not the rest of the programs provided. For example, is it Ecology's intent that a jurisdiction utilizing Puget Sound Starts Here campaign for Don't Drip and Drive shall now also participate and complete all of the other campaigns associated with Puget Sound Starts Here? What about the regional STORM group? It seems local jurisdictions understand their local water quality problems and would have a better idea of which educational programs and campaigns would be more/less appropriate for their jurisdiction than to just subscribe fully to a regional program. Permittees need flexibility in designing programs and developing working partnerships.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.b		We believe there needs to be a concerted effort to distinguish between the different terms "campaign" and "programs". Campaigns are efforts directed towards a specific topic or behavior for a limited duration of time. Programs are broader and generally ongoing. We consider Education and Outreach the "Program", while behavior change efforts are discrete "campaigns".
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.b	23 of 92	There is a disagreement with the word "ongoing" being used in this sentence. The 2012-2018 NPDES permit E&O campaigns were never intended or required to be "ongoing". Ecology can not require a jurisdiction to continue these campaigns. For a variety of reasons jurisdictions may cease campaigns, including changing science, water quality and management priorities, costs, etc.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.b	23 of 92	Because best available science changes priorities, can you please include the option to start a new campaign for this requirement.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.b	23 of 92	Please update all requirements in S5.C.2 to allow for a new campaign. The use of the language "existing" is limiting to permittees, it also assumes campaigns continue in perpetuity which is not the case. It may be appropriate to include to language "expired" if keeping "existing".
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.b	23 of 92	Propose the following text: No later than July 1, 2020 Each permittee shall conduct a new evaluation of a behavior change campaign. Or the permittee may choose to conduct a new evaluation of an expired/existing campaign from the 2012-2018 NPDES Permit.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.c.(1) and (2)	24 of 92	In 1 and 2, recommend including the term "expired" in front of or after "existing" in accordance with the disagreement that campaigns are required to be ongoing as this was never identified in the 2013-2018 permit.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.(d)	24 of 92	The timeline is insufficient to begin implementing the strategy. For example if you are planning on conducting workshops, two months is not enough time to secure a venue, hire speakers, advertise the event, carry out all the planning and implementation logistics, and secure the funding. Also, CBSM recommends running a pilot project and evaluating it, implementing changes before implementing the full campaign broadly. So you don't waste money and time. There is nothing in the timeline that allows for this step.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.(d)	24 of 92	Recommend that the third step be a timeline (No later than August 1, 2021) to implement a pilot campaign with evaluation. This should take six months.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.(d)	24 of 92	Then the last step ((e) No later than March 31, 2024 evaluate and report on the changes in understanding and adoption of targeted behaviors)....
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.2.(f)	24 of 92	Ecology must provide in clarifying terms whether or not the permit is requiring that these campaigns be ongoing into the next permit cycle. The result of this campaign may not be positive or effective, and priorities may change based on best available sciences, therefore it should not be ongoing.

Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.4.b.i	27 of 92	Why is there a start date and no end date for mapping the size and materials of outfalls?
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.4.c	27 of 92	Unless scanned images are acceptable, electronic formats should be defined.
				IDDE - concern with recordkeeping proposal and schema. Not sure why the need for all of the information and parameters being included. Please eliminate the suggested required xml file format. This would require substantial resources for smaller jurisdictions without IT programming staff. Please explain why there has been such a large increase in request of multiple parameters of information. It isn't clear the extra collection of data will do much to eliminate a potential pollution problem and how it will help inform the program. Also, there is a concern staff conducting investigations in the field may not take the time to do a thorough and consistent job. If the proposed language remains, there needs to be some ramp up time allowed to develop a new database, provide training and ensure QA/QC.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.5	27 of 92	
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.5.e.iv	32 of 92	The revision to the third bullet seems erroneous.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.6.a.ii	34 of 92	The "prior to" date could be problematic. What if a jurisdiction adopted a manual equivalent to the 2014 SWMMWW prior to January 1, 2017?
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.7.iii.e	49 of 92	New requirement to document all practices, policies and procedures (SOPs) without a roll-out date. This may put us in immediate non-compliance. There needs to be a due date included with this permit requirement.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.8.	51 of 92	"Application and enforcement of local ordinances at sites, identified pursuant to S5.C.8.b.ii, including sites with discharges authorized by a separate NPDES permit." Need guidance document on how to manage enforcement process for when this occurs. How are disagreements settled and which permits take jurisdictional lead? This has been a real world issue in the past and may become more of an issue once the source control program roles out.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.8.a.i and S5.C.8.b.i	51 and 52	The requirement for structural BMPs could be substantial and burdensome. Are there any timeframes proposed for corrections? One foreseen problematic area is existing non-conforming gravel parking lots. Paving typically triggers all minimum requirements. Businesses may close down rather than comply, but runoff would continue.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.8.a.iv	51 of 92	This item could be more specific. It is assumed it applies only to Permittee owned and operated lands. Recommend changing the language to read: Practices to reduce polluted runoff from the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer discharging into MS4s from land owned or operated by the Permittee.
Olympia	2019 Draft Phase II Permit Redline	S5.C.8.b.v and General Training Comment	54 of 92	Training is called for throughout the permit, but qualified trainers and applicable training is limited. Will Ecology consider developing training materials for source control BMPs, IDDE and erosion and sediment control? Training for operations and maintenance field staff working on linear transportation and drainage projects would be helpful. The CESCL training available (through approved by Ecology) is designed for square acre parcel development and is inadequate for O&M staff. Sending municipal staff to this training undermines credibility because staff believe it is a wasted effort of 16 hours and often come back more confused. CESCL training has little relevance to the work they do. Where training is required in the permit, we recommend Ecology take the lead on working toward developing appropriate minimum training standards and curriculum. It would also be helpful if Ecology housed a training page on their website with training classes, materials, technical materials/standards and training videos. It is also recognized that some training is necessarily specific to a jurisdiction.