

Jerry Schamel

1. Scrap the SIC or NAICS codes from the start of the permit. While helpful to narrow down who is required to have a permit, the codes do not directly tie to "industrial activity". For example, log yards do not have a NAICS or SIC code. They were implied to be part of logging, but by definition do not count as logging. Instead, define each sector for what it is. This way it is harder for 3rd parties to try and get someone who doesn't need coverage under coverage and harder for industry who needs coverage to find a way out of it. This would also eliminate the need to "add new industry groups" as the two being pulled in would likely already be covered under one of the other categories if it weren't for the use of codes.
2. We need more protection for groundwater discharges. As it is now, anyone can infiltrate their water no matter how nasty and get out of permit coverage. Ecology doesn't appear ready to handle issuing individual groundwater permit. Set benchmarks at drinking water standards to be met at the vadose zone.
3. Require that all people who have a permit put their SWPPP online for review.
4. The references to manuals for BMPs is confusing. All BMPs that need to be onsite should be listed as an appendix to the permit.
5. Each sector should have it's own permit. Breaking out the sectors would allow Ecology to write industry specific BMPs for each sector instead of relying on the manuals. This approach would also give the public a chance to weigh in on what is required for each industry. This would help lead to a more formal consideration of what AKART is for each group instead of relying on that group and their paid consultants to determine that the way the Port's have attempted to do.
6. While I applaud Ecology for attempting to collect data on the first flush, including a date is the wrong way to do so. This leads to confusion and is exploited by industry anyway who sample whenever they feel like it anyway. And while the date does a better job of correlating the East and West side data, the first fall flush is more of a West side issue. Either remove the date (as dates can change on a year by year basis) and replace it with "first discharge after the dry season" or revert back to Oct. 1 so that is easier to align with the quarterly sample scheme.
7. Require the submittal of a form for people claiming substantially identical. Many are not identical and ecology doesn't have the staff to catch those who use that claim to avoid sampling.
8. Remove consistent attainment. Even with a one time per year sample, industry will only keep their site clean immediately before they sample and will still be out of compliance when not sampling.
9. Remove the magnesium benchmark, there are no water quality standards for this and it was added by EPA for no other reason then they didn't know what they were doing.
10. The TSS effluent limit should be statewide. This is an easy limit to meet.
11. Require the Visual Oil Sheen as monthly. Since they are inspecting their sites anyway, they should already be looking for this. Since there is no test to pay for, and if they see it is an exceedance, require it monthly.
12. Ecology needs to provide more guidance to small permittees. As it is now, the only trainings are

by independent places that are too expensive or put on by consulting firms who try to sell their "magic seeds" that never work. Ecology training would allow us to get the info from the people who actually know what is going on and not secondhand.

13. Ecology should attempt to accredit consultants/engineers/etc the same way they do labs. This would ensure the work we get is actually correct and not some way for a consultant to fleece us out of our money. While the manuals help figure some stuff out, and Ecology engineers review the plans, many places try to use off the shelf stuff without even attempting to see if it would work according to Ecology.

14. Require submittal of engineering reports even for off the shelf treatment.

15. Looking over the data in the fact sheet, it is obvious certain industries are problematic (i.e. water transportation). The median is far above the marine water quality standard. Why hasn't ecology initiated enforcement on those people? Instead, 3rd parties must get involved to level the playing field for those of us who try to do the right thing. Just because they have a powerful lobby and union does not excuse them from the requirements of the law.