

Informal Comments on the PRELIMINARY DRAFT Municipal Stormwater Permits (Phase I, Eastern and Western Phase II) and Stormwater Management Manuals (Eastern and Western)
 October 17 - December 2, 2022

PRELIMINARY DRAFT TOPIC (select from drop down)	Comment	Comment Made By
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	Realistic canopy cover retention/restoration objectives: the proposal mentions a few results from the SAM study for canopy cover (CC) and B-IBI. Before using these results as targets, conducting a pilot test and calculating CC using a chosen CC dataset across a few areas of interest is recommended	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	There are various sources and methods used to identify/calculate tree canopy across an area, and can have varying results. It would be useful if these source(s) could be provided to the permittees to keep consistency with Ecology and between permittees.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	Jurisdiction/purview: Large scale tree canopy retention and target levels is better addressed in a land use code or forestry practices. It is already included in the Structural Source Control list. If Ecology wants to increase trees, they should increase the points for tree retention and tree canopy restoration, rather than add it as another requirement in our permit.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	Define the areas of interest: the proposal mentions different scales (landscape, watershed, riparian, etc). A clear definition of the areas of interest would be useful in choosing the most meaningful area to calculate canopy cover. Realistic canopy cover retention/restoration objectives: the proposal mentions a few results from the SAM study for canopy cover (CC) and B-IBI. Before using results such as these as targets, Pierce County recommends a pilot test and calculate CC using a chosen CC dataset, across a few areas of interest ("watersheds", "landscapes", etc), in areas with varying levels of development, to see if CC can be reliably measured and the targets are applicable across a large and variable area.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	A clear definition of "landscape scale" would be useful since the area of interest is an integral part to calculating canopy cover.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	Will Ecology provide these sources to the permittees? It would be good to use the same sources for tree canopy as some sources may yield different results than others.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	We urge Ecology to gather more information from permittees before adding canopy retention or restoration requirements to an already complex permit. Tree benefit is dependent on the species, size and location. Recommend Ecology gather information on if, and how permittees organizations track tree canopy, what methods they use and then consider only high value areas for regulation, if at all.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Tree Retention	Pierce County strongly recommends that tree canopy retention remain an option in the Structural Source Control program rather than a separate requirement in the permit. Adding tree planting and maintenance may be a valuable behavior change option in the Education and Outreach section of the permit, but setting canopy standards across privately owned property is not feasible or reasonable for a municipality to enforce.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Mapping	We are looking to better our database for NPDES features (outfalls, discharge points, connections, etc) and we can use this format/schema in the new database. Does Ecology plan to provide a format for the other NPDES features too? Possibly even UICs?	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Mapping	What would be the process for adapting the format in the future? For example, if a particular attribute/field requires an addition, would the permittee request that change from ECY and the update be rolled out to all the permittees? Or are we free to edit the format ourselves?	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Mapping	Our estimate for adopting the new format would be 1-2 years.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Mapping	We recommend that Ecology use the simplest template that is most likely used by all permittees, such as the Excel format. SRI and Shapefiles already exist and are likely to be formatted to integrate with the jurisdiction's own mapping needs, not Ecology's. Requiring outfalls in a specific data format will duplicate work already completed.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: PCBs	The PCB regulations are not manageable within a municipal stormwater permit. PCB regulation efforts would be better designed to be similar to general outreach through joint education and outreach efforts, similar to household hazardous waste, lead paint concerns, etc.	Pierce County

MS4 Permit: PCBs	Pierce County is concerned about the the IDDE section of this proposed language: The County does not have a database of buildings by age. Gathering this information would require research to find the data, creating a database and map, and developing a system to track these buildings. Even after that was created, there is no permit for building washing. The only way we'd know a building was being washed would be through a complaint call and the only authority we'd have to stop the washing was if it was reaching a stormdrain connected to our MS4 or a receiving water. If washwater is not impacting the MS4 or receiving waters, this would be a toxics cleanup issue.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: PCBs	Ecology should create an exemption for window washing. Removal of the routine external building washdown may appear to prohibit window washing.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Sweeping	Water quality benefits of sweeping are dependent on the type of sweeper and the surrounding land use, not just ADT. As written, permittees will be forced to spend money that doesn't benefit water quality and Ecology won't see the downstream benefits they are hoping for. This language should be narrowed to streets that don't drain to treatment, are curbed, and have a high traffic volume that includes traffic signals or other traffic controls that cause frequent braking and turning and drain to a salmon bearing stream.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Sweeping	Ecology cites the consultant report as evidence for sweeping being effective at managing 6-PPD. The report suggested only that some of the ideas listed <u>could</u> be effective. More research needs to be done before implementing an expensive sweeping program across every permittees jurisdiction.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Ecology failed to provide a document showing the Appendix 1 changes within the document. We understand that a track change document was messy and unreadable, however there are numerous options for crossing out, highlighting or changing the font in any word processing application that Ecology could have used to provide a readable document showing the proposed changes. This does not seem like a transparent and genuine effort to gather permittees input, especially considering that many coordinators workloads in the Phase II communities are such that they may not have time to compare documents to determine changes./ This could lead to under representation from Phase II jurisdictions in the comments that Ecology receives.	Pierce County
SWMMWW Item 1: Table of Contents	Ecology failed to provide a document showing the SWMMWW changes within the document. We understand that a track change document was messy and unreadable, however there are numerous options for crossing out, highlighting or changing the font in any word processing application that Ecology could have used to provide a readable document showing the proposed changes. This does not seem like a transparent and genuine effort to gather permittees input, especially considering that many coordinators workloads in the Phase II communities are such that they may not have time to compare documents to determine changes./ This could lead to under representation from Phase II jurisdictions in the comments that Ecology receives.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	The Bioretention BMPs definition adds unnecessary complexity to existing requirements. Plants "adapted to the local climate and soil moisture condition" is vague and open to individual interpretation, which could lead to conflicts during permit review. The "typically sited to receive stormwater runoff from a small contributing area" is also vague. Is there a limit to the size a bioretention should be? Is there a maximum amount of runoff that should be directed to any one bioretention system? Please specify these in the language to prevent confusion. Without specifics developers will be able to justify any size bioretention BMP. If the intent is to limit the size, that size should be spelled out and if exceptions are intended to be permitted, the conditions for an exception should be spelled out.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Recommend removal of "movement of earth" to the land disturbing activity changes made. The phrase "movement of earth or" could apply to a compost pile, or a stockyard of soil material.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	On-site stormwater management. Requesting Ecology add the word preservation as shown: "Development, <u>preservation</u> and mitigation...."	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	The definition for project is confusing. Recommend clarifying language.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: PCBs	Will there be a threshold size for buildings required to meet PCB requirements? For brick buildings with window caulking will there be a de minimis exemption for buildings under a certain size or that have potential minimal PCB exposure (ie window caulking in brick buildings)	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Pavement maintenance : "The exemption MAY only be applied.." followed by "the entire project MUST be" clarify whether this is a recommendation or a requirement	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Underground Utility Projects : "This exemption MAY only be applied to" clarify whether this is a recommendation or a requirement	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Underground Utility Projects: "materials with similar runoff characteristics" Clarify and provide examples.	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Bioretention BMPs definition: Bioretention facilities include a variety of plant material....Is vegetation required element for Bioretention BMPs?	Pierce County
MS4 Permit: Appendix 1 (Phase I and Western Phase II)	Bioretention BMPs definition: Suggest to delete "typically sited to receive stormwater runoff from a small contributing area"	Pierce County

