

Darin Janda

Draft PSNGP Comments

These comments of the draft PSNGP are submitted by the Mukilteo Water and Wastewater District.

1. Page 7, S2, A. 1. Obtaining Permit Coverage- “must apply for permit coverage no later than 45 days after the effective date of this General Permit”.

Comment: 45 days is insufficient time for a WWTP to make an informed decision to voluntarily apply for the PSNGP. To try and review the impacts to the facility and engineering requirements, make a decision and present this information to a counsel, board or commissioners for review and approval within a 45-day window is not possible. This difficulty is compounded as there are no proposed limits for any facility in this draft and early planning can not proceed.

2. Page 22, Table 10 and page 24, S6, B. Nitrogen Optimization Plan and Report-

Comment: If a WWTP has already submitted this report under the original PSNGP would that submittal complete this requirement with no further actions needed?

3. Page 25, S6, 2, b. Discharge Evaluation- “By March each year beginning in 2026”.

Comment: The first reporting period would be much less than one year. By Ecy comments the draft PSNGP is not expected to be adopted until the winter of 2025 giving only 4 months of data to make a discharge evaluation and propose process/engineering changes. To require a facility to produce an evaluation, propose and make changes based on four months of data is not realistic.

4. Page 26, S6, C. 1. AKART Analysis- “Permittees that maintain an annual TIN average of <10mg/L and do not document an increase in load through their DMRs do not have to submit this analysis”.

Comment: The words “increase in loads” is very vague. Does this refer to influent TIN, effluent TIN, gallons per day/year, what? Also, with the PSNGP expected to be adopted in winter 2025 this is insufficient time to study, engineer and propose an AKART analysis by June 2026.

5. Page 35, S7, C. Table 19

Comments: In the PSNRP it states that in the future the method of measuring nutrients will be TN instead of TIN. Why is not TN listed in this table for monitoring then? If there is to be a move from TIN to TN I think now would be a beneficial time to make this change and collect the data.

6. Page 40, S9, F. Records Retention

Comments: This paragraph is confusing and is written, it seems, counter to required current records retention schedules. Was the intention of this records retention section for only the PSNGP? If so, what is meant by the sentence “for a minimum of 5 years following the termination of permit coverage”?

If the intention of this section is to apply to the WWTPs General Permit, It appears that this schedule would require a WWTP to retain every lab report, maintenance log, field reports, permits and DMRs for the lifetime of the WWTP plus 5 years after the facility closes, is this what Ecology is proposing?

7. Page 42, S10. Permit Fees

Comments: There is no mention in this section if the fee for this voluntary permit is inclusive of the WWTPs General Permit (one fee for both permits). Or will there be a permit fee for the voluntary PSNGP and another fee for the General Permit costing the WWTP more to opt into the PSNGP?

Transparency on this issue is crucial for WWTPs to move forward.

8. Page 45, G7. Duty to Reapply

Comment: If application is made in a timely manner and Ecy does not approve the permit within 180 days, will the old permit continue until Ecy can approve the permit renewal?

9. Page 46, G12. Additional Monitoring- “Ecology may establish specific monitoring requirements in addition to those contained in this permit by administrative order or permit modification”.

Comment: Should add “after the effected WWTPs are notified in writing and allowed a 30-day appeal period”.

10. Page 46, G15. Duty To Comply

Comments: Should add “after written notification and a 30-day appeal period”.