March 4, 2014

State Water Resources Control Board
c/o Jeannie Townsend, Clerk to the Board
1001 “I” Street, 24th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Submitted via email: commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Comment Letter – April 1, 2014 Board Meeting: Final Draft Industrial General Permit

Dear Ms. Townsend and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD), thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the 2014 Draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (Permit) released February 19, 2014. SASD provides wastewater collection services to 1.2 million residents throughout the greater Sacramento area and is an existing discharger under 97-03-DWQ. The 2014 Draft Permit will have a direct impact on two municipal corporation yards that are owned and operated by SASD.

SASD supports the use of a general industrial permit for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activities, and appreciates the efforts of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in accepting comments on the 2014 Draft Industrial General Permit.

The following comments are being provided by SASD to address our main issues of concern with this draft Permit. The draft Permit text is shown in black, SASD's additions are in blue-underline text, and deletions are shown in red-strikeout.

General Comment
SASD is very concerned with the short comment period provided by the SWRCB (essentially 9 business days). There are several substantive changes to the current draft, which was just released on February 19, 2014 at 5:00 pm.
Then on February 24, 2014, the SWRCB released an additional 200 pages of their Response to Comments on the previous July 2013 Draft. Due to the substantive changes and large volume of documents released, SASD encourages the SWRCB to extend the comment period to allow a more thorough review by affected stakeholders.

**Main Comment:**
SASD’s main comment is regarding the new revision to Appendix 3 - Waterbodies with Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Impairments, and the related permit sections. The Permit language should be clear and distinguish between those that discharge directly into a 303(d) listed impaired receiving water, and those that do not have a direct discharge. For instance, several Dischargers may discharge into a municipal storm system (MS4), but only the MS4 permittee discharges directly into receiving water. The following modifications will provide clarity for Dischargers and minimize unnecessary sampling, while still being protective of the waterbodies and watershed.

**Appendix 3 - Waterbodies with Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Impairments** should be clarified to state:

> "The 303(d) impairments below are sourced from the 2010 Integrated Report. The rows in red are impairments for which industrial storm water Dischargers subject to this General Permit are not required to analyze the discharge from their facility for additional parameters unless directed by the Regional Water Board, because these parameters are typically not associated with industrial storm water. Test methods with substantially similar or more stringent method detection limits may be used if approved by the staff of the State Water Board prior to sampling and analysis and upon approval, will be added into SMARTS. The rows that are not in red are impairments for which Dischargers that discharge directly into in the 303(d) impaired watershed waterbody are required to analyze for additional parameters, if applicable, because these parameters are more likely to be associated with industrial storm water. See General Permit Section XI.B.6.e. In the event that any of the impairments in this appendix are subsequently delisted, the affected Dischargers in to that watershed waterbody are no longer required to analyze for the additional parameters for those impairments, and the provisions for new Dischargers in to 303(d) impaired watersheds waterbodies contained in Section VII.B of this General Permit no longer apply for those impairments. Dischargers that contribute a portion of the combined flow and loading for a 303(d) listed parameter in an affected waterbody may be required to sample, if the combined discharge exceeds a water quality standard."

**Related General Permit Sections:**

**XI. Monitoring, B. Sampling and Analysis, Page 41** should be clarified to state:

6. e. “Additional applicable industrial parameters related to receiving waters with 303(d) listed impairments or approved TMDLs based on the assessment in Section X.G.2.xia.ix. Test methods with lower detection limits may be necessary when directly discharging to receiving waters with 303(d) listed impairments or TMDLs;”
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SASD supports, in general, the California Stormwater Quality Association’s (CASQA) comment letter and supporting documents associated with the review of the 2014 Draft Industrial General Permit released February 19, 2014.

In conclusion, we urge the SWRCB to consider our comments regarding the 2014 Final Draft Industrial General Permit, and ensure that with any additional requirements there is an equal corresponding environmental benefit.

If you have questions or comments regarding the items above, please feel free to contact me at (916) 876-6092 or MitchellT@sac sewer.com or Nanette Bailey (916) 876-6038 or BaileyN@sac sewer.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Terrie Mitchell  
Manager, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs
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Cc:    Prabhakar Somavarapu, District Engineer  
       Rosemary Clark, SASD Director of Operations  
       Christoph Dobson, Director of Policy and Planning  
       Matt Doyle, Senior Safety Specialist  
       Lysa Voight, Senior Civil Engineer