

October 22, 2012  
Ms. Jeanine Townsend  
Clerk of the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

#60



**Subject: Comment Letter – Draft Industrial Storm Water NPDES General Permit issued July 16, 2012**

Dear Ms. Townsend and Members of the Board:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Industrial Storm Water NPDES General Permit issued July 16, 2012. I appreciate the effort that went into this second draft, and that many issues that I both raised and was concerned about were addressed. However, there are a few that still concern me, about authorization to do the job I am doing, practical sampling, electronic filing, and the role of the groups. In general, I agree with the California Stormwater Quality Association's recommendations. I have additional comments, though.

**1 QISP and Certifications**

I agree with the comments heard about granting full QISP to other professionals not listed in the current Draft, especially for those in the storm water field, and Certified Hazardous Materials Managers, for example.

I am also concerned about my having the "appropriate qualifications" by July 1, 2014, when the permit requires a QISP I or above, to certify the facility SWPPP and provide employee training by July 1, 2014. I am a chemist, and an Environmental Safety and Health Coordinator. I currently do the QISP I tasks, but, short of becoming one of the listed engineers in two years, won't likely be able to do it in 2014. The cost of a Professional Engineer or similar licensee to certify a SWPPP and to provide basic employee storm water training would be exorbitant. One recommendation is to put off those dates, and another would be to grandfather professionals currently doing the job of a QISP I, who are getting training in a group, until the training & certification is established and available.

**2 Sampling**

I am in agreement with those who have commented that darkness needs to be taken into account, for both the sampler's safety and the character of the sample. An insufficient light source, at many outfalls, might also make accurate sampling extremely difficult.

**3 Electronic Filing**

As a Safety and Health professional, I am totally opposed to putting the entire SWPPP in a location where anyone and everyone may access it. Although our company, like many others has been working diligently to drive down any hazardous properties of our product, concentrated raw materials are being used, which could be a hazard to the public if placed in the wrong environment. Many of those concentrated materials are not on the Homeland Security's lists. I am opposed to the map with the location designations of those raw materials being included in any public document. Currently, anyone with

significant amounts of chemicals must report them to the county and the state, already, but there is a protective process in place to keep the information out of the hands of those who would either endanger others, or profit from the information, at the expense of the business. The Certified Unified Public agencies (usually counties & city fire departments) are the defacto regulators, anyway, so any additional computer reporting of materials by a facility is redundant.

**4** Monitoring Groups

Kelly-Moore Paint is currently in the California Paint Council Monitoring Group. The group leaders have given group members storm water training, inspections, recommendations on BMPs, and kept group members apprised of what is going on in the storm water regulatory world. Although groups are looked on, in this permit, only as a source of data, they are a valuable asset, beyond that, which needs to be recognized. I recommend that QSP training by their legal and environmental staff be more than encouraged in the next draft.

Thank you, again for considering these comments.

Best regards,

Janet Bailey  
EH&S Coordinator  
Kelly-Moore Paint Co., Inc.  
987 Commercial St.  
PO Box 3016  
San Carlos, CA 94070-1316  
o(650) 610-4151  
m(650) 333-4322  
fx(650)590-6355