

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

**United States Department of Defense, Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Fleet Logistics
Center Puget Sound, Manchester Fuel Department
NPDES Permit WA0002780
November 2020**

On October 11, 2018, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a public notice for the reissuance of the United States Department of Defense, Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Fleet Logistics Center Puget Sound, Manchester Fuel Department, (Logistics Center) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. WA0002780.

This Response to Comments document provides a summary of significant comments received and corresponding EPA responses.

The EPA received comments from:

- E.P. Nixon, Director, Manchester Fuel Department

The following changes to the Final Permit have been made as a result of the comment period:

- Outfalls 001B, 002A and 008A monitoring for oil and grease is changed from once per day during discharge to monthly.
- Outfalls 004A, 006A, and 007A monitoring for oil and grease is changed from once per day during discharge to a visual sheen inspection quarterly and during storm events. If an oil sheen is observed during visual monitoring, the discharge must be sampled for oil and grease.
- The requirement to sample Outfalls 001B, 002A, 004A, 006A, 007A and 008A during the first 30 minutes of an actual discharge from a storm event is removed. The follow-on paragraph stating there must be a 72-hour interval between stormwater sampling events is also removed.
- The pH monitoring requirement is changed from once per day during discharge to twice per year for Outfalls 001B, 002A, 004A, 006A, 007A and 008A.
- The WET testing sample location is changed from Outfall 001B to Internal Outfall 001A in Condition I.C. first paragraph and I.C.2.a).

I. Draft Permit Comments

1. Comment: Outfall 001A effluent limitation for TSS:

The limits for TSS are not quantifiable using EPA-approved analytical methods. How can the effluent limit be below the quantifiable value for the test method? The effluent limit must be a value that is quantifiable using EPA approved analytical methods.

Response: Since the TSS effluent limit is below the quantifiable level, Footnote 2 to Table 1 states:

The limits for TSS are not quantifiable using EPA-approved analytical methods. The minimum level (ML) for TSS is 5 mg/L for this parameter. The EPA will use 5 mg/L as the compliance evaluation level for this parameter. The permittee will be in compliance with the TSS limitation if the average monthly concentration is less than 5 mg/L and the maximum daily concentration is less than 5 mg/L.

The EPA will only enforce the TSS effluent limits based on monitoring results above the quantifiable level to account for the fact that the effluent limit is below the quantifiable level. This is consistent with the recommendations in Section 5.7.3 of the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* (USEPA, 1991) for situations in which effluent limits are less than detection or quantification limits.

The comment did not result in a change to the permit.

2. Comment: Outfall 001B, 002A, 004A, 006A, 007A and 008A Sample Frequency:

Why was the sample frequency increased to 1/day during discharge? Discharges from Outfalls 001B and 006A are continuous throughout the year and discharges from Outfalls 002A, 004A, 007A and 008A are continuous throughout the year except for brief periods during the summer months. All of the above listed separators process groundwater to varying degrees. By requiring a sampling frequency of 1/day during discharge the sample frequency has essentially increased 30 times and will require sampling 365 days/year. There is no history of permit exceedances to justify such an increase.

Response: The EPA believed the discharges from the above-listed outfalls were intermittent, thus, the EPA included the requirements for daily monitoring in the draft permit. Based on the description in the comment that ground water flow to the outfalls is continuous throughout the year, which would therefore require daily monitoring for oil and grease, the EPA agrees the monitoring frequency proposed in the draft permit is excessive.

The permit is revised to require the same oil and grease monitoring frequencies as the previous permit, as described below:

Outfalls 001B, 002A and 008A

Monitoring for oil and grease will be required monthly.

004A, 006A, and 007A

Monitoring for these outfalls with very low potential to contain oil and grease will be visual inspection quarterly and during storm events. If an oil sheen is observed the discharge must be sampled for oil and grease.

3. Comment: The sample frequency for pH (1/day during discharge) differs from sample frequency outlined in Fact Sheet (1/day during rain event). Again, this is a significant increase to our sampling requirements and not warranted given our past compliance history.

Response: As shown in Tables 1 and 2 of the fact sheet, the Logistics Center has a low probability of violating the pH effluent limitations. Therefore, the monitoring frequency for pH will be reduced to twice per year, the same frequency as in the previous permit, for Outfalls 001B, 002A, 004A, 006A, 007A and 008A.

4. Comment: Is WET testing to be conducted on effluent samples from Outfall 001B or Outfall 001A?

Response: The WET Testing is to be conducted on effluent samples from Internal Outfall 001A. In the final permit, the outfall to be monitored for WET testing has been changed from Outfall 001B to Internal Outfall 001A so that discharges from the oily wastewater treatment plant are not diluted prior to WET testing. See the first paragraph of Part I.C. and Part I.C.2.a.

5. Comment: Including a requirement to conduct WET testing when it has been established there is no reasonable potential for acute or chronic toxicity seems onerous and excessive. Why is there no off-ramp for the WET testing as in previous permits issued to the Navy? For example, our current permit required quarterly WET testing for a 1-year period with subsequent testing contingent on initial results.

The fact sheet states, on Page 20, that “The available WET data demonstrates the effluent does not have reasonable potential for acute or chronic toxicity.”

Response: As the fact sheet states, annual WET monitoring is included in the permit to ensure the facility continues to meet Washington State’s water quality criteria for toxicity. The expired permit requires WET testing quarterly for a one-year period. The new final permit changed this requirement to annual WET testing to ensure the toxicity monitoring is current if the permit is administratively extended.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

6. **Comment:** “Samples should be collected within the first 30 minutes of an actual discharge from a storm event”

Discharges from Outfalls 001B and 006A are continuous throughout the year and discharges from Outfalls 002A, 004A, 007A and 008A are continuous throughout the year except for brief periods during the summer months. Differentiating flow caused by storm events and the continuous or near-continuous groundwater flow throughout the year is not possible as it exits our oil-water separators.

Response: Based on the comment of continuous flow throughout the year from ground water the requirement to sample during the first 30 minutes of an actual discharge from a storm event is removed from the requirements for the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Condition II.B. c) iv. Inspections.

The follow-on paragraph stating when a 72-hour interval between stormwater sampling events is not required is also removed since the discharges are continuous.

II. Fact Sheet Comments

7. **Comment:** Page 8 of the Fact Sheet states: “The oily wastes include wastewater from fuel tank cleaning, ship bilge cleaning...”

Ship bilge cleaning liquids are no longer received to be treated in the OWTP.

No bilge water is treated in the treatment plant, and thus no portion of the discharge is treated bilge water.

Page 11 of the Fact Sheet states:

“Therefore, a portion of the discharge from Internal Outfall 001A is treated bilge water”

No bilge water is treated in the treatment plant, and thus no portion of the discharge is treated bilge water.

Response: The comment is noted, however, as the Fact Sheet also states, “the Navy stated inadvertent mixing of tank cleaning wastewater and bilge water may occur leading to discharges of bilge water.”

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

8. **Comment:** Page 8 of the Fact Sheet states: “An ultraviolet peroxidation unit is utilized as needed to process oily wastewater.” Page 32 of the fact sheet also refers to “the use of the ultraviolet peroxidation unit.” Hydrogen peroxide is used as one of the chemicals to treat the oily wastewater but there is not a UV peroxidation unit in the treatment plant.

Response: The comment is noted.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

- 9. Comment:** Additional information is provided to the description of Outfall 006A on page 9 of the Fact Sheet.:

Outfall 006A also includes stormwater drainage from containments around five above ground storage tanks. The discharge from the containments is routed through separator 6A before entering Franco Pond before discharge through Outfall 006A. Separator 6 has been dismantled and consists of a flow through concrete box to allow free passage of fish. Separator 6A has a capacity of 2,000 gpm.

Response: The additional information is noted.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

- 10. Comment:** Additional information is provided to the description of Outfall 007A on page 9 of the Fact Sheet:

Separator 7 remains open throughout the year allowing ground water and stormwater to pass through to Outfall 007A.

Response: The additional information is noted.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

- 11. Comment:** Additional information is provided to the description of Outfall 008A on page 9 of the Fact Sheet:

Water is routed through two oil water separators in parallel, 8 and 8A, which have a combined capacity of 2,800 gpm.

Response: The additional information is noted.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

- 12. Comment:** The fact sheet states, on page 41 regarding outfalls 004A, 006A, and 007A, “Because of the infrequent discharges there are insufficient data to calculate an oil and grease performance-based limit for outfalls 004A, 006A and 007A.”

Outfalls 004A, 006A and 007A have continuous discharge throughout the year except for brief periods during the summer months. The previous permit did not require Oil and Grease for these outfalls thus there is no oil and grease data for these outfalls.

Response: The additional information is noted.

The permit is not changed based on the comment.

III. Conditions of the State of Washington’s Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification

The State of Washington Department of Ecology provided a Clean Water Act Section 401 certification for this permit on May 18, 2020. The certification contained conditions which the EPA has incorporated into the final permit (40 CFR 124.53(e), 124.55(a)(2)). See also CWA Section 401(d). These conditions are:

- A requirement for the permittee to submit the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to the EPA for review and approval. The certification did not specify a deadline for submitting the SWPPP. In the final permit, the deadline for submitting the SWPPP to the EPA is the same as the deadline in the draft permit for evaluating and updating the SWPPP (12 months after the effective date of the permit).

- A requirement that stormwater best management practices BMPs must be equivalent to BMPs in the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.
- A requirement to monitor for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at outfall 006A quarterly for one year. The permit requires PCB monitoring to occur during calendar year 2022 to allow time for the quality assurance plan (QAP) to be updated before PCB monitoring begins.
- A requirement for the permittee to submit the quality assurance plan (QAP) to the EPA for review and approval. The certification did not specify a deadline for submitting the QAP. In the final permit, the deadline for submitting the QAP to the EPA is the same as the deadline in the draft permit for submitting written notice that the QAP has been developed and implemented (180 days after the effective date of the final permit).

Conditions from the final 401 certification which were incorporated into the final permit are identified in the permit with footnotes.

IV. References

USEPA. (1991). *Technical support document for water quality-based toxics control*. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. Office of the Assistant Administrator for Water. Office of Water Enforcement and Permits : Office of Water Regulations and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Retrieved from <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=100002CU.PDF>.