



PASADENA WATER AND POWER



February 14, 2018

Sent via email: [commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov) and U.S. Mail

Jeanine Townsend, Clerk to the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

Subject: Proposed Amendment to the Statewide Industrial General Storm Water Permit

Dear Ms. Townsend:

The City of Pasadena Water and Power Department ("PWP") appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Industrial General Storm Water Permit ("IGP"), which would impose additional requirements on PWP's Electrical Power Generating Plant. We respectfully request that the Board consider the following:

1) **Attachment I Compliance Options**

These are much needed and beneficial options. However, the following changes and clarifications are requested to provide dischargers with the necessary flexibility to design and install effective and efficient systems to reduce industrial storm water runoff to impaired water bodies.

- a. Allow dischargers to demonstrate that the design of their proposed system is equivalent to a system that dewater within 24 hours, based on an annual average reduction in storm water discharge. (Section II.E.3 and footnotes 2 &10)
- b. Remove the requirement that the system has to be designed to dewater completely between 12:00 a.m. and 11:59 p.m. because it is too restrictive. For example, should rainfall begin during the 11 p.m. hour, it would be impractical to design a system to dewater the entire design flow or volume in the same hour prior to the 11:59 deadline. (Section II.E.3 and footnotes 2 &10)
- c. Allow a mix of uses for the water captured and diverted for use under this option, including the permitted diversion of water to the sewer system. (Section II.b)
- d. Remove the requirement for sampling and analysis of the influent entering the pretreatment because this monitoring may only apply to infiltration projects,

which are already required to sample and analyze groundwater quality. (Section II H.2 a & b) Other uses of captured water would be sampled and analyzed based on their use. For example permitted flows to the sewer would be sampled and analyzed in accordance with the permit, water reclaimed for reuse may be subject to reclaimed water requirements.

- e. Restrict the requirement to update the SWPPP with information on soil or groundwater contamination to only those dischargers who implement water infiltration projects. (Section II H.3.v.)
- f. Limit the number of required sampling/reporting events to no more than two per year. This would be consistent with the existing sampling requirements except that it is half what is required from sites that do not reduce their discharge through the use of an alternative compliance option. In addition, it is appropriate to require less sampling and reporting from properly designed and constructed water projects that are certified by a licensed professional engineer. (Section II H.2.a-3)
- g. Include an automatic cessation of the groundwater monitoring requirement after the discharger obtains five years of groundwater monitoring results that comply with the amended permit. (Section II K.4)

**2) TMDL Numeric Action Level (“TNAL”) should be annual averages (IGP page 9 Paragraph 54)**

Many of the TNALs are extremely low. This requires the accurate measurement of trace amounts of pollutants near their quantification limit. Requiring dischargers to meet these levels on an instantaneous basis may unfairly penalize them for a result that does not accurately characterize their discharge. Basing the TNALs on annual averages would help ensure that the measurements are reliable and would increase the likelihood that they are representative. It allows for the analysis to be verified because it's repeated over time. This is critical to the accurate measurement of trace amounts.

**3) Sampling and analysis of Authorized Non-Storm Water Discharges should not be required (Attachment E Compliance with Dry-Weather WLAs)**

These discharges are limited to potable water, atmospheric condensate, naturally-occurring water, and windblown mist. They are typically small, incidental discharges and it may not be possible to obtain an adequate sample volume. For planned releases like fire hydrant flushing and testing of potable water systems, the discharger could obtain a sample. However, this water is already regulated and unlikely to contain pollutants from industrial activities especially if the discharger follows the best management practices already required in the existing permit.

**4) Include guidelines on how to determine whether Best Management Practices (“BMP”) are economically practical and achievable (Fact Sheet 6.b.)**

The Fact Sheet Section 6 Exceedance Response Actions (“ERA”) has conditions for the discharger to discontinue performing additional ERA requirements. One of these conditions is for the discharger to demonstrate that “Additional BMPs required to eliminate [Numeric Action Levels] NAL/TNAL exceedances are not technologically available or economically practical and achievable.” This document should include or reference guidelines for demonstrating whether a BMP is economically practical and achievable.

5) **SMARTS should identify TNAL/NEL exceedances** (IGP page 25 C.3)

To avoid potential confusion, errors and omissions, the SMARTS online reporting tool should track and notify dischargers if their level status changes because of a TNAL/NEL exceedance.

6) **Additional time should be allowed before dischargers are subject to level 1 status for exceeding a TNAL** (IGP page 53 C. Level 1 Status)

Because structural BMPs are likely to be required to achieve compliance, dischargers should be allowed at least two years from the date the amended regulation is adopted before being moved to level 1 status for exceeding the TNALs. Under PWP’s procurement process, outlined below, it would take approximately two years to complete construction and/or installation of a structural BMP to capture and divert industrial storm water discharges.

a. Contract procurement to hire consultant for conceptual design and preparation of specifications	36 weeks
b. Consultant engineering work	5 weeks
c. Preparation of work specification and contract procurement for construction contractor	42 weeks
d. Contractor detailed design and construction work	20 weeks

Allowing additional time before the discharger is moved to level 1 status would allow limited resources to be dedicated to implementing these improvements that may be necessary for compliance. This will also eliminate the need for Board staff to review Technical Reports and ERA action plans while the procurement and construction process is underway.

Please contact Mr. Arturo Silva at (626) 744-4568 or Kim Yapp at (626) 744-3926 should you have any questions. We thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



GURCHARAN S. BAWA  
General Manager

cc: Michael Lauffer, Chief Counsel, State Water Resources Control Board  
Eric Oppenheimer, Chief Deputy Director, State Water Resources Control Board  
Steve Mermell, City Manager, City of Pasadena  
David Jones, Emanuels Jones and Associates