Meeting Agenda begins on page 2.

## Meeting Location Information - DoubleTree by Hilton Richmond Airport Ballroom 1 and 2 445 International Center Drive Sandston, Virginia 23150

Attendees are not entitled to be disorderly or disrupt the meeting from proceeding in an orderly, efficient, and effective fashion. Disruptive behavior may result in a recess or removal from the meeting.

Possession or use of any device that may disrupt the conduct of business is prohibited, including but not limited to: voice-amplification equipment; bullhorns; blow horns; sirens, or other noise-producing devices; as well as signs on sticks, poles or stakes; or helium-filled balloons.

Attendees shall not block or gather in exits, doors, or aisles.

All attendees are asked to be respectful of all speakers.

Rules will be enforced fairly and impartially not only to ensure the efficient and effective conduct of business, but also to ensure no interference with the business of the hotel, its employees and guests.

All violators are subject to removal.

#### TENTATIVE AGENDA AND MINIBOOK STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 15, 2019

#### DoubleTree by Hilton Richmond Airport Ballroom 1 and 2 445 International Center Drive Sandston, Virginia 23150

Convene - 10:00 a.m.

# AGENDA ITEM

#### DEPARTMENT PRESENTER

# Introductions

I. Minutes (December 13, 2018 and March 1, 2019))

#### II. Fast-Track Regulations

Closure Plan and Demonstration of Financial Capability (9VAC25-650) Porterfield (page 4)

#### III. Regulation – Final

	Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) General Permit Regulation for Nonmetallic Mineral Mining (9VAC25-193) (page 4, comment summary - page 4, regulatory text - page 23)	Sherman
	General Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activity (9VAC25-151)	Richardson
	<ul> <li>(page 45, comment summary - page 45, regulatory text - page 78)</li> <li>General VPDES Permit for Discharges of Stormwater from Construction Activities (9VAC25-880)</li> <li>(page 175, comment summary - page 175, regulatory text - page 307)</li> </ul>	Robb
IV.	Significant Noncompliance Report (page 333)	Sadtler
V.	<b>Consent Special Orders - VPDES</b> Tyson Farms, Inc., Temperanceville (Accomack Co.) (page 334)	Sadtler
VI.	Public Forum (time for this item not to exceed 45 minutes)	
VII.	<b>Other Business</b> Division Director's Report Future Meetings (June 27, September 6, December 13, 2019	Schneider/Davenport

#### **ADJOURN**

NOTE: The Board reserves the right to revise this agenda without notice unless prohibited by law. Revisions to the agenda include, but are not limited to, scheduling changes, additions or deletions. Questions on the latest status of the agenda should be directed to Cindy M. Berndt at (804) 698-4378.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AT <u>STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD</u> MEETINGS: The Board encourages public participation in the performance of its duties and responsibilities. To this end, the Board has adopted public participation procedures for regulatory action and for case decisions. These procedures establish the times for the public to provide appropriate comment to the Board for its consideration.

For <u>REGULATORY ACTIONS (adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations)</u>, public participation is governed by the Administrative Process Act and the Board's Public Participation Guidelines. Public comment is accepted during the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action phase (minimum 30-day comment period) and during the Notice of Public Comment Period on Proposed Regulatory Action (minimum 60-day comment period). Notice of these comment periods is announced in the Virginia Register, by posting to the Department of Environmental Quality and Virginia Regulatory Town Hall web sites and by mail to those on the Regulatory Development Mailing List. The comments received during the announced public comment periods are summarized for the Board and considered by the Board when making a decision on the regulatory action.

For <u>CASE DECISIONS (issuance and amendment of permits)</u>, the Board adopts public participation procedures in the individual regulations which establish the permit programs. As a general rule, public comment is accepted on a draft permit for a period of 30 days. In some cases a public hearing is held at the conclusion of the public comment period on a draft permit. In other cases there may an additional comment period during which a public hearing is held. In light of these established procedures, the Board accepts public comment on regulatory actions and case decisions, as well as general comments, at Board meetings in accordance with the following:

REGULATORY ACTIONS: Comments on regulatory actions are allowed only when the staff initially presents a regulatory action to the Board for final adoption. At that time, those persons who commented during the public comment period on the proposal are allowed up to 3 minutes to respond to the summary of the comments presented to the Board. Adoption of an emergency regulation is a final adoption for the purposes of this policy. Persons are allowed up to 3 minutes to address the Board on the emergency regulation under consideration.

CASE DECISIONS: Comments on pending case decisions at Board meetings are accepted only when the staff initially presents the pending case decision to the Board for final action. At that time the Board will allow up to 5 minutes for the applicant/owner to make his complete presentation on the pending decision, unless the applicant/owner objects to specific conditions of the decision. In that case, the applicant/owner will be allowed up to 15 minutes to make his complete presentation. The Board will then allow others who commented at the public hearing or during the public comment period up to 3 minutes to exercise their rights to respond to the summary of the prior public comment period presented to the Board. No public comment is allowed on case decisions when a FORMAL HEARING is being held.

POOLING MINUTES: Those persons who commented during the public hearing or public comment period and attend the Board meeting may pool their minutes to allow for a single presentation to the Board that does not exceed the time limitation of 3 minutes times the number of persons pooling minutes, or 15 minutes, whichever is less.

NEW INFORMATION will not be accepted at the meeting. The Board expects comments and information on a regulatory action or pending case decision to be submitted during the established public comment periods. However, the Board recognizes that in rare instances new information may become available after the close of the public comment period. To provide for consideration of and ensure the appropriate review of this new information, persons who commented during the prior public comment period shall submit the new information to the Department of Environmental Quality (Department) staff contact listed below at least 10 days prior to the Board meeting. The Board's decision will be based on the Department-developed official file and discussions at the Board meeting. In the case of a regulatory action, should the Board or Department decide that the new information was not reasonably available during the prior public comment period, is significant to the Board's decision and should be included in the official file, the Department may announce an additional public comment period in order for all interested persons to have an opportunity to participate.

PUBLIC FORUM: The Board schedules a public forum at each regular meeting to provide an opportunity for citizens to address the Board on matters other than those on the agenda, pending regulatory actions or pending case decisions. Those persons wishing to address the Board during this time should indicate their desire on the sign-in cards/sheet and limit their presentations to 3 minutes or less.

The Board reserves the right to alter the time limitations set forth in this policy without notice and to ensure comments presented at the meeting conform to this policy.

<u>Department of Environmental Quality Staff Contact:</u> Cindy M. Berndt, Director, Regulatory Affairs, Department of Environmental Quality, 1111 East Main Street, Suite 1400, P.O. Box 1105, Richmond, Virginia 23218, phone (804) 698-4378; fax (804) 698-4346; e-mail: <u>cindy.berndt@deq.virginia.gov</u>.

# REQUEST TO ADOPT FAST-TRACK AMENDMENTS CLOSURE PLAN AND DEMONSTRATION OF

**FINANCIAL CAPABILITY (9VAC25-650 ET SEQ.) REGULATION:** DEQ will request the Board to accept final amendments to the Closure Plan and Demonstration of Financial Capability (9VAC25-650 et seq.) regulation. This regulatory amendment will be processed using the fast-track regulatory process established in Section 2.2-4012.1 of the Code of Virginia . Privately owned sewerage systems and sewerage treatment works that discharge more than 1,000 gallons per day and less than 40,000 gallons per day to develop closure plans and provide financial assurance for closure of the sewerage systems or sewage treatment works. Closure plans and financial assurance mechanisms are submitted to the department for approval.

This regulation is being amended to revise financial assurance requirements related to the transfer of the permit to a new owner or operator. Currently the previous owner or operator is required to provide financial assurance until the new owner or operator provides financial assurance. The regulation is being amended to require the new owner or operator to provide financial assurance prior to the transfer of the permit. This change is consistent with the requirement for an owner or operator of a new facility to provide financial assurance prior to the facility beginning to operate.

# **VPDES GENERAL PERMIT REGULATION NONMETALLIC MINERAL MINES (VAG 84);**

<u>AMENDMENTS TO 9VAC25-190 AND FINAL REISSUANCE OF GENERAL PERMIT</u>: The current VPDES General Permit Regulation for Nonmetallic Mineral Mining will expire on June 30, 2019 and the regulation establishing this general permit is being amended to reissue this general permit for another five-year term. The staff is bringing this final regulation before the Board to request adoption. This regulation took into consideration the recommendations of a technical advisory committee (TAC) formed for this regulatory action. The TAC consisted of industry representatives, a Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (DMME) representative, and DEQ staff. Attempts to include NGO groups were unsuccessful.

The Board's authorization to hold a public hearing and receive public comments on the proposal was received at the September 20, 2018 meeting. A Notice of Public Comment (NOPC) was published and the comment period ran from October 29, 2018 to December 28, 2018. A public hearing was held on November 27, 2018. There were three attendees at the public hearing and one person provided comment. Public comments were received from 11 individuals or groups on the proposed changes to the general permit regulation.

Comments and Responses: The comments and responses are:

Eleven commenters submitted comments and most of these consisted of the same set of comments. The summary below combines comments that are the same and presents the Agency's response. (For those comments that are the same, VTCA's written comments are used unless noted). Comments marked with an \* were also raised by VTCA at a more summary level at the public hearing held 11/27/2018.

# Commenter

## Affiliation

Comment –

		Response Identifier
Rob Lanham, Aggregates Program Manager	Virginia Transportation Construction Alliance	VTCA
Walter Beck III, Environmental Engineer	Vulcan Construction Materials	Vulcan
Thomas Harris, General Operations Manager	E. Dillion & Co.	E. Dillion
Mitch Scott, Environmental Manager, VA Dist.	Martin Marietta	Martin Marietta
Tim Mauzy, Engineer	Boxley Materials	Boxley
Ned Gumble, President	Virginia Vermiculite	Virginia Vermiculite
Mark Williams, Environmental Manager	Luck Stone Corp	Luck Stone
Tom Locher, Safety & Equipment Manager	Chemung Contracting Corp., Cedar Mountain Stone Corp.	Chemung
John Snoddy, Environmental & Safety Director	Kyanite Mining Corp.	Kyanite
Van Medlock, Director of Environmental Services	Rogers Group Inc.	Rogers
Mark Vigil	Luck Stone Corp	Luck Stone - Vigil

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
(1) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 56 - 25-190-	The draft general permit regulation
Vulcan, E.	<u> 10 Definitions - Inactive Mining –</u>	includes at the end of the definition of
Dillion, Martin		"[I]ndustrial activity" a description of
Marietta,	There is not a definition of inactive mining in	"[I]nactive mining operations." This
Boxley, Luck	the permit. While Draft Line 471 Section I, B,	description is verbatim from the
Stone,	14 goes into great detail, this random sentence	definitions in 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(iii)
Chemung,	at the beginning of the permit is confusing and	(stormwater discharge associated with
Rogers, Luck	is not really a definition. In addition, Draft	industrial activity, SICs 10-14).
Stone - Vigil	Line 806 notes training needs to be completed	
	annually for "temporarily inactive sites." Some	In the final general permit regulation
	sites do not have active personnel, even at	DEQ has made the existing description of
	"temporarily inactive sites." We recommend	inactive mining operations into the
	altering the language.	following stand-alone definition:
	<u>SUGGESTED ACTION</u> : Provide the following as a definition, remove language within the parenthesis at line 56 and remove all language of "temporary inactive sites." This should include the removal of training requirements for "temporary inactive sites." <i>Inactive Mining – DMME permitted mining or</i> <i>waivered sites that are not being actively</i> <i>mined, but which have an identifiable</i> <i>owner/operator. Inactive sites do <u>not</u> include</i> <i>sites where claims are being maintained prior</i>	"Inactive mining operations" means mining sites that are not being actively mined, but which have an identifiable owner/operator; inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined materials, nor sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim. The language defining inactive mining operations remains unchanged, and thus

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	to disturbances associated with extraction,	consistent with 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(iii)
	beneficiation, or processing of mined	and the ISWGP (9VAC25-151). In
	materials, nor sites where minimal actives are	addition, it is substantially the same
	undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining	language as is suggested in the comment.
	a mining claim.	This restructuring more clearly indicates
		that the term "inactive mining operations" is specifically defined, which should aid
		stakeholders in more fully understanding
		the permit requirements.
		the permit requirements:
		The final permit maintains the two uses of
		the phrase "temporarily inactive" but with
		an additional qualification. The first use at
		I B 14 (waiver of monitoring and
		inspection for inactive and unstaffed
		facilities) is existing permit language that
		has not been changed for this reissuance. For clarity, in the heading the language in
		parentheses has been amended to say
		"(including temporarily inactive and
		unstaffed facilities)."
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		The second use of this phrase regarding
		training has been amended slightly to
		better address the situation raised in the
		comment. The first sentence in Part II H 3 e now reads "Employee training shall be
		conducted at least annually at active
		mining sites and at those temporarily
		inactive sites that are staffed." (Final
		changes are underlined). Training is an
		important element of stormwater
		management as evidenced by the fact that
		the 2015 MSGP requires training at active
		and temporarily inactive nonmetallic mineral mining sites (8.J.5.1, pg. 111).
		mineral mining sites (6.3.3.1, pg. 111).
		To ensure the permit is as clear as
		possible, DEQ has added a definition that
		provides that "temporarily inactive sites"
		means a site or portion of a site where
		nonmetallic mineral mining and/or
		milling occurred in the past but currently
		are not being actively undertaken, and the facility is covered by an active mining
		permit. This definition is based on the
		2015 MSGP (8.J.3.6, pg. 102) and is
		consistent with comparable language in
		the VPDES industrial stormwater permit.
(2) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 364: Section	DEQ agrees that this provision of the
Vulcan, E.	<u>I, A, 2a</u>	draft general permit regulation includes
Dillion, Martin		an extra word (In the second sentence of
Marietta,		Part I A 2 a, the fourth use of "the" should

Boxley, Luck		
DOAICY, LUCK	The language in this section is difficult to	be removed). The extra "the" has been
Stone,	follow and should be corrected:	removed in the final general permit
Chemung,		regulation.
Luck Stone -	<sup>(3)</sup> Refer to Part I B-12 should the TSS	
Vigil	evaluation monitoring exceed 100 mg/l daily	
	maximum. <u>Permittees shall review the results</u>	
	of the TSS monitoring required by Part I A 2 a	
	to determine if changes to the storm water	
	pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) may be	
	necessary. If the TSS monitoring results are	
	greater than the evaluation value of 100 mg/l,	
	then the permittee shall perform [sic] <sup>1</sup> a	
	routine facility inspection within five days of	
	• •	
	<u>oo uuys of being tuchtificu.</u>	
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	
	ë .	
	then the permittee shall perform a routine	
	facility inspection within five days of becoming	
	aware of the exceedance and maintain	
	documentation as described in Part II H 3 d	
	for that outfall. Any deficiencies noted during	
	the inspection shall be corrected within 60	
		e
,	$\left  \frac{I, A, 2b}{2b} \right $	
	Within this section there is here and i	
•		-
,		
•	•	
-		• •
2.000 , ign		
	· ·	
	documented. Lastly, the storage of visual	
(3) VTCA, Vulcan, E. Dillion, Martin Marietta, Boxley, Luck Stone, Chemung, Rogers, Luck Stone - Vigil	becoming aware of the exceedance and maintain documentation as described in Part II H 3 d for that outfall. Any deficiencies noted during the inspection shall be corrected within 60 days of being identified.SUGGESTED ACTION:The suggested language is below:(3) Refer to Part I B 12 should the TSS evaluation monitoring exceed 100 mg/l daily maximum. Permittees shall review the results of the TSS monitoring required by Part I A 2 a to determine if changes to the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) may be necessary. If the TSS monitoring results are greater than the evaluation value of 100 mg/l, then the permittee shall perform a routine facility inspection within five days of becoming aware of the exceedance and maintain documentation as described in Part II H 3 d for that outfall. Any deficiencies noted during the inspection shall be corrected within 60 days of being identified.VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 364: Section I, A, 2bWithin this section, there is language asking for the "nature of the discharge." It is confusing as to why this is being requested if it can only be storm water. This seems to be unnecessary information and should be removed. As well, both the SWPPP and Registration Statement already requires that each outfall have a description of its type of discharge, so the nature of the discharge is already known and	In including "the nature of the dischar as an item that must be documented for quarterly visual stormwater monitorin DEQ is interested in whether the discharge is a result of runoff or snowmelt, which may have different characteristics (e.g., quantity, quality, timing). To clarify this, DEQ amended relevant language to read "the nature of the discharge (i.e., runoff or snowmelt "

<sup>1</sup> The word "the" from the draft regulation is omitted in the original comment here.

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	monitoring information should simply be	Both the 2015 MSGP (3.2.2) and the
	within the SWPPP and not the "SWPPP Visual	ISWGP (I.A.1.a.3) require that visual
	Monitoring Records." There is no reason to	assessments include documentation of the
	update an existing plan to move this	nature of the discharge (i.e., runoff or
	documentation if these items already exist	snowmelt). Neither the registration
	within the SWPPP.	statement nor the SWPPP currently
		require this specific information (the
	The permittee shall conduct calendar quarterly	current registration statement asks for the
	visual monitoring of storm water discharges	outfall type and source, while the SWPPP
	associated with industrial activity. The	must include information describing the
	monitoring shall include examination of storm	quality and quantity of stormwater
	water samples representative of storm event	discharges).
	discharges from the facility and observation of	
	<u>color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled</u>	With regard to the retention of visual
	solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and	monitoring documentation, DEQ agrees
	other obvious indicators of storm water	with the comment that visual monitoring
	pollution. Documentation of visual monitoring	can be documented in the SWPPP. The
	of storm water shall be maintained on-site in	final permit has been changed to specify
	the SWPPP and include the discharge	that such records must be retained in the
	examination date and time, examination	SWPPP, which is consistent with the
	personnel, outfall location, the nature of the	2015 MSGP and ISWGP.
	discharge, quality of the storm water discharge	
	and probable sources of any observed storm	
	water contamination. Part II A regarding	
	monitoring instructions, Part II B regarding	
	<u>representative outfalls, and Part II C</u> regarding sampling waivers shall apply to the	
	taking of samples for visual monitoring except	
	that (i) the documentation required by these	
	sections shall be retained with the SWPPP	
	visual monitoring records rather than	
	submitted to the department. Calendar	
	guarters equal the following three-month	
	periods each year of permit coverage: January	
	through March, April through June, July	
	through September, and October through	
	December.	
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	
	The suggested language is below:	
	The permittee shall conduct calendar quarterly	
	visual monitoring of storm water discharges	
	associated with industrial activity. The	
	monitoring shall include examination of storm	
	water samples representative of storm event	
	discharges from the facility and observation of	
	<u>color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled</u>	
	solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and	
	other obvious indicators of storm water	
	pollution. Documentation of visual monitoring	
	of storm water shall be maintained on-site in	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	the SWPPP and include the examination date	
	and time, examination personnel, outfall	
	location, visual quality of the storm water	
	discharge and probable sources of any	
	observed storm water contamination. Part II A	
	regarding monitoring instructions, Part II B	
	regarding representative outfalls, and Part II	
	C regarding sampling waivers shall apply to	
	the taking of samples for visual monitoring	
	except that (i) the documentation required by	
	these sections shall be retained with the	
	SWPPP rather than submitted to the	
	department. Calendar quarters equal the	
	following three-month periods each year of	
	permit coverage: January through March,	
	April through June, July through September,	
	and October through December.	
(4) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 377: Section	DEQ has removed the draft language in
Vulcan, E.	<u>I, B – Cationic Chemicals</u> *	I.B.3 that states "[t]he use of cationic
Dillion, Martin		chemicals is ineligible for coverage under
Marietta,	This permit is already utilized by some	this permit unless such use is approved by
Boxley, Luck	operators that use Cationic chemicals, for those	the board based on a demonstration that
Stone,	permittees, the new language would be a	the application or use will not result in
Chemung,	dramatic change. It is suggested that the	aquatic toxicity." This language had been
Rogers, Luck	proposed language be deleted, and cationic	added to the draft permit based on
Stone – Vigil	chemical approvals be just as all other	language in the 2015 MSGP (8.J.4.1.8,
	chemicals currently are, to ensure they are used	pg. 104). That EPA language reflected
	appropriately. Currently the permit requires	EPA concerns regarding the aquatic
	MSDS sheets for all chemicals to be submitted	toxicity of cationic chemicals, as
	with the Registration Statement for approved	discussed in the fact sheet to EPA's 2012
	use. If the DEQ decides the cationic chemical	Construction General Permit (Page 69 of
	being submitted is a concern, then it can be	the 2015 MSGP fact sheet references the
	reviewed and discussed during the permit	2017 CGP fact sheet, which adopts by
	application submittal process.	reference the discussion at pages 20-28 of 2012 CGP fact sheet). The MSGP
	If the language "No chemicals shall be added	provisions in 8.J.4.1.8 focus on pre-
	to the discharge," only applies to directly	mining, earth-disturbing activities. As
	adding chemicals to treat water prior to	discussed in the fact sheet for this permit,
	discharging and does not mean that the	these activities are not addressed in
	Cationic chemicals cannot be used internally in	VAG84 based on state law (§ 62.1-
	the process, then this language is less	44.15:34 and 44.15:55) and existing
	concerning.	mining regulations and permit
		requirements.
	<i>3. There shall be no chemicals added to the</i>	
	discharge, other than those listed on the	The use of chemicals, including cationic
	owner's approved registration statement,	chemicals, by nonmetallic mineral mining
	unless prior approval of the chemical is	facilities remains a potential concern due
	granted by the board. The use of cationic	to the aquatic toxicity of these chemicals
	chemicals is ineligible for coverage under this	in certain settings. The draft VAG84
	permit unless such use is approved by the	permit at the proposed stage required that
	board based on a demonstration that the	registration statements include a list of
	application or use will not result in aquatic	treatment chemicals added to wastewater
	toxicity.	or stormwater that could be discharged

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
		and that Safety Data Sheets and maximum
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	proposed dosing rates be provided. In
		addition, the final permit proposal
	Please see the proposed language below:	requires that registration statements
		include a demonstration that the
	<i>3. There shall be no chemicals added to the</i>	application or use of treatment chemicals
	discharge, other than those listed on the	will not result in aquatic toxicity. DEQ
	owner's approved registration statement.	uses this information to evaluate the
		potential toxicity of chemicals being used
		by permitted facilities and to restrict or condition such use as appropriate. The
		permit further provides that no chemicals
		other than those on the approved
		registration statement may be used unless
		prior approval is obtained.
		prior approvar is obtained.
		The restriction on the addition of
		chemicals to a discharge applies to all
		chemicals that are added to wastewater or
		stormwater at the facility and that could
		be discharged from the facility. DEQ's
		principal concern is restricting the
		potential discharge of such chemicals at
		levels that pose aquatic toxicity. The
		restriction on the use of chemicals is not
		limited to only treating water prior to
		discharging. Treatment earlier in the
		process can also potentially result in a
		discharge. At the same time, the use of
		chemicals at an earlier point in the
		process may better support a
		demonstration of no aquatic toxicity in the discharge due to factors such as
		attenuation (see 9VAC25-190-60 C 8).
(5) Virginia	Current Language of 9VAC25-190-70-B-3:	See response to comment 4.
Vermiculite	There shall be no chemicals added to the	See response to comment 1.
( enniounite	discharge, other than those listed on the	
	owner's approved registration statement.	
	Proposed New Language of 9VAC25-190-70-	
	B-3:	
	There shall be no chemicals added to the	
	discharge, other than those listed on the	
	owner's approved registration statement,	
	unless prior approval of the chemical is	
	granted by the board. The use of cationic	
	chemicals is ineligible for coverage under this permit unless such use is approved by the	
	board based on a demonstration that the	
	application or use will not result in aquatic	
	toxicity.	
	1	1

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	This additional language is concerning to Virginia Vermiculite because of the possible use of cationic chemicals in the mill to aid in vermiculite beneficiation. These chemicals are added to the process water in the mill. In some instances, this process water can be comingled with stormwater in the mine pits. Trace amounts of these chemicals could be present in our pond system. We assume DEQ's intent is to prohibit cationic chemicals for the use of sediment treatment prior to stormwater discharge (similar to EPA), and suggest the following language: <i>There shall be no chemicals added directly to the discharge, other than those listed on the owner's approved registration statement.</i>	
(6) Virginia Vermiculite	<ul> <li>DEQ is proposing to amend another section of the VPDES GP as follows:</li> <li>Current Language of 9VAC25-190-60-C-8:</li> <li>The required registration statement shall contain the following information: List of any chemicals added to water that could be discharged;</li> <li>The proposed new language of 9VAC25-190-60-C-8 potentially narrows the scope of the required chemical list:</li> <li>List of any treatment chemicals added to water wastewater or stormwater that could be discharged.</li> <li>If DEQ's intent is to align this regulation with EPA's NPDES Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP), Virginia Vermiculite suggests that DEQ amend the language to read:</li> <li>"List of any treatment chemicals added to water wastewater or stormwater for sediment control that could be discharged."</li> </ul>	EPA's 2015 MSGP uses "sediment treatment chemicals" in the context of imposing seven minimum requirements intended to reduce the risk of using such chemicals. Although sediment control is a primary concern under this general permit, it is not the only potential pollutant of concern. Other chemicals could pose water quality concerns and DEQ is responsible for addressing compliance with all water quality standards. As such, DEQ does not believe it would be prudent to limit the identification of chemicals to those only used for sediment control.
(7) Kyanite	<u>VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT Part I.B.3</u> <u>Cationic Chemicals</u> DEQ has revised Part I.B.3 of the permit to read as follows (underlined wording represents revised language):	The language in I.B.3 has been revised consistent with the comment. As discussed above, DEQ has removed the draft language in I.B.3 that states "[t]he use of cationic chemicals is ineligible for coverage under this permit unless such use is approved by the board based on a

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	"3. There shall be no chemicals added to the	demonstration that the application or use
	discharge, other than those listed on the	will not result in aquatic toxicity."
	owner's approved registration statement, <u>unless</u>	
	prior approval of the chemical is granted by the	The restriction on the addition of
	board. The use of cationic chemicals is	chemicals to a discharge applies to all
	ineligible for coverage under this permit unless	chemicals that are added to wastewater or
	such use is approved by the board based on a	stormwater at the facility and that could
	demonstration that the application or use will not result in aquatic toxicity."	be discharged from the facility. DEQ's principal concern is restricting the
		potential discharge of such chemicals at
	Based on our reading of the first sentence of	levels that pose aquatic toxicity. The
	this condition, and DEQ's use of the words,	restriction on the use of chemicals is not
	"added to the discharge," it is our interpretation	limited to only treating water prior to
	that this condition is intended to apply to	discharging. Treatment earlier in the
	treatment chemicals that are added to the water	process can also potentially result in a
	discharge and does not apply to chemicals that	discharge. At the same time, the use of
	may be used during the facility's processing	chemicals at an earlier point in the
	operations.	process may better support a
	However, the addition of the second sentence	demonstration of no aquatic toxicity in the discharge due to factors such as
	may provide confusion to this point. In	attenuation.
	addition, since the first sentence of this	
	condition already requires the facility to submit	
	for approval any treatment chemicals added to	
	the discharge, either as part of the registration	
	statement or as part of a specific request, we	
	believe that the second sentence is redundant	
	and unnecessary. Therefore, we request that	
	Part I.B.3 of the draft permit be revised to read	
	as follows:	
	"3. There shall be no chemicals added to the	
	discharge, other than those listed on the	
	owner's	
	approved registration statement, unless prior	
	approval of the chemical is granted by the	
	board."	
	Alternatively, we request that DEQ, at a	
	minimum, add language clarifying that the	
	prohibition of the use of cationic chemicals is	
	specific to cationic chemicals used to treat	
	water discharges. Example clarifying language	
	is provided as follows (clarifying language	
	included in bold and italicized font):	
	3. There shall be no chemicals added to the	
	discharge, other than those listed on the	
	owner's approved registration statement, <u>unless</u>	
	prior approval of the chemical is granted by the	
	board. The use of cationic chemicals <i>to treat</i>	
	discharges is ineligible for coverage under this	
	permit unless such use is approved by the	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	board based on a demonstration that the	
	application or use will not result in aquatic	
	toxicity.	
(8) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 572: Section	DEQ has removed the draft language
Vulcan, E.	II, B – Representative Outfalls *	specifying that the size of the drainage
Dillion, Martin		area must be assessed as part of
Marietta,	New language was added which requests	determining representative discharges.
Boxley, Luck	information related to the "size of the drainage	The language had been added to the draft
Stone,	area and frequency of discharges" as methods	permit to be consistent with the language
Chemung,	of determining similar outfall, or representative	in the VPDES industrial stormwater
Rogers, Luck	outfall, status. As explained previously by	general permit, however, as the
Stone - Vigil	industry in past meetings and permit reviews,	commenters point out, the size of the
	all outfalls are sized according to the DMM	drainage area is a less significant factor
	Reclamation Regulations, which requires 0.125	where applicable DMME regulations
	acre-ft/acre of storage for each acre of	require that stormwater basins are sized
	drainage. This requirement is over 50% greater	based on the acres draining to the basin.
	than that required of the Virginia Erosion &	The evaluation of evailable monitoring
	Sediment Control Regulation. No matter what size the drainage area, the designed sediment	The evaluation of available monitoring data language was added to the draft
	structure will have the same effective sediment	permit to be consistent with the language
	storage capacity of .125 acre-ft/acre. For	in the VPDES industrial stormwater
	instance, if the disturbed area is 1 acre, the	general permit. The draft language
	sediment structure will be designed to have	requires monitoring data only if such data
	.125 acre-ft/acre of storage capacity.	are available. If data are not available, for
	Comparably, if the disturbed area is 10 acres	example because there are new outfalls or
	the sediment structure will be designed to have	outfalls have been represented by other
	1.25 acre-ft/acre of storage capacity. Each	outfalls, evaluation of data is not required.
	disturbed acre is afforded the same amount of	
	sediment storage capacity making the size of	The requirement that permittees list on the
	the drainage area not a factor in function. As	DMR of the outfall to be sampled those
	discussed in the past, the main item at mining facilities that determines if outfalls are	outfall locations that are represented by the sampled outfall is an existing
	representative are if the type of activities that	provision in the general permit that was
	report to them are similar. For instance,	not altered in the draft permit. Permittees
	outfalls that are all associated with overburden	are, as observed in the comment, required
	removal would be considered representative.	to document representative outfalls on the
	Outfalls associated with storm water runoff	registration statement. Including this
	from a Processing Plant, a shop facility, or a	existing information on the DMR,
	rail loadout facility would not be considered	therefore, should not be excessively
	substantially identical outfalls to those built to	burdensome. At present, DEQ does not
	control overburden removal areas even though	specify all representative outfalls in
	their control structures were afforded the same	DMRs provided to permittees as a matter
	.125 acre-feet/acre of sediment storage design.	of standard practice. Yet, ensuring
	Coordinate this section the section it is	complete monitoring and reporting
	Secondly in this section, the permit is now	information is a core element of the VPDES program so accounting for all
	requesting "An evaluation, including available monitoring data, indicating why the outfalls are	VPDES program, so accounting for all outfalls is important. Sampling
	expected to discharge substantially identical	representative outfalls helps reduce the
	effluents" This information is unnecessary	burden on the permitted facilities. As
	and excessive. Some outfalls that have yet to	such, specifying that permittees provide
	be constructed will have no available	this information is a reasonable approach
	monitoring data. The majority of existing	to ensuring program compliance.

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	mining facilities holding general permits have	
	many existing representative outfalls which	
	have operated as such for 10 or more years;	
	will these facilities now be required to provide	
	monitoring data from other outfalls that they	
	represent? This data likely does not exist and	
	therefore the ability to set up representative	
	outfalls will be initially impossible.	
	Considering that each outfall, no matter what	
	the drainage area, will be designed with the	
	same amount of sediment storage control	
	capabilities, the type of industrial activity	
	should be the only major determining factor as	
	to if they are substantially identical outfalls.	
	Also, the type of discharge is already submitted	
	during the registration statement and is	
	included within the SWPPP.	
	Lastly, this section continues to state that the	
	permittee's DMR must list all locations that are	
	represented by the discharge. The need to	
	require this does not seem appropriate since the	
	permittee is required to list representative	
	outfalls on the Registration Statement and the	
	DEQ will issue only those DMR's for those	
	outfalls required to be sampled and submitted.	
	DMR's are not issued for those that outfalls	
	that are being represented. As well, currently	
	most DEQ offices list the outfalls being	
	represented on the DMR being issued during	
	the permit issuance process after approving the	
	representative outfall request. We do not see the need to provide this information on the	
	DMR considering it is already approved. However, if the DEQ would like that	
	information on the DMR, then it would be best for the agency to continue to provide the list of	
	outfalls covered by the representative outfall	
	on the DMR that they issue. Equally as	
	important, making this a requirement of the	
	permittee can lead to compliance issues that	
	have nothing to do with the ultimate goal of	
	protecting the environment. Someone	
	innocently overlooking this permit	
	requirement, due to it not being a clear	
	requirement of the DMR, can lead to unwanted	
	compliance issues. Under the circumstances of	
	prior approval being obtained, it does not feel	
	appropriate to subject requirements with	
	potential compliance concerns on the permittee.	
	permittee.	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	B. Representative discharge outfalls. When a If	
	a facility has two or more exclusively storm	
	water outfalls that the permittee reasonably	
	believes discharge substantially identical	
	effluents, based on a consideration of	
	similarity of industrial activity, significant	
	materials, size of the drainage areas,	
	frequency of discharges and management	
	practices and activities within the area drained	
	<i>by the outfalls, then the permittee may submit</i>	
	information with the registration statement	
	substantiating the request for only one DMR to	
	be issued for the outfall to be sampled that	
	represents one or more substantially identical	
	outfalls. Also the The permittee must shall	
	document representative outfalls in the SWPPP	
	and list on the DMR of the outfall to be	
	sampled all outfall locations that are	
	represented by the discharge. The	
	representative outfall monitoring provisions	
	apply to Part I A 2 a monitoring and quarterly	
	visual monitoring.	
	The permittee must include the following	
	information in the SWPPP:	
	1. The locations of the outfalls;	
	2. An evaluation, including available	
	monitoring data, indicating why the outfalls	
	are expected to discharge substantially	
	identical effluents; and	
	3. An estimate of the size of the drainage area	
	(in acres).	
	<u></u>	
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	
	Please see the proposed language below:	
	B. Representative <del>discharge</del> outfalls. <del>When a</del> If	
	a facility has two or more exclusively storm	
	water outfalls that <del>the permittee reasonably</del>	
	believes discharge substantially identical	
	effluents, based <del>on a consideration of</del>	
	similarity of industrial activity, significant	
	materials and management practices and	
	activities within the area drained by the	
	outfalls, then the permittee may submit	
	information with the registration statement	
	substantiating the request for only one DMR to	
	be issued for the outfall to be sampled that	
	represents one or more substantially identical	
	outfalls. Also the The permittee must shall	
	document representative outfalls in the	
	SWPPP. The representative outfall monitoring	
	STITI . The representative output monitoring	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	provisions apply to Part I A 2 a monitoring	
	and quarterly visual monitoring.	
	The permittee must include the following	
	information in the SWPPP:	
	<u>1. The locations of the outfalls;</u>	
	2. A description of the type of discharge for	
	each storm water outfall	
(9) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 806: Section	See response to Comment 1.
Vulcan, E.	II, H, 3e – Inactive and Unstaffed Facilities	See response to Comment 1.
Dillion, Martin	<u>11, 11, 5e – Indcuve und Onsulfeu Faculites</u>	The general permit does not require
Marietta,	As detailed at the beginning of the comments,	training at inactive sites. At active and
Boxley, Luck	new wording suggests employee training shall	temporarily inactive sites, training must
Stone,	be conducted annually at "temporarily inactive	inform persons responsible for stormwater
Chemung,	sites." At this time, there is no definition for an	management, including implementation of
Rogers, Luck	inactive site, or a temporarily inactive site.	activities identified in the SWPPP, of the
Stone - Vigil	Regarding the need for inactive sites to require	components and goals of the SWPPP.
8	training, current language suggests "spill	Some training topics are suggested
	response, good housekeeping and material	because they are addressed by the SWPPP
	management practices." Requiring training for	provisions in the permit. Training
	areas of which are not a concern for inactive	promotes the effective implementation of
	sites is unnecessary.	the SWPPP, which is important since the
		SWPPP is a key mechanism required
	Employee training shall be conducted at least	under the permit to achieve effective
	annually at active mining and temporarily	stormwater management. Given that
	inactive sites.	temporarily inactive facilities pose
	SUCCESTED ACTION.	potential stormwater concerns due to past
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	mining and no complete closure, relevant staff need pertinent training.
	Please see the proposed language below:	starr need pertinent training.
	Employee training shall be conducted at least	
	annually at active mining sites.	
(10) VTCA,	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT LINE 847: Section	The last sentence of draft II.I.8, which
Vulcan, E.	<u>II, H, 3, i, 8 – Authorized Non-Storm Water</u>	provides "[p]avement wash waters shall
Dillion, Martin	<u>Discharges</u>	be managed to prevent the discharge of
Marietta,	This addition may discussed during the TAC	pollutants", was added after adding a list
Boxley, Luck	This addition was discussed during the TAC	of authorized non-stormwater discharges
Stone, Chemung,	meeting process but does not match the exact language viewed and discussed at that meeting.	in response to TAC input, to ensure the protection of water quality and for
Rogers, Luck	In particular, the last sentence was added and	consistency with other VPDES general
Stone - Vigil	states waters must be "managed" to prevent the	permits. This sentence has been amended
	discharge of pollutants. The big question is,	to say "[p]avement wash waters shall be
	"how do you manage an authorized discharge	managed in a manner to avoid an instream
	of paving wash waters that immediately exits	impact." This wording is the same as in
	the site?" It is understood that prior to washing	the VPDES industrial stormwater general
	that all materials capable of removal be	permit, which was referenced in the TAC
	cleaned using mechanical means prior to	as including such a list, and is more
	washing. It would be best if the agency worked	compatible with an authorized discharge
	with industry to agree on what is meant by	while still addressing the goal of
	"managing" an authorized non-storm water	protecting water quality.

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	discharge and add this information in the	
	permit or fact sheet to better clarify what type	
	of management will be needed.	
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	
	Discuss with industry and provide a better	
	explanation of what management procedures	
	are expected within the permit or fact sheet to	
	make it clear what is expected.	
(11) VTCA,	NEW LANGUAGE - VPDES GP 2018	DEQ recognizes that large storms can
Vulcan, E.	DRAFT LINE 494: Section I, B, 15 –	pose challenges to a range of permitted
Dillion, Martin	<b>Discharge of Quarry Pit Process Water</b>	facilities, including nonmetallic mines.
Marietta,	during Large Storm Events *	However, DEQ has not identified a basis
Boxley, Luck		to fully waive effluent limitations
Stone,	As initially detailed by multiple TAC group	applicable to nonmetallic mineral mine
Chemung,	representatives during the TAC meeting on	dewatering for conditions created by such
Rogers, Luck	August 2 2018, it is requested that the permit	storms and such a waiver would be
Stone - Vigil	be updated to allow for pit dewatering	inconsistent with the long-established
	discharges with no DEQ effluent limitations in	requirements under VAG84.
	emergency situations when storm events in	
	excess of 10yr/24hr events have resulted in	The effluent limitations guidelines
	excessive pit bottom flooding of storm water.	(ELGs) applicable to VAG84 include
	This addition and proposed language was provided after the TAC meeting, but was not	effluent limitations applicable to dewatering. Under 40 CFR 436 there are
	included in the draft language.	three federal ELG Subparts (which
	included in the draft language.	Virginia adopts by reference) that address
	According to the recent National Climate	nonmetallic mineral mining covered
	Assessment (NCA4), annual precipitation since	under VAG84 (Subparts B, C and R).
	the beginning of the last century has increased	These ELGs address process wastewater
	across most of the northern and eastern United	and dewatering. All three ELGs set pH
	States. In addition, observed increases in the	limits for dewatering, and one sets TSS
	frequency and intensity of events with greater	limits for dewatering. These Subparts
	than 3 inches of precipitation - in most parts of	also provide that these process wastewater
	the United States are projected to continue.	and dewatering limits are not applicable
	Data show that from 1900 to 2016 the number	to overflows from facilities designed,
	of days with heavy precipitation are increasing.	constructed and maintained to contain the
	In Virginia, the number of days of heavy	volume of wastewater that would result
	precipitation at individual stations has	from a 10-year, 24-hour storm.
	increased for almost all stations particularly	
	since the 1980s. Knowing this and with the	With regard to stormwater at in-scope
	rainfall occurrences seen in Virginia over the	nonmetallic mineral mines, the 2015
	last year, it has been a struggle at many	MSGP includes pH limits for dewatering
	facilities to operate our facilities after many of	discharges.
	these large events. Many mine sites within the state of Virginia utilize quarry pits for storm	VAG84includes effluent limits for
	water storage during storm events; the quarry	discharges of process wastewater and
	pit itself has no other choice but to store direct	comingled stormwater associated with
	rainfall. This is usually preferred and very	industrial activity. The general permit also
	practical during smaller events as it allows	defines mine pit dewatering as process
	facilities to collect storm water and eliminates	wastewater (such water may comingle
	the need to manage multiple storm water	with process wastewater and typically
	outfalls. However, during very large storm	comes into contact with raw materials,
	<b>~</b> • <b>~</b>	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	events of around 4 inches equaling about a	intermediate byproducts, finished
	10yr/24hr storm event or larger, the quarry pit	products, and/or waste products that result
	collects an exorbitant amount of water. This	in potential contamination).
	excess of water in the pit can delay mining for	1
	a facility by flooding active mining areas.	In VAG84, the most stringent of the
	Below is an example of a real-life type of	applicable ELGs is applied to discharges
	Scenario:	of process wastewater (including
		dewatering) and comingled wastewaters.
	A facility operates a quarry pit with	Process wastewater discharges are subject
	approximately 150 acres of drainage area	to pH limits based on federal effluent
	reporting to the quarry pit. The storm water	limitation guidelines and Virginia's water
	controls are via their quarry pit which would be	quality standards. Process wastewater
	the equivalent of approximately 15 additional	discharges are also subject to TSS limits
	outfalls at the facility if the storm water	based federal effluent guidelines for some
	structures could be built to report to them. The	of the industrial categories covered and
	facility tries to maintain multiple active	levels that DEQ has determined will
	working areas within the pit, but pit	protect receiving waters from solids
	development has forced the majority of the	impacts based on experience with VPDES
	extraction within the bottom pit level. During a	individual permits.
	busy month in August, a large storm event hits	marviauai permito.
		VAC94 door not include the provision in
	the site and dumps approximately 5.6 inches of	VAG84 does not include the provision in
	rain overnight – the equivalent of a 10yr/24hr	40 CFR 436 that provides that limits are
	rain event for the region. The 0.5-acre pit sump	not applicable to overflows from facilities
	is completely overwhelmed with over 2 million	designed, constructed and maintained to contain or treat the volume of wastewater
	gallons of water and the pit bottom is flooded	
	with approximately 13 million gallons of	that would result from a 10-year, 24-hour
	water. The active face is no longer accessible,	storm. VAG84 includes a "no discharge"
	and operations come to a halt.	facility provision under which no
		sampling or DMR is required for a
	Upon completion of the storm event, the site	discharge where a process wastewater
	decides to wait to discharge for two weeks to	system is designed to operate as a no
	ensure they can meet their effluent limitations	discharge system except in storm events
	of the permit. At the end of the wait, they begin	greater than the 25-year, 24-hour storm.
	discharging the process water 24-hours a day	This design threshold is based on best
	via 1,000 GPM pump to their permitted	professional judgement and consistent
	process water outfall. It takes approximately 8	with Virginia Pollution Abatement (VPA)
	<ul> <li>12 working days to drain the pit to allow</li> </ul>	no discharge permit requirements
	access to the working face. During that time,	(9VAC25-32-30). DEQ notes that the
	approximately 13 million gallons of storm	overflow provision in Part 436 applies to
	water were discharged, and the site has been	treatment systems (i.e., impoundments)
	down for an approximately a month.	and by its terms is limited to overflows of
		properly designed and maintained ponds,
	If allowed to report to DEQ and discharge, the	it is not applicable to intentional mine pit
	pit could ideally discharge very soon after the	dewatering discharges.
	storm event; operations could restart within 8-	
	12 days instead of 3-4 weeks.	The Texas stormwater general permit
		(TXR050000) mentioned in the comment
	As previously discussed, if these 10yr/24hr or	does not alter the information presented
	larger storm event drainage waters reported	above or provide a unique basis for
	directly to traditional storm water basins, then	waiving dewatering limits in Virginia.
	the water would be discharged immediately	The Texas stormwater general permit,
	during the storm event in a shorter timeframe	which includes limits for dewatering,
	(usually a few hours) resulting in less retention	largely reflects the federal MSGP. As

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	time and sediment settling than when	such, the Texas stormwater general permit
	compared to being collected in the quarry pit	only covers discharges of industrial
	and then being pumped over an extended	stormwater, not discharges of process
	period of time (usually days or weeks). Would a basin with a much shorter retention time of a	wastewater, which are addressed under VAG84. In addition, under TXR050000,
	few hours be favorable to collecting in a sump and pumping slowly allowing for a longer retention and settling time of multiple days or	mine dewatering discharges consist solely of stormwater and non-contaminated groundwater. In contrast, VAG84 covers
	weeks and therefore affording a cleaner discharge?	discharges of process wastewater and discharges of stormwater and, under VAG84, mine pit dewatering is defined as process wastewater. Unlike the MSGP,
	The current permit already allows for designed process water ponds, which are true process water systems as they are water used in the	the Texas stormwater general permit does include a waiver that provides (similar to the ELGs) that numeric effluent
	processing of mined materials, to discharge without limits in a storm larger than a 25-year	limitations for mine dewatering do not apply to discharges that overflow from
	24-hour storm event. Conversely, in most cases, pit dewatering involves pumping storm	structural control facilities that are designed, constructed, and maintained to
	water with possible minimal amounts of infiltrating groundwater from the quarry pit.	contain or treat the volume of mine dewatering wastewater that would result
	The water is more similar to storm water than process water since it is typically generated	from a 10-year, 24-hour storm event. As discussed above, VAG84 includes a
	from an accumulation of storm runoff into the pit and in most cases no process water systems	different design standard used as a no discharge management option based on
	are located in the mining pit. The state of	BPJ and existing VPA regulations. Thus,
	Texas, in fact, treats mine pit dewatering more like storm water than process water. In the Texas TPDES General Permit No.	the approach in the Texas stormwater general permit is not a substitute for VAG84.
	TXR050000, Mine Pit Dewatering only has an effluent limit and annual sample for pH. Otherwise water can be pumped and is treated	As part of considering this issue, DEQ inquired of several other states as to
	like storm water collected in the bottom of the pit. In pits that are designed to hold or treat the	whether dewatering was given special treatment and researched existing state
	volume of water from a 10-year 24-hour rain event, no effluent limits apply to the discharge	requirements.
	from these systems.	Information and responses from seven states (IN, MD, MN, MO, NC, OR, PA)
	Please consider the below language regarding an allowance to discharge storm water	did not identify a waiver of limits for dewatering following extreme storms.
	collected in our pits under extremely unusual storm events. The language both assists mining	Rather, these states tend to reflect the federal ELG overflow provision. For
	facilities after these events while also keeping the DEQ informed during the discharge.	example, North Carolina (which includes TSS, settleable solids, and flow limits
	SUGGESTED ACTION:	applicable to dewatering for certain high quality waters, as well as turbidity and pH limits) indicated that they provide a
	Please see the proposed language below for	conditional monitoring waiver for
	Mine Pit Dewatering in case of flooded pit conditions	dewatering and process wastewater (i.e., "except for mine dewatering of clay pits,
	Effluent limitations shall not apply to	a grab sample is not required for these [limited] parameters from a basin/pond
	discharges associated with mine pit dewatering	designed to contain or treat mine

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response		
	consisting of storm water and infiltrating	dewatering wastewater that only		
	ground water resulting from a storm equal to	discharges in response to rainfall in		
	or greater than a 10-year, 24-hour storm event	excess of the 10-yr, 24-hr storm). (See,		
	that has caused emergency flood conditions	See Table 7, footnote 2, and Table 8,		
	within the mine. Effluent limitations shall not	NCG020000). Communication with NC		
	apply until the flooding condition can be	DEQ staff indicated that the statement in		
	rectified or as deemed appropriate by the DEQ	footnote 2 only gives relief to obtaining a		
	regional office. The operator must notify the	grab sample of overflows from a		
	DEQ of such conditions as an Unusual or	basin/pond designed to contain the		
	Extraordinary discharge as described in Part	10yr/24hr storm that only discharges due to a rainfall in excess of that event.		
	<i>III H of the permit. This discharge event may only occur during emergency operation</i>	Otherwise, the dewatering is still subject		
	scenarios where pit access is obstructed due to	to the effluent limitations of the permit.		
	the severity of the storm. The facility shall	As discussed above, Virginia does not use		
	provide a time period of expected discharge in	the 10-year, 24-hour design standard in		
	order to rectify flooding conditions. These	VAG84.		
	discharges may not contravene Virginia water			
	quality standards.	Similarly, Minnesota offers a waiver of		
		sampling for dewatering (TSS and pH		
		limits) where a basin is designed/		
		confirmed by PE to control the 10-year,		
		24-hour storm, but this waiver is limited		
		to overflows caused solely by direct		
		rainfall and groundwater seepage. This		
		does not include unauthorized non-		
		stormwater discharges to surface waters.		
		This waiver is for monitoring only;		
		effluent limits still apply to the discharge		
		and permittees must maintain compliance with the limits. (See sec. 2.6.87,		
		MNG490000).		
		With regard to existing state		
		requirements, DEQ notes that under the		
		VPDES Bypass regulation the term		
		"severe property damage", which is an		
		exception to the prohibition of Bypass, is		
		specifically defined such that it expressly		
		excludes economic loss caused by delays		
		in production. (9VAC25-31-190 M and		
		25-31-10).		
		In assessment in an and the second it is a		
		In summary, in researching permitting approaches in other states DEQ found that		
		several states offer relief consistent with		
		the provisions in 40 CFR 436 such that		
		effluent limits and/or monitoring		
		requirements do not apply to <u>overflows</u>		
		from facilities designed to meet the 10-		
		year, 24-hour storm event. None of these		
		provisions appear to apply to the		
		deliberate dewatering of a mine pit		
		following a storm event.		

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
(12) Kyanite	NEW LANGUAGE - VPDES GP 2018:	DEQ is not adopting the large storm
	<u>Section I.B.15 — Discharge of Quarry Pit</u>	dewatering waiver language suggested by
	<u>Process Water During Large Storm Events</u>	VTCA for the reasons discussed above.
		See response to Comment 11.
	Members of the Virginia Transportation	
	Construction Alliance (VTCA) are providing detailed comments on this new condition.	
	KMC supports the comments of the VTCA	
	member companies and incorporates those	
	comments as part of this submission, with one	
	exception.	
	Specifically, KMC requests that Part I.B.15 be	
	revised consistent with the VTCA comments,	
	except for clarifying language added to the last	
	sentence. We request that this condition be	
	revised as follows (note that we have placed in bold and underlined font, the sentence of the	
	VTCA's proposed condition that we request be	
	revised).	
	"Effluent limitations shall not apply to	
	discharges associated with mine pit dewatering	
	consisting of storm water and infiltrating	
	ground water resulting from a storm equal to	
	or greater than a 10 year, 24-hour storm event	
	that has caused emergency flood conditions within the mine. Effluent limitations shall not	
	apply until the flooding condition can be	
	rectified or as deemed appropriate by the DEQ	
	regional office. The operator must notify the	
	DEQ of such conditions as an Unusual or	
	Extraordinary discharge as described in Part	
	III H of the permit. This discharge event may	
	only occur during emergency operation	
	scenarios where pit access is obstructed due to	
	the severity of the storm. The facility shall	
	provide a time period of expected discharge in order to rectify flooding conditions. <u>These</u>	
	discharges may not cause a contravention of	
	Virginia water quality standards in the	
	receiving waters."	
(13) Kyanite	VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT Part I.B.10	Under the VPDES program, discharge is
	Discharge Prohibitions	normally understood to mean discharge of
		a pollutant from a point source, with
	DEQ has revised Part I.B.10 of the permit to	outfalls normally constituting those point
	include separate discharge prohibitions in Conditions I.B.10.a, b, and c. For example,	sources. (See the definition of "discharge" and "discharge of a pollutant" in
	Condition I.B.10.b now reads, in part, as	9VAC25-31-10).
	follows:	
		In Part I.B.10, subsections a and c address
	"There shall be no:	discharges and, thus, DEQ does not

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	b. Solids deposition to surface water as a result of industrial activity"	believe further clarification is necessary. For purposes of clarification consistent
	For clarity, KMC requests that Conditions I.B.10.a, b, & c be revised to clarify that these prohibitions apply to floating solids, visible foam, solids deposition, and oil sheens downstream of the facility's outfall(s). Proposed language is provided as follows (proposed changes underlined for emphasis):	with the comment, DEQ has amended subsection b to read as follows: "Solids deposition to surface water as a result of <u>a</u> <u>discharge associated with</u> industrial activity;" (final change underlined).
	"There shall be no: a. Discharge of floating solids or visible foam <u>downstream of the outfall</u> in other than trace amounts from process water discharges; b. Solids deposition to surface water <u>downstream of the outfall</u> as a result of industrial activity; or c. Oil Sheen resulting from petroleum products discharged to surface water <u>downstream of the</u> <u>outfall</u> as a result of the industrial activity,"	
(14) Kyanite	<u>VPDES GP 2018 DRAFT Part II.A.2.a –</u> <u>Sampling from Stormwater Management</u> <u>Structures</u>	Removal of the parenthetical was done to promote consistency with the ISWGP (9VAC25-151). The change is not meant
	Draft Permit Part II.A.2 provides procedures on "when and how to sample" stormwater	to imply that a series of settling ponds are not a stormwater management structure.
	discharges. DEQ has revised Part II.A.2.a of the permit to read as follows (underlined wording represents revised language):	The draft and final permit adds a definition of "control measure" that is consistent with 9VAC25-151 and provides that "[c]ontrol measure" means
	"a. In the case of snowmelt or a discharge from a stormwater management structure (a series of settling lagoons), a representative sample shall be taken at the time the discharge occurs."	any best management practice or other method (including effluent limitations) used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters. 9VAC25-
	The DEQ has removed the parenthetical that previously read "(a series of settling lagoons)." The reason for the removal of this language is	190-10. This definition does not include examples but does provide criteria that owners of regulated facilities can use to determine their status and corresponding
	unclear. However, by removing this parenthetical language, we are concerned that the DEQ may have inadvertently implied that it does not consider "a series of settling lagoons"	permit requirements.
	to be a stormwater management structure. We have also noted that the term "stormwater management structure" is not defined within the regulation. Therefore, if the DEQ removes	
	the above-referenced parenthetical in Draft Permit Part II.A.2.a, we request that the term "stormwater management structure" be defined	
	within the rule and include examples of	

Commenter(s)	Comment(s)	Agency Response
	stormwater management structures such as	
	lagoons, settling basins, retention ponds, etc.	
VTCA (Public Hearing comment not addressed elsewhere)	DEQ and VTCA could have addressed comments through negotiations as part of additional TAC meetings but we are confident comments can and will be addressed.	DEQ respects and values the dialogue achieved within the TAC process and acknowledges that, in this instance, the general permit development process proceeded quickly. This resulted from DEQ's need to reissue this general permit in a timely manner while satisfying all procedural requirements. DEQ did not want to have to administratively extend this general permit. If a general permit is not reissued in a timely manner and must be administratively extended, no new facilities can obtain coverage under that general permit. A TAC meeting was held on 8/2/2018. DEQ proposed the NMMM general permit regulation at the 9/20/18 Board meeting. A public hearing was held on 11/27/2018, and the public comment period extended from 10/29/2018-12/28- 2018. Eleven interested parties submitted comments regarding the draft general permit. In response to industry concerns, DEQ held a call with industry representatives on 1/31/19 to discuss the remaining steps in the regulatory process. This document reflects DEQ's consideration and response to those comments. In several instances, the draft regulation has been altered in response to comments.

Substantive changes to the existing regulation are:

- Section 10 *Definitions*. Added North American Industry Classification System codes (NAICS) to provisions that include SIC codes. Added definitions of "control measure," "minimize," "NAICS," "Temporarily inactive sites," and "Virginia Environmental Excellence Program." Removed definition of "Vehicle or equipment degreasing." Made the description of "inactive mining operations" within the definition of "Industrial activity" into a stand-alone definition.
- Section 15 *Applicability of incorporated references based on the dates that they became effective*. A statement was revised to update all Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations within the document to be those published as of July 1, 2018. This is a recommendation from the DEQ Office of Policy.
- Section 20 *Purpose; delegation of authority; effective date of permit.* Updated the effective date to July 1, 2019 and the expiration date to June 30, 2024. Added NAICS codes that correspond to existing SIC codes (corrected two NAICS codes added to draft permit).

- Section 50 *Authorization to discharge*. Clarified that permittees must have and maintain a DMME (mining) permit. Made continuation of permit language more generic (for use across most general permit [GPs]).
- Section 60 *Registration Statement*. New facility registration statement must be submitted 60 days prior to discharge (was 45) to ensure consistent registration requirements across GP sectors. For existing facilities covered by an individual permit and seeking general permit coverage, changed registration submittal from 210 to 240 days prior to expiration of the individual permit. For existing facilities covered under the expiring general permit, removed the specific permit effective date (July 1, 2009) and provide that a complete registration statement must be submitted at least 60 days prior to permit expiration or as specified by the Board. For late registration, removed the June 30, 2014 date and replaced with after the expiration date of this permit. Removed the sentence pertaining to submission of registration after April 1, 2014.

Required discharge notification of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) at the time of registration and inclusion of the notification with the registration statement. Removed the requirement to submit monitoring data associated with Special Standard m under the Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-310). This standard applies to discharges to the Chickahominy watershed and has been amended to apply to sources of organic nutrients only. Added a requirement that applicants provide a State Corporation Commission entity identification number if the facility is required to obtain an entity identification number by law. This ensures the correct entity is permitted and the permittee is authorized to conduct business in the state.

Include on registration statement a list of chemicals added to water that could be discharged, *including* Safety Data Sheets, the maximum proposed dosing rates, and a demonstration that the application or use will not result in aquatic toxicity to protect water quality in receiving streams.

Removed the requirement to provide the latitude and longitude of the facility. (Retain the latitude and longitude requirement for outfalls).

Section 70 – *General Permit*. Revised the effective and termination dates of the general permit. Added that the discharge must be in accordance with the information submitted with the registration statement. This ensures the authorization is further conditioned on such information.

Removed TPH monitoring for process water outfalls from vehicle or equipment degreasing. Data levels have been predominantly below detection. Removed associated footnote 3.

Added I.A.2.b, which relocates visual monitoring requirement (with associated documentation) from routine inspection section. Clarified in response to comment that language in the draft permit that asks for documentation of the "nature of discharge" focuses on whether the discharge is the result of runoff or snowmelt. Specify that visual monitoring records are to be retained in the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP).

Replaced materials handling storage text with language from GM14-2003 VPDES guidance document (boilerplate). Added language clarifying that dust suppression shall not occur during a storm that results in an actual discharge.

Specified that if a facility exceeds the action threshold the permittee must conduct a routine facility inspection within 5 days of becoming aware of the exceedance, and correct any deficiency with 60 days of identification. Moved this from special conditions (I B) to I A 2 a.

Clarified in response to comment that the prohibition on solids deposition to surface water applies to *discharges* associated with industrial activity.

Deleted requirement to meet special Chickahominy water quality standard since the standard has been revised to apply to wastewater treatment facilities treating an organic nutrient source.

Added a new provision that requires the use of BMPs to ensure that contaminants do not enter surface waters as a result of blasting. One regional office identified a concern with ammonia associated with explosives.

The inactive and unstaffed facilities waiver for monitoring and inspections applies to temporarily inactive sites. Clarified in response to comment that this applies to temporarily inactive and unstaffed sites.

#### PART II

Revised and updated the representative outfall language. Removed in response to comment consideration of the size of drainage area in assessing representative outfalls. Narrowed sampling waiver language so it is only applicable to quarterly visual stormwater monitoring.

Changed updating SWPPP from within 90 days of coverage to 60 days to be consistent with other SWPPP revision/ update provisions in this and other related general permits.

Merged comprehensive site compliance evaluation into routine inspection provisions, consistent with the VPDES industrial stormwater general permit (ISW GP) and EPA 2015 Multisector General Permit (MSGP), and amended related references.

Added that employee training shall be conducted at least annually at active mining and at temporarily inactive sites that are staffed, consistent with ISW GP and EPA 2015 MSGP. Training must be documented in the SWPPP.

For housekeeping, added, "the permittee shall keep clean all exposed areas of the facility that are potential sources of pollutants in stormwater. The permittee shall sweep or vacuum paved surfaces of the site that are exposed to stormwater at regular intervals or use other equivalent measures, to minimize the potential discharge of these materials in stormwater. Indicate in the SWPPP the frequency of sweeping, vacuuming, or other equivalent measures." This language is for consistency with the ISW general permit and U.S. EPA MSGP.

Clarified follow up actions to be taken in response to routine facility inspections.

Added, "the requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status." This is consistent with the ISW general permit. The VEEP program requires a fully implemented EMS, pollution prevention program, and demonstrated environmental compliance.

Added a list of authorized non-stormwater discharges consistent with the ISW general permit. Revised the entry addressing pavement wash waters in response to comment to specify that pavement wash waters shall be managed in a manner to avoid instream impacts.

#### 2019 - Amend and Reissue Existing Nonmetallic Mineral Mining General Permit Regulation

#### 9VAC25-190-10. Definitions.

The words and terms used in this chapter shall have the meanings defined in the State Water Control Law Chapter 3.1 (§ 62.1-44.2 et seq.) of Title 62.1 of the Code of Virginia and the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Permit Regulation (9VAC25-31) unless the context clearly indicates otherwise. Additionally, for the purposes of this chapter:

"Best management practices" or "BMPs" means schedules of activities, practices (and prohibitions of practices), structures, vegetation, maintenance procedures, and other management practices to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters. BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site run-off, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

"Colocated facility" means an industrial activity other than mineral mining operating on a site where the primary industrial activity is mineral mining. Such an activity must have wastewater characteristics similar to those of the mineral mine and be located within the permitted mining area. The term refers to activities that are commonly found at mining

sites such as manufacturing of ready-mix concrete (SIC Code 3273) 3273, NAICS Code 327320), concrete products (SIC Codes 3271 and 3272) 3271 and 3272, NAICS Codes 327331, 327332, and 327390), and asphalt paving materials (SIC Code 2951) 2951, NAICS Code 324121) except asphalt emulsion manufacturing. It does not mean industrial activity that is specifically excluded from this permit.

"Control measure" means any best management practice or other method (including effluent limitations) used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

"Department" or "DEQ" means the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

["Inactive mining operations" means mining sites that are not being actively mined, but which have an identifiable owner or operator; inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined materials, nor sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim.]

"Industrial activity" means activity associated with mineral mining facilities generally identified by SIC Major Group 14 including active or inactive mining operations that discharge stormwater that has come into contact with any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished products, by-products or waste products located on the site of such operations. <u>This includes activity at facilities or those portions of a facility where the primary purpose is classified</u> <u>as:</u>

1. North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 212311 - Dimension Stone Mining and Quarrying, and Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 1411 - Dimension Stone;

2. NAICS Code 212312 - Crushed and Broken Limestone Mining and Quarrying, and SIC Code 1422 Crushed and Broken Limestone;

3. NAICS Code 212313 - Crushed and Broken Granite Mining and Quarrying, and SIC Code 1423 - Crushed and Broken Granite;

4. NAICS Code 212319 - Crushed and Broken Stone not elsewhere classified (NEC), and SIC Code 1429 Crushed and Broken Stone NEC;

5. NAICS Code 212321 - Construction Sand and Gravel, and SIC Code 1442 - Construction Sand and Gravel; 6. NAICS Code 212324 - Kaolin and Ball Clay Mining, and SIC Code 1455 - Kaolin and Ball Clay;

7. NAICS Code 212325 - Clay and Ceramic and Refractory Minerals Mining, and SIC Code 1459 - Clay and Related Minerals, NEC (excluding for purposes of both NAICS and SIC bentonite and magnesite mines);

8. NAICS Code 212392 - Phosphate Rock Mining, and SIC Code 1475 - Phosphate Rock; and

9. NAICS Codes 212399 - All Other Nonmetallic Mineral Mining, and SIC Code 1499 - Miscellaneous Nonmetallic Minerals, except fuels (excluding for purposes of both NAICS and SIC gypsum, graphite, asbestos, diatomite, jade, novaculite, wollastonite, Tripoli, or asphaltic mineral mines).

[(Inactive mining operations are mining sites that are not being actively mined, but which have an identifiable owner/operator <u>owner or operator</u>; inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined materials, nor sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim.)] Industrial activity also includes facilities classified under other SIC codes that may be colocated within the mineral mine permit area, unless they are expressly excluded by this general permit.

"Minimize" means reduce or eliminate to the extent achievable using control measures, including best management practices, that are technologically available and economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practice.

"Municipal separate storm sewer system" or "MS4" means a conveyance or system of conveyances, including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains (i) owned or operated by a state, city, town, county, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to state law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, stormwater, or other wastes, including special districts under state law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under § 208 of the Clean Water Act that discharges to surface waters of the state; (ii) designed or used for collecting or conveying stormwater; (iii) that is not a combined sewer; and (iv) that is not part of a publicly owned treatment works (POTW).

"NAICS" means North American Industry Classification System, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 2017.

"Permittee" means the owner of a nonmetallic mineral mine covered under this general permit.

"Process wastewater" means any wastewater used in the slurry transport of mined material, air emissions control, or processing exclusive of mining, and any other water that becomes commingled with such wastewater in a pit, pond, lagoon, mine, or other facility used for treatment of such wastewater. It includes mine pit dewatering, water used in the

process of washing stone, noncontact cooling water, wastewater from vehicle or equipment degreasing activities, vehicle washing and return water from operations where mined material is dredged and miscellaneous plant cleanup wastewaters.

"Run-off coefficient" means the fraction of total rainfall that will appear at the conveyance as run-off.

"SIC" means the Standard Industrial Classification Code or Industrial Grouping from the U.S. Office of Management and Budget Standard Industrial Classification Manual, 1987 Edition.

"Significant materials" includes, but is not limited to, raw materials; fuels; materials such as solvents, detergents, and plastic pellets; finished materials; hazardous substances designated under Section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 USC § 9601 et seq.); any chemical the owner is required to report pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) (42 USC § 11001 et seq.); fertilizers; pesticides; and waste products such as ashes, slag and sludge (including pond sediments) that have the potential to be released with stormwater discharges.

"Significant spills" includes, but is not limited to, releases of oil or hazardous substances in excess of reportable quantities under § 311 of the Clean Water Act (see 40 CFR 110.10 and 40 CFR 117.21) or § 102 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 USC § 9601 et seq.) (see 40 CFR 302.4).

"Stormwater" means stormwater run-off, snow melt run-off, and surface run-off and drainage.

"Stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity" means the discharge from any conveyance that is used for collecting and conveying stormwater and that is directly related to manufacturing, processing or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant. The term does not include discharges from facilities or activities excluded from the VPDES program under 9VAC25-31. For the categories of industries identified in the "industrial activity" definition, the term includes, but is not limited to, stormwater discharges from industrial plant yards; immediate access roads and rail lines used or traveled by carriers of raw materials, manufactured products, waste material, or by-products used or created by the mineral mine; material handling sites; refuse sites; sites used for the application or disposal of process wastewaters; sites used for the storage and maintenance of material handling equipment; sites used for residual treatment, storage, or disposal; shipping and receiving areas; manufacturing buildings; storage areas (including tank farms) for raw materials, and intermediate and finished products; and areas where industrial activity has taken place in the past and significant materials remain and are exposed to stormwater. For the purposes of this paragraph, material handling activities include the storage, loading and unloading, transportation, or conveyance of any raw material, intermediate product, finished product, by-product or waste product. The term excludes areas located on plant lands separate from the plant's industrial activities, such as office buildings and accompanying parking lots as long as the drainage from the excluded areas is not mixed with stormwater drained from the above described areas.

[ "Temporarily inactive mineral mining facility" means a site or portion of a site where nonmetallic mineral mining and/or milling occurred in the past but currently are not being actively undertaken, and the facility is covered by an active mining permit issued by the applicable state or federal agency. ]

"Total maximum daily load" or "TMDL" means a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant's sources. A TMDL includes wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point source discharges, and load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources or natural background or both, and must include a margin of safety (MOS) and account for seasonal variations.

"Twenty-five-year, 24-hour storm event" means the maximum 24-hour precipitation event with a probable recurrence interval of once in 25 years as established by the National Weather Service or appropriate regional or state rainfall probability information.

"Vehicle or equipment degreasing" means the washing or steam cleaning of engines of a vehicle or piece of equipment and other drive components in which the purpose is to clean and degrease and clean petroleum products from the equipment for maintenance. Washing the vehicle exterior for the purpose of removing sediment is not considered vehicle or equipment degreasing.

"Virginia Environmental Excellence Program" or "VEEP" means a voluntary program established by the department to provide public recognition and regulatory incentives to encourage higher levels of environmental performance for program participants that develop and implement environmental management systems (EMSs). The program is based on the use of EMSs that improve compliance, prevent pollution, and utilize other measures to improve environmental performance.

#### 9VAC25-190-15. Applicability of incorporated references based on the dates that they became effective.

Except as noted, when a regulation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency set forth in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is referenced or adopted herein in this chapter and incorporated by reference that regulation shall be as it exists and has been published as of July 1, 2013 2018.

#### 9VAC25-190-20. Purpose; delegation of authority; effective date of permit.

A. The purpose of this chapter is to establish General Permit Number VAG84 to regulate wastewater discharge and stormwater discharges to surface waters from nonmetallic mineral mines as follows:

1. For active and inactive nonmetallic mineral mining facilities in SIC Major Group 14, this general permit covers discharges composed entirely of stormwater associated with industrial activity.

2. This general permit authorizes the discharge of process wastewater as well as stormwater associated with industrial activity from active and inactive mineral mines classified under:

a. SIC Codes Code 1411 - NAICS Code 212311,

b. SIC Code 1422 - NAICS Code [ 21312212312 ],

c. SIC Code 1423 - NAICS Code 212313,

d. SIC Code 1429 - NAICS Code 212319,

e. SIC Code 1442 - NAICS Code [ 212421212321 ],

f. SIC Code 1455 - NAICS Code 212324,

g. SIC Code 1459 - NAICS Code 212325, excluding bentonite and magnesite mines,

h. SIC Code 1475 - NACIS Code 212392, and

<u>i. SIC Code</u> 1499 <u>- NAICS Code 212399</u>, excluding gypsum, graphite, asbestos, diatomite, jade, novaculite, wollastonite, tripoli or asphaltic mineral mines.

3. Coal mining, metal mining, and oil and gas extraction are not covered by this general permit.

B. The director, or an authorized representative, may perform any act of the board provided under this chapter, except as limited by § 62.1-44.14 of the Code of Virginia.

C. This general permit will become effective on July 1,  $\frac{2014}{2019}$ , and will expire June 30,  $\frac{2019}{2024}$ . For any covered owner, this general permit is effective upon compliance with all the provisions of 9VAC25-190-50 and the receipt of this general permit.

## 9VAC25-190-50. Authorization to discharge.

A. Any owner governed by this general permit is authorized to discharge process wastewater and stormwater as described in 9VAC25-190-20 A 1 and 2 to surface waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia provided that:

1. The owner submits a registration statement in accordance with 9VAC25-190-60, and that registration statement is accepted by the board;

2. The owner submits the required permit fee;

3. The owner complies with the applicable effluent limitations and other requirements of 9VAC25-190-70;

4. The owner has <u>and maintains during such authorization</u> a mineral mining permit for the operation to be covered by this general permit that has been approved by the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy, Division of Mineral Mining (or an associated waivered program, locality, or state agency) under provisions and requirements of Title 45.1 of the Code of Virginia. Mineral mines located in bordering states with discharges in Virginia shall provide documentation that they have a mining permit from the appropriate state authority. Mineral mines owned and operated by governmental bodies not subject to the provisions and requirements of Title 45.1 of the Code of Virginia are exempt from this requirement; and

5. The board has not notified the owner that the discharge is not eligible for coverage in accordance with subsection B of this section.

B. The board will notify an owner that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit in the event of any of the following:

1. The owner is required to obtain an individual permit in accordance with 9VAC25-31-170 B 3 of the VPDES Permit Regulation;

2. The owner is proposing to discharge to state waters specifically named in other board regulations that prohibit such discharges;

3. The discharge violates or would violate the antidegradation policy in the water quality standards at 9VAC25-260-30; or

4. The discharge is not consistent with the assumptions and requirements of an approved TMDL.

C. Compliance with this general permit constitutes compliance for purposes of enforcement with §§ 301, 302, 306, 307, 318, 403, and 405(b) of the federal Clean Water Act and the State Water Control Law, with the exceptions stated in 9VAC25-31-60 of the VPDES Permit Regulation. Approval for coverage under this general permit does not relieve any owner of the responsibility to comply with any other applicable federal, state, or local statute, ordinance, or regulation.

D. Continuation of permit coverage.

1. Any owner that was authorized to discharge under the nonmetallic mineral mining general permit issued in 2009 and that submits a complete registration statement before July 1, 2014, is authorized to continue to discharge under the terms of the 2009 general permit Permit coverage shall expire at the end of the applicable permit term. However, expiring permit coverages are automatically continued if the owner has submitted a complete registration statement at least 60 days prior to the expiration date of the permit, or a later submittal date established by the board, which cannot extend beyond the expiration date of the permit. The permittee is authorized to continue to discharge until such time as the board either:

a. Issues coverage to the owner under this general permit; or

b. Notifies the owner that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit.

2. When the owner that was covered under the expiring or expired general permit has violated or is violating the conditions of that permit, the board may choose to do any or all of the following:

a. Initiate enforcement action based upon <del>coverage under the 2009</del> <u>the</u> general permit <u>coverage</u> that has been continued;

b. Issue a notice of intent to deny coverage under the reissued general permit. If the general permit coverage is denied, the owner would then be required to cease the discharges authorized by <u>the continued</u> coverage <del>under the 2009 continued general permit</del> or be subject to enforcement action for discharging without a permit;

c. Issue an individual permit with appropriate conditions; or

d. Take other actions authorized by the VPDES Permit Regulation (9VAC25-31).

#### 9VAC25-190-60. Registration statement.

A. The <u>Any</u> owner seeking coverage under this general permit shall submit a complete VPDES general permit registration statement in accordance with this section, which shall serve as a notice of intent for coverage under the <u>VPDES</u> general <del>VPDES</del> permit for nonmetallic mineral mining facilities.

1. New facilities. Any owner proposing a discharge shall submit a complete registration statement at least  $45 \underline{60}$  days prior to the date planned for commencement of the discharge <u>or a later submittal date established by the board</u>.

2. Existing facilities.

a. Any owner covered by an <u>VPDES</u> individual <del>VPDES</del> permit that is proposing to be covered by this general permit shall submit a complete registration statement at least <del>210</del> <u>240</u> days prior to the expiration date of the individual VPDES permit.

b. Any owner that was authorized to discharge under the <u>expiring</u> VPDES general permit for nonmetallic mineral mining that became effective on July 1, 2009, and that intends to continue coverage under this general permit shall submit a complete registration statement to the board on or before April 1, 2014 at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the existing permit or a later submittal date established by the board.

B. Late registration statements. Registration statements for existing facilities covered under subdivision A 2 b of this section will be accepted after June 30, 2014 the expiration date of this permit, but authorization to discharge will not be retroactive. Owners described in subdivision A 2 b of this section that submit registration statements after April 1, 2014, are authorized to discharge under the provisions of 9VAC25-190-50 D if a complete registration statement is submitted before July 1, 2014.

C. The required registration statement shall contain the following information:

- 1. Facility owner and operator or other contact name, address, email address, and telephone number;
- 2. Facility name, county, [ and ] location [ , latitude, and longitude ];
- 3. Description of mining activity;
- 4. Primary and secondary SIC codes;
- 5. Discharge information including:
  - a. A list of outfalls identified by outfall numbers;

b. Characterization of the type of each listed outfall's discharge as either process wastewater, stormwater, or process wastewater commingled with stormwater;

c. Characterization of the source of each listed outfall's discharge as either mine pit dewatering, stormwater associated with industrial activity (see definition in 9VAC25-190-10), stormwater not associated with industrial activity, ground water groundwater infiltration, wastewater from vehicle or equipment degreasing activities, vehicle washing and return water from operations where mined material is dredged, mined material washing, noncontact cooling water, miscellaneous plant cleanup wastewater, colocated facility

discharges (identify the colocated facility), other discharges not listed here (describe), or any combination of the above;

d. The receiving stream, including wetlands for each outfall listed;

e. The latitude and longitude for each outfall listed; and

f. Indicate which stormwater outfalls will be representative outfalls that require a single discharge monitoring report (DMR). For stormwater outfalls that are to be represented by other outfall discharges, provide a description of the activities associated with those outfalls and explain why they are substantially the same as the representative outfall to be sampled;

6. Indicate if the facility has a current VPDES permit and the permit number if it does;

7. Description of wastewater treatment or reuse/recycle, reuse or recycle systems, or both;

8. List of any <u>treatment</u> chemicals added to <u>water</u> <u>wastewater or stormwater</u> that could be discharged. <u>Include</u> <u>safety data sheets[ ; ] [ and ] the maximum proposed dosing rates; [ and a demonstration that application or use will not result in aquatic toxicity. ]</u>

9. List of colocated facilities;

10. Indicate if the facility is a hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility;

11. Schematic drawing showing water flow from source to water-using industrial operations to waste treatment and disposal, and disposal of any solids removed from wastewater;

12. Aerial photo or scale map that clearly shows the property boundaries, plant site, drainage areas associated with each outfall, locations of all mine pit dewatering, existing, significant sources of materials exposed to precipitation, stormwater or process wastewater outfalls and the receiving streams;

13. Evidence, such as the permit-license to operate a mine page, that the operation to be covered by this general permit has a mining permit that has been approved by the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy, Division of Mineral Mining (or associated waivered program) under the provisions and requirements of Title 45.1 of the Code of Virginia (or appropriate bordering state authorization). Mineral mines owned and operated by governmental bodies not subject to the provisions and requirements of Title 45.1 of the Code of Virginia are exempt from this requirement;

14. Mining permit number;

15. Whether the permitted [ outfall facility ] will discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). If so, provide the name of the MS4 owner. The yes, the facility owner of the facility shall notify the MS4 owner in writing of the existence of the discharge within 30 days of coverage under the general permit and shall copy the DEQ regional office with the notification at the time of registration under this permit and include that notification with the registration statement. The notification shall include the following information: the name of the facility, a contact person and phone number contact information, the location of the discharge, the nature of the discharge, and the facility's VPDES general permit number if assigned by DEQ;

16. Indicate if there are vehicle or equipment degreasing activities performed on site. If yes, indicate if there is any process wastewater generated from these activities;

17. Monitoring data to determine compliance with 9VAC25-260-310 m (Chickahominy special standards) as per Part I B 14 of this permit;

18. Provide certification that the process water wastewater system is designed to operate as "no discharge" if special condition Part I B 47 15 is to apply to the facility. Identify the emergency outfall number;

<u>18.</u> [For applicants other than a sole proprietor, the ]State Corporation Commission entity identification number [if the facility is required to obtain an entity identification number by law]; and

19. The following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is to the best of my knowledge and belief true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

D. The registration statement shall be signed in accordance with 9VAC25-31-110.

E. Where to submit. The registration statement may shall be delivered to the department by either postal or electronic mail and shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located.

#### 9VAC25-190-70. General permit.

Any owner whose registration statement is accepted by the board will receive coverage under the following general permit and shall comply with the requirements in it the general permit and be subject to all requirements of the VPDES permit regulation, 9VAC25-31 9VAC25-31-190.

General Permit No.: VAG84

Effective date: July 1, <del>2014</del> 2019

Expiration date: June 30, 2019 2024

# GENERAL PERMIT FOR NONMETALLIC MINERAL MINING

# AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE VIRGINIA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM AND THE VIRGINIA STATE WATER CONTROL LAW

In compliance with the provisions of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and pursuant to the State Water Control Law and regulations adopted pursuant to it, owners of nonmetallic mineral mines are authorized to discharge to surface waters within the boundaries of the Commonwealth of Virginia, except those specifically named in board regulations that prohibit such discharges.

The authorized discharge shall be in accordance with <u>the information submitted with the registration statement</u>, this cover page, Part I - Effluent Limitations, Monitoring Requirements, and Special Conditions, Part II - Stormwater Management, and Part III - Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits, as set forth <u>herein in this permit</u>.

Part I

#### Effluent Limitations, Monitoring Requirements, and Special Conditions

- A. Effluent limitations and monitoring requirements.
  - 1. During the period beginning with the permittee's coverage under this general permit and lasting until the permit's expiration date, the permittee is authorized to discharge process wastewater and commingled stormwater associated with industrial activity from outfall(s) outfalls.

EFFLUENT	DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS			MONITORING REQUIREMENTS		
CHARACTERISTICS	Monthly Average	Daily Minimum	Daily Maximum	Frequency <sup>(1)</sup>	Sample Type	
Flow (MGD)	NL	NA	NL	1/3 Months	Estimate	
Total Suspended Solids (mg/l)	30	NA	60	1/3 Months	Grab	
pH (standard units) <sup>(2)</sup>	NA	6.0	9.0	1/3 Months	Grab	
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (mg/l) (3)	NA	NA	NL	<del>1/3 Months</del>	Grab	

Such discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

NL = No Limitation, monitoring required

NA = Not Applicable

<sup>(1)</sup><u>1/3 Months equals the following three-month periods each year of permit coverage: January through March, April through June, July through September, and October through December.</u> Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) of quarterly monitoring shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office no later than the 10th day of April, July, October, and January.

<sup>(2)</sup>Where the Water Quality Standards (9VAC25-260) establish alternate standards for pH, those standards shall be the minimum and maximum pH effluent limits.

<sup>(3)</sup>Monitoring for total petroleum hydrocarbons is only required for outfalls that contain process wastewater from vehicle or equipment degreasing activities. Total petroleum hydrocarbons shall be analyzed using EPA SW-846 Method 8015 B (1996), 8015C (2000), 8015C (2007), 8015 D (2003) for diesel range organics, or EPA 40 CFR 136.

2. During the period beginning with the permittee's coverage under the general permit and lasting until the permit's expiration date, the permittee is authorized to discharge stormwater associated with industrial activity that does not combine with other wastewaters prior to discharge from outfall(s) outfalls.

<u>a.</u> Such discharges shall be limited and monitored by the permittee as specified below:

EFFLUENT	DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS	MONITORING	
CHARACTERISTICS		REQUIREMENTS	

	Monthly Average	Daily Minimum	Daily Maximum	Frequency <sup>(1)</sup>	Sample Type
Flow (MG)	NA	NA	NL	1/Year	Estimate <sup>(2)</sup>
Total Suspended Solids (mg/l)	NA	NA	NL <sup>(3)</sup>	1/Year	Grab
pH (standard units)	NA	NL	NL	1/Year	Grab

NL = No Limitation, monitoring required

NA = Not applicable

<sup>(1)</sup>Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) of yearly monitoring (January 1 to December 31) shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office no later than the 10th day of January.

<sup>(2)</sup> Estimate of the total volume of the discharge during the storm event.

<sup>(3)</sup>Refer to Part I B 12 should the TSS evaluation monitoring exceed 100 mg/l daily maximum. <u>Permittees shall</u> review the results of the TSS monitoring required by Part I A 2 a to determine if changes to the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) may be necessary. If the TSS monitoring results are greater than the evaluation value of 100 mg/l, then the permittee shall perform [ the ]a routine facility inspection within five days of becoming aware of the exceedance and maintain documentation as described in Part II H 3 d for that outfall. Any deficiencies noted during the inspection shall be corrected within 60 days of being identified.

b. The permittee shall conduct calendar quarterly visual monitoring of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity. The monitoring shall include examination of stormwater samples representative of storm event discharges from the facility and observation of color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and other obvious indicators of stormwater pollution. Documentation of visual monitoring of stormwater shall be maintained onsite in the SWPPP and include the examination date and time, examination personnel, outfall location, the nature of the discharge [ (i.e., runoff or snowmelt) ], visual quality of the stormwater discharge and probable sources of any observed stormwater contamination. Part II A regarding monitoring instructions, Part II B regarding representative outfalls, and Part II C regarding sampling waivers shall apply to the taking of samples for visual monitoring except that the documentation required by these sections shall be retained with the SWPPP [ visual monitoring records ] rather than submitted to the department. Calendar quarters equal the following three-month periods each year of permit coverage: January through March, April through June, July through September, and October through December.

# B. Special conditions.

1. Vehicles and equipment utilized during the industrial activity on a site must be operated and maintained in such a manner as to prevent the potential or actual point source pollution of the surface or groundwaters of the state. Fuels, lubricants, coolants, and hydraulic fluids, or any other petroleum products, shall not be disposed of by discharging on the ground or into surface waters. Spent fluids shall be disposed of in a manner so as not to enter the surface or groundwaters of the state and in accordance with the applicable state and federal disposal regulations. Any spilled fluids shall be cleaned up and disposed of in a manner so as not to allow their entry into the surface or groundwaters of the state.

2. No sewage shall be discharged from this mineral mining activity except under the provisions of another VPDES permit specifically issued for that purpose.

3. There shall be no chemicals added to the discharge, other than those listed on the owner's approved registration statement, unless prior approval of the chemical is granted by the board. [ The use of cationic chemicals is ineligible for coverage under this permit unless such use is approved by the board based on a demonstration that the application or use will not result in aquatic toxicity. ]

4. The permittee shall submit a new registration statement if the mining permit approved by the Division of Mineral Mining (or associated waivered program, or bordering state mine authority) is modified or reissued in any way that would affect the outfall location or the characteristics of a discharge covered by this general permit. Government owned and operated mines without mining permits shall submit the registration statement whenever outfall location or characteristics are altered. The new registration statement shall be filed within 30 days of the outfall relocation or change in the characteristics of the discharge.

5. The permittee shall notify the department as soon as they know or have reason to believe:

a. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a routine or frequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this permit, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following notification levels:

(1) One hundred micrograms per liter (100 µg/l) of the toxic pollutant;

(2) Two hundred micrograms per liter (200  $\mu$ g/l) for acrolein and acrylonitrile; five hundred micrograms per liter (500  $\mu$ g/l) for 2,4-dinitrophenol and for 2-methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol; and one milligram per liter (1 mg/l) for antimony;

(3) Five times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the permit application; or(4) The level established by the board.

b. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in any discharge, on a nonroutine or infrequent basis, of a toxic pollutant that is not limited in this permit, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following notification levels:

(1) Five hundred micrograms per liter (500 µg/l) of the toxic pollutant;

(2) One milligram per liter (1 mg/l) for antimony;

(3) Ten times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the permit application; or

(4) The level established by the board in accordance with 9VAC25-31-220 F.

6. Except as expressly authorized by this permit, no product, materials, industrial wastes, or other wastes resulting from the purchase, sale, mining, extraction, transport, preparation, or storage of raw or intermediate materials, final product, by product or wastes, shall be handled, disposed of, or stored so as to permit a discharge of such product, materials, industrial wastes, or other wastes to state waters. Any and all product, materials, industrial wastes resulting from the purchase, sale, mining, extraction, transport, preparation, or storage of raw or intermediate materials, final product, by-product, or wastes shall be handled, disposed of, or stored so as to permit a discharge of storage of raw or intermediate materials, final product, by-product, or wastes shall be handled, disposed of, or stored in such a manner and consistent with best management practices, so as not to permit a discharge of such product, materials, industrial wastes, or other wastes to state waters, except as expressly authorized.

7. There shall be no discharge of process wastewater pollutants from colocated asphalt paving materials operations. For the purposes of this special condition, process wastewater pollutants are any pollutants present in water used in asphalt paving materials manufacturing that come into direct contact with any raw materials, intermediate product, by-product or product related to the asphalt paving materials manufacturing process.

8. Process water may be used on site for the purpose of dust suppression. Dust suppression shall be carried out as a best management practice but not as a wastewater disposal method provided that ponding or direct run-off from the site does not occur during or immediately following its application. Dust suppression shall not occur during a storm event that results in an actual discharge from the site.

Process water from mine dewatering may be provided to local property owners for beneficial agricultural use.
 There shall be no discharge:

<u>a. Discharge</u> of floating solids or visible foam in other than trace amounts from process water discharges<del>.</del> There shall be no solids:

<u>b. Solids</u> deposition <u>to surface water as a result of [ a discharge associated with industrial ] [ <u>industrial</u> ] <u>activity;</u> or</u>

oil <u>c. Oil</u> sheen <u>resulting</u> from petroleum products discharged to surface water as a result of the industrial activity.

11. The permittee shall report at least two significant digits for a given parameter. Regardless of the rounding convention used (i.e., five always rounding up or to the nearest even number) by the permittee, the permittee shall use the convention consistently and shall ensure that consulting laboratories employed by the permittee use the same convention.

12. Stormwater monitoring total suspended solids (TSS) evaluation. Permittees that monitor stormwater associated with industrial activity that does not combine with other wastewaters prior to discharge shall review the results of the TSS monitoring required by Part I A 2 to determine if changes to the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) may be necessary. If the TSS monitoring results are greater than the evaluation value of 100 mg/l, then the permittee shall perform the inspection and maintain documentation as described in Part II H 3 d for that outfall. Any deficiencies noted during the inspection shall be corrected in a timely manner.

13. Discharges to waters subject to TMDL wasteload allocations. Owners of facilities that are a source of the specified pollutant of concern to waters for which a total maximum daily load (TMDL) wasteload allocation has been approved prior to the term of this permit shall incorporate measures and controls into the SWPPP required by Part II that are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. The department will provide written notification to the owner that a facility is subject to the TMDL requirements. If the TMDL establishes a numeric wasteload allocation that applies to discharges from the facility, the owner shall perform any required monitoring in accordance with Part I A and implement measures necessary to meet that allocation.

14. Discharges in the entire Chickahominy watershed above Walker's Dam (excluding discharges consisting solely of stormwater) shall also meet the effluent limitations in 9VAC25-260-310 m (special standards and requirements) of the January 6, 2011, water quality standards regulation. These limitations are BOD<sub>5</sub> (6.0 mg/l average and 8.0 mg/l maximum), total suspended solids (TSS) (5.0 mg/l average and 7.5 mg/l maximum), total phosphorus (0.10 mg/l average), ammonia as nitrogen (2.0 mg/l average), and settleable solids (0.1 mg/l average). These parameters, except for TSS, shall be monitored once per calendar year and the data submitted with the next registration statement (for the 2019 reissuance). TSS data shall be monitored and submitted with the Part I A DMR.

15. <u>13.</u> The discharges authorized by this permit shall be controlled as necessary to meet applicable water quality standards.

16. <u>14.</u> Inactive and unstaffed facilities [ (including temporarily inactive sites)(including temporarily inactive and unstaffed facilities)].

a. A waiver of the process and stormwater monitoring and routine inspections may be exercised by the board at a facility that is both inactive and unstaffed as long as the facility remains inactive and unstaffed. Such a facility is required to conduct an annual comprehensive site inspection in accordance with the requirements in Part II H 4  $\underline{d}$  3. No DMR reports will be required to be submitted when a facility is approved as inactive and unstaffed.

b. An inactive and unstaffed sites waiver request shall be submitted to the board for approval and shall include the name of the facility; the facility's VPDES general permit registration number; a contact person, phone number, and email address (if available); the reason for the request; and the date the facility became or will become inactive and unstaffed. The waiver request shall be signed and certified in accordance with Part III K. If this waiver is granted, a copy of the request and the board's written approval of the waiver shall be maintained with the SWPPP.

c. To reactivate the site the permittee shall notify the department within 30 days or an alternate timeframe if written approval is received in advance from the board, and all process and stormwater monitoring and routine inspections shall be resumed immediately. This notification must be submitted to the department, signed in accordance with Part III K, and retained on site at the facility covered by this permit in accordance with Part III B.

d. The board retains the authority to revoke this waiver when it is determined that the discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to a water quality standards violation.

17. 15. Process water wastewater systems designed to operate as "no discharge" shall have no discharge of wastewater or pollutants, except in storm events greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event. In the event of such a discharge, the permittee shall report an unusual or extraordinary discharge per Part III H of this permit. No sampling or DMR is required for these discharges as they are considered to be discharging in emergency discharge conditions. These discharges shall not contravene the Water Quality Standards (9VAC25-260), as adopted and amended by the board, or any provision of the State Water Control Law. Any other discharge from this type of system is prohibited, and shall be reported as an unauthorized discharge per Part III G of this permit. 18. 16. Best management practices for blasting. The permittee shall utilize best management practices to ensure that contaminants do not enter surface water as a result of blasting at the site.

<u>17.</u> Notice of termination.

a. The owner may terminate coverage under this general permit by filing a complete notice of termination. The notice of termination may be filed after one or more of the following conditions have been met:

(1) Operations have ceased at the facility and there are no longer discharges of process wastewater or stormwater associated with the industrial activity;

(2) A new owner has assumed responsibility for the facility (NOTE: A notice of termination does not have to be submitted if a VPDES Change of Ownership Agreement Form has been submitted) submitted;

(3) All discharges associated with this facility have been covered by an <u>VPDES</u> individual <del>VPDES</del> permit or an alternative VPDES permit; or

(4) Termination of coverage is being requested for another reason, provided the board agrees that coverage under this general permit is no longer needed.

b. The notice of termination shall contain the following information:

(1) Owner's name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if available);

(2) Facility name and location;

(3) VPDES general permit registration number for the facility; and

(4) The basis for submitting the notice of termination, including:

(a) A statement indicating that a new owner has assumed responsibility for the facility;

(b) A statement indicating that operations have ceased at the facility, a closure plan has been implemented according to the O & M Manual, and there are no longer discharges from the facility;

(c) A statement indicating that all discharges have been covered by an <u>VPDES</u> individual <del>VPDES</del> permit; or

(d) A statement indicating that termination of coverage is being requested for another reason (state the reason).

c. The following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that all wastewater and stormwater discharges from the identified facility that are authorized by this VPDES general permit have been eliminated, or covered under a VPDES individual or alternative permit, or that I am no longer the owner of the facility, or permit coverage should be terminated for another reason listed above. I understand that by submitting this notice of termination, that I am no longer authorized to discharge nonmetallic mineral mining wastewater or stormwater in accordance with the general permit, and that discharging pollutants to surface waters is unlawful where the discharge is not authorized by a VPDES permit. I also understand that the submittal of this notice of termination does not release an owner from liability for any violations of this permit or the Clean Water Act."

d. The notice of termination shall be submitted to the <del>department</del> <u>DEQ regional office serving the area where</u> <u>the facility discharge is located</u> and signed in accordance with Part III K.

Part II

#### Stormwater Management

A. Monitoring instructions.

1. Collection and analysis of samples. Sampling requirements shall be assessed on an outfall-by-outfall basis. Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with the requirements of Part III A.

2. When and how to sample.

a. In the case of snowmelt or a discharge from a stormwater management structure (a series of settling lagoons), a representative sample shall be taken at the time the discharge occurs.

b. For all other types of stormwater discharges, a minimum of one grab sample shall be taken resulting from a storm event that results in an actual <u>a</u> discharge from the site (defined as a "measurable storm event"), providing the interval from the preceding measurable storm event is at least 72 hours. The 72-hour storm interval is waived if the permittee is able to document with the discharge monitoring report (DMR) that less than a 72-hour interval is representative for local storm events during the sampling period. The grab sample shall be taken during the first 30 minutes of the discharge. If it is not practicable to take the sample during the first 30 minutes, the sample may be taken during the first three hours of discharge provided that the permittee explains with the DMR why a grab sample during the first 30 minutes was impracticable <u>and</u> maintains that documentation with the SWPPP.

B. Representative discharge outfalls. When a If a facility has two or more exclusively stormwater outfalls that the permittee reasonably believes discharge substantially identical effluents, based on a consideration of similarity of industrial activity, significant materials, [size of the drainage areas, ] frequency of discharges, and management practices and activities within the area drained by the outfalls, then the permittee may submit information with the registration statement substantially identical outfalls. Also the The permittee must shall document representative outfalls in the SWPPP and list on the DMR of the outfall to be sampled all outfall locations that are represented by the discharge. The representative outfall monitoring provisions apply to Part I A 2 a monitoring and quarterly visual monitoring.

The permittee must include the following information in the SWPPP:

1. The locations of the outfalls;

2. An evaluation, including available monitoring data, indicating why the outfalls are expected to discharge substantially identical effluents; and

3. An estimate of the size of the drainage area in acres.

C. Sampling waivers. When a permittee is unable to conduct <u>quarterly</u> stormwater monitoring <u>required under Part I</u> <u>A 2 b</u> within the specified sampling period due to no measurable storm event or adverse weather conditions, documentation shall be submitted explaining the permittee's inability to conduct the stormwater monitoring. The documentation must include the dates and times that the outfalls were viewed and sampling was attempted. Adverse weather conditions that may prohibit the collection of samples include weather conditions that create dangerous

conditions for personnel (such as local flooding, high winds, hurricane, tornadoes, electrical storms, etc.). Acceptable documentation includes but is not limited to National Climatic Data Center weather station data, local weather station data, facility rainfall logs, and other appropriate supporting data. All documentation shall also be maintained with the SWPPP. This waiver is not applicable to annual monitoring required under Part I A 2 a.

D. Stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPP). An SWPPP shall be developed and implemented for the facility. The plan shall include best management practices (BMPs) that are reasonable, economically practicable, and appropriate in light of current industry practices. The BMPs shall be selected, designed, installed, implemented, and maintained in accordance with good engineering practices to eliminate or reduce the pollutants in all stormwater discharges from the facility. The SWPPP shall also include all control measures necessary for the stormwater discharges to meet applicable water quality standards.

The SWPPP requirements of this general permit may be fulfilled, in part, by incorporating by reference other plans or documents such as an erosion and sediment control plan, a mine drainage plan as required by the Virginia Division of Mineral Mining, a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan developed for the facility under § 311 of the federal Clean Water Act or BMP programs otherwise required for the facility provided that the incorporated plan meets or exceeds the plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements of Part II H (contents of plan) <u>SWPPP</u>). All plans incorporated by reference into the SWPPP become enforceable under this permit. If a plan incorporated by reference does not contain all of the required elements of Part II H, the permittee must develop the missing SWPPP elements and include them in the required <del>plan SWPPP</del>.

E. Deadlines for plan <u>SWPPP</u> preparation and compliance.

1. Owners of existing facilities that were covered under the  $2009 \ 2014$  Nonmetallic Mineral Mining General Permit that are continuing coverage under this general permit shall update and implement any revisions to the SWPPP within  $90 \ 60$  days of the board granting coverage under this permit.

2. Owners of new facilities, facilities previously covered by an expiring individual permit, and existing facilities not currently covered by a VPDES permit that elect to be covered under this general permit shall prepare and implement the SWPPP prior to submitting the registration statement.

3. Where the owner of an existing facility that is covered by this permit changes, the new owner of the facility shall update and implement any revisions to the SWPPP within 60 days of ownership change.

4. Upon a showing of good cause, the director may establish a later date in writing for the preparation and compliance with the SWPPP.

F. Signature and plan <u>SWPPP</u> review.

1. The SWPPP shall be signed in accordance with Part III K (signatory requirements), and be retained on site at the facility covered by this permit in accordance with Part III B (records) of this permit. When there are no onsite buildings or offices in which to store the plan, it shall be kept at the nearest company office.

2. The permittee shall make the SWPPP, annual site compliance routine inspection report documentation, or other information available to the department upon request.

3. The director, or an authorized representative, may notify the permittee at any time that the SWPPP, BMPs, or other components of the facility's stormwater program do not meet one or more of the requirements of this part. Such notification shall identify specific provisions of the permit that are not being met and may include required modifications to the stormwater program, additional monitoring requirements, and special reporting requirements. Within 60 days of such notification from the director, or as otherwise provided by the director, or an authorized representative, the permittee shall make the required changes to the plan and shall submit to the department a written certification that the requested changes have been made.

G. Maintaining an updated SWPPP. The permittee shall review and amend the SWPPP as appropriate whenever:

1. There is construction or a change in design, operation, or maintenance that has a significant effect on the discharge or the potential for the discharge of pollutants to surface waters;

- 2. Routine inspections or compliance evaluations determine that there are deficiencies in the BMPs;
- 3. Inspections by local, state, or federal officials determine that modifications to the SWPPP are necessary;
- 4. There is a spill, leak, or other release at the facility; or
- 5. There is an unauthorized discharge from the facility.

SWPPP modifications shall be made within <u>30 60</u> calendar days after discovery, observation, or an event requiring an SWPPP modification. Implementation of new or modified BMPs (distinct from regular preventive maintenance of existing BMPs described in Part II H 3 b (preventative maintenance) shall be initiated before the next storm event if possible, but no later than 60 days after discovery, or as otherwise provided or approved by the director. The amount of time taken to modify a BMP or implement additional BMPs shall be documented in the SWPPP.

If the SWPPP modification is based on a release or unauthorized discharge, include a description and date of the release, the circumstances leading to the release, actions taken in response to the release, and measures to prevent the recurrence of such releases. Unauthorized releases and discharges are subject to the reporting requirements of Part III G of this permit.

H. Contents of plan <u>SWPPP</u>. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Pollution prevention team. Each plan shall identify the staff individuals by name or title who comprise the facility's stormwater pollution prevention team. The pollution prevention team is responsible for assisting the facility or plant manager in developing, implementing, maintaining, revising, and ensuring compliance with the facility's SWPPP. Specific responsibilities of each staff individual on the team shall be identified and listed.

2. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall identify where industrial materials or activities at the facility are exposed to stormwater. The description shall include:

a. Site map. The site map shall document:

(1) An outline of the drainage area of each stormwater outfall that are within the facility boundaries, each existing structural control measure to reduce pollutants in stormwater run-off, surface water bodies, locations where materials are exposed to precipitation, locations where major spills or leaks identified under Part II H 2 c (spills and leaks) of this permit have occurred, and the locations of the following activities where such activities are exposed to precipitation: fueling stations, vehicle or equipment degreasing, cleaning areas, loading/unloading areas loading or unloading, locations used for the treatment, storage or disposal of wastes and wastewaters, liquid storage tanks, processing areas, and storage areas. The map must indicate all outfall locations. The types of discharges contained in the drainage areas of the outfalls must be indicated either on the map or in an attached narrative.

(2) For each area of the facility that generates stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity with a potential for containing significant amounts of pollutants, locations of stormwater conveyances, including ditches, pipes, swales, and inlets, and the directions of stormwater flow and an identification of the types of pollutants that are likely to be present in stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity. Factors to consider include the toxicity of the chemicals; quantity of chemicals used, produced or discharged; the likelihood of contact with stormwater; and history of significant spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous pollutants. Flows with a potential for causing erosion shall be identified.

b. Inventory of exposed materials. A list of the industrial materials or activities, including but not limited to material handling equipment or activities, industrial machinery, raw materials, industrial production and processes, intermediate products, by-products, final products, and waste products. Material handling activities include but are not limited to the storage, loading and unloading, transportation, disposal, or conveyance of any raw material, intermediate product, final product, or waste product.

c. Spills and leaks. A list of significant spills and leaks of toxic or hazardous pollutants that occurred at areas that are exposed to precipitation or that otherwise drain to a stormwater conveyance at the facility after the date of three years prior to the date of coverage under this general permit. Such list shall be updated as appropriate during the term of the permit.

d. Sampling data. A summary of existing stormwater sampling data taken at the facility. The summary shall include, at a minimum, any data collected during the previous three years.

3. Stormwater controls. <u>BMPs Control measures</u> shall be implemented for all areas identified in Part II H 2 b (inventory of exposed materials) to prevent or control pollutants in stormwater discharges from the facility. All reasonable steps shall be taken to control or address the quality of discharges from the site that may not originate at the facility. The SWPPP shall describe the type, location, and implementation of all BMPs for each area where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater. The BMPs shall also address the following minimum components, including a schedule for implementing such controls:

a. Good housekeeping. Good housekeeping requires the <u>clean and orderly</u> maintenance of areas that may contribute pollutants to stormwater discharges in a clean, orderly manner. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall describe procedures performed to minimize contact of materials with stormwater run-off. Particular attention should be paid to areas where raw materials are stockpiled, material handling areas, storage areas, liquid storage tanks, vehicle fueling and maintenance areas, and loading/unloading loading or unloading areas, and vehicle entrance and exits. The permittee shall keep clean all exposed areas of the facility that are potential sources of pollutants in stormwater. The permittee shall sweep or vacuum paved surfaces of the site that are exposed to stormwater at regular intervals or use other equivalent measures to minimize the potential discharge of

these materials in stormwater. Indicate in the SWPPP the frequency of sweeping, vacuuming, or other equivalent measures.

b. Preventive maintenance. A preventive maintenance program shall involve regular inspection, testing, maintenance, and repairing of all industrial equipment and systems to avoid breakdowns or failures that could result in leaks, spills, and other releases. All BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be maintained in effective operating condition. The SWPPP shall include a description of procedures and a regular schedule for preventive maintenance and observation of all BMPs and shall include a description of the back-up practices that are in place should a run-off event occur while a BMP is off line or not operating effectively. The effectiveness of nonstructural BMPs shall also be maintained by appropriate means (e.g., spill response supplies available and personnel trained). If site inspections required by Part II H 3 d (routine facility inspections) or Part II H 4 (comprehensive site compliance evaluation) identify BMPs that are not operating effectively, repairs or maintenance shall be performed before the next anticipated storm event. If maintenance prior to the next anticipated storm event is not possible, maintenance shall be scheduled and accomplished as soon as practicable. Documentation shall be kept with the SWPPP of maintenance and repairs of BMPs, including the date(s) dates of regular maintenance, date(s) dates of discovery of areas in need of repair or replacement, date(s) dates for repairs, date(s) dates that the BMP(s) BMPs returned to full function, and the justification for an extended maintenance or repair schedules. The maintenance program shall require periodic removal of debris from discharge diversions and conveyance systems. Permittees using settling basins to control their effluents must provide maintenance schedules for such basins in the pollution prevention plan SWPPP.

c. Spill prevention and response procedures. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall describe the procedures that will be followed for preventing and responding to spills and leaks, including barriers between material storage and traffic areas, secondary containment provisions, procedures for material storage and handling, response procedures for notification of appropriate facility personnel, emergency agencies, and regulatory agencies and procedures for stopping, containing, and cleaning up spills. Measures for cleaning up hazardous material spills or leaks shall be consistent with applicable RCRA regulations at 40 CFR Part 264 and 40 CFR Part 265. Employees who may cause, detect, or respond to a spill or leak shall be trained in these procedures and have necessary spill response equipment available. If possible, one of these individuals shall be a member of the pollution prevention team. Contact information for individuals and agencies that must be notified in the event of a spill shall be included in the SWPPP and in other locations where it will be readily available. d. Routine facility inspections.

(1) Facility personnel <u>Personnel</u> who are familiar with the mining activity, the best management practices, and the stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall be identified to <u>inspect conduct routine facility</u> inspections. Such inspections must include all areas where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater as identified in Part II H 2 b (inventory of exposed materials), including material storage and handling areas, including but not limited to areas where aggregate is stockpiled outdoors, liquid storage tanks, hoppers or silos, material handling vehicles, equipment, and processing areas; <u>off-site tracking of industrial or waste materials or sediment where vehicles enter or exit the site; to inspect vehicle and equipment maintenance areas and cleaning and fueling areas; to inspect best management practices; and to conduct visual examinations of stormwater associated with industrial activity discharge points.</u>

(2) The inspection frequency shall be specified in the plan <u>SWPPP</u> based upon a consideration of the level of industrial activity at the facility, but shall be a minimum of quarterly. Inspections of best management practices shall include inspection of stormwater discharge diversions, conveyance systems, sediment control and collection systems, containment structures, vegetation, serrated slopes, and benched slopes to determine their <u>adequacy and</u> effectiveness, the integrity of control structures, if soil erosion has occurred, or if there is evidence of actual or potential discharge of contaminated stormwater.

(3) Quarterly visual examinations of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity shall include examination of stormwater samples representative of storm event discharges from the facility and observation of color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and other obvious indicators of stormwater pollution.

(4) Site inspection, and best management practices inspection and visual examination results must be documented and maintained on-site with the SWPPP. Documentation for visual examinations of stormwater shall include the examination date and time, examination personnel, outfall location, the nature of the discharge, visual quality of the stormwater discharge and probable sources of any observed stormwater

contamination. Part II A regarding monitoring instructions, Part II B regarding representative discharges, and Part II C regarding sampling waivers shall apply to the taking of samples for visual examination except that (i) the documentation required by these sections shall be retained with the SWPPP visual examination records rather than submitted to the department, and (ii) substitute sampling for waivered sampling is not required if the proper documentation is maintained.

(5) (4) A set of tracking or followup procedures shall be used to ensure that appropriate actions are taken in response to the inspections. Such actions must include updating pollution sources, updating pollution prevention measures and controls, and updating the SWPPP as appropriate based on information developed during the inspections.

(5) The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

e. Employee training. Employee training shall be conducted at least annually at active mining and [temporarily inactive sites. at those temporarily inactive sites that are unstaffed.] Employee training programs shall inform personnel responsible for implementing activities identified in the stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> or otherwise responsible for stormwater management at all levels of responsibility of the components and goals of the stormwater pollution prevention plan. Training should address topics such as spill response, good housekeeping and material management practices. A pollution prevention plan shall identify periodic dates for such training. All employee training shall be documented in the SWPPP.

f. Recordkeeping and internal reporting procedures. A description of incidents such as spills, or other discharges, along with other information describing the quality and quantity of stormwater discharges shall be included in the <u>plan SWPPP</u> required under this part. Inspections and maintenance activities shall be documented and records of such activities shall be incorporated into the <u>plan SWPPP</u>. Ineffective best management practices must be recorded and the date of their corrective action noted <u>in the SWPPP</u>.

g. Sediment and erosion control. The plan shall identify areas that, due to topography, land disturbance (e.g., construction, landscaping, site grading), or other factors, have a potential for soil erosion. The permittee shall identify and implement structural, vegetative, or stabilization BMPs to prevent or control on-site and off-site erosion and sedimentation.

h. Management of run-off. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe the stormwater run-off management practices (i.e., permanent structural BMPs) for the facility. These types of BMPs are typically used to divert, infiltrate, reuse, or otherwise reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges from the site. Appropriate measures may include: vegetative swales and practices, reuse of collected stormwater (such as for a process or as an irrigation source), inlet controls (such as oil/water separators), snow management activities, infiltration devices, and wet detention/retention detention or retention devices.

4. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. Facility personnel who are familiar with the mining activity, the BMPs, and the SWPPP shall conduct site compliance evaluations at appropriate intervals specified in the plan, but in no case less frequently than once a year. Evaluations shall include all areas where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater as identified in Part II H 2 b (inventory exposed materials). Such evaluations shall include the following:

a. Areas contributing to a stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity, including material storage and handling areas (e.g., areas where aggregate is stockpiled outdoors, liquid storage tanks, hoppers or silos, material handling vehicles, equipment, and processing areas); vehicle and equipment maintenance areas and eleaning and fueling areas; off site tracking of industrial or waste materials or sediment where vehicles enter or exit the site; tracking or blowing of raw, final, or waste materials from areas of no exposure to exposed areas; and residue or trash shall be visually inspected for evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system. Measures to reduce pollutant loadings shall be evaluated to determine whether they are adequate and properly implemented in accordance with the terms of the permit or whether additional control measures are needed. Structural stormwater management measures, sediment and erosion control measures, and other structural pollution prevention measures identified in the plan shall be observed to ensure that they are operating correctly. A visual inspection of equipment needed to implement the plan, such as spill response equipment, shall be made. A review of training performed, routine inspections completed, visual examinations completed, maintenance performed, and effective operation of BMPs, shall be made.

b. Based on the results of the evaluation, the summary of potential pollutant sources identified in the plan in accordance with Part II H 2 (summary of potential pollutant sources) of this permit and pollution prevention

measures and controls identified in the plan in accordance with Part II H 3 (stormwater controls) of this permit shall be revised as appropriate within 14 days of such inspection and shall provide for implementation of any changes to the plan in a timely manner, but in no case more than 90 days after the inspection.

c. A report summarizing the scope of the inspection, personnel making the inspection, the dates of the inspection, observations relating to the implementation of the SWPPP, including the elements stipulated in Part II H 4 a, and actions taken in accordance with Part II H 4 b of this permit shall be made and retained as required in Part III B (records). The report shall identify any incidents of noncompliance. Where a report does not identify any incidents of noncompliance, the report shall contain a certification that the facility is in compliance with the SWPPP and this permit. The report shall be signed in accordance with Part III K (signatory requirements) of this permit and retained as required in Part III B.

d. Where compliance evaluation schedules overlap with inspections required under Part II H 3 d (inspections), the compliance evaluation may be conducted in place of one such inspection.

I. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. The following nonstormwater discharges are authorized by this permit: 1. Discharges from emergency firefighting activities;

2. Fire hydrant flushing, managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

3. Potable water, including water line flushing, managed in a manner to avoid instream impact;

4. Uncontaminated condensate from air conditioners, coolers, and other compressors and from the outside storage of refrigerated gases or liquids;

5. Irrigation drainage;

6. Landscape watering, provided all pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers have been applied in accordance with approved labeling;

7. Routine external building washdown that does not use detergents or hazardous cleaning products;

8. Pavement wash waters where no detergents or hazardous cleaning products are used and no spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have occurred (unless all spilled material has been removed). Pavement wash waters shall be managed [ to prevent the discharge of pollutants in a manner to avoid instream impacts ];

9. Uncontaminated groundwater or spring water;

10. Foundation or footing drains where flows are not contaminated with process materials; and

11. Incidental windblown mist from cooling towers that collects on rooftops or adjacent portions of the facility,

but not intentional discharges from the cooling tower (e.g., "piped" cooling tower blowdown or drains).

## Part III

## Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits

A. Monitoring.

1. Samples and measurements taken as required by this permit shall be representative of the monitored activity. 2. Monitoring shall be conducted according to procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or alternative methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, unless other procedures have been specified in this permit.

3. The permittee shall periodically calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring and analytical instrumentation at intervals that will ensure accuracy of measurements.

4. Samples taken as required by this permit shall be analyzed in accordance with 1VAC30-45, Certification for Noncommercial Environmental Laboratories, or 1VAC30-46, Accreditation for Commercial Environmental Laboratories.

## B. Records.

- 1. Records of monitoring information shall include:
  - a. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
  - b. The individual(s) individuals who performed the sampling or measurements;
  - c. The date(s) dates and time(s) times analyses were performed;
  - d. The individual(s) individuals who performed the analyses;
  - e. The analytical techniques or methods used; and
  - f. The results of such analyses.

2. The permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the registration statement for this permit, for a period of at least three years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or request for coverage. This

period of retention shall be extended automatically during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding the regulated activity or regarding control standards applicable to the permittee, or as requested by the board.

C. Reporting monitoring results.

1. The permittee shall submit the results of the monitoring required by this permit not later than the 10th day of the month after monitoring takes place, unless another reporting schedule is specified elsewhere in this permit. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the department's regional office.

2. Monitoring results shall be reported on a discharge monitoring report (DMR) or on forms provided, approved or specified by the department.

3. If the permittee monitors any pollutant specifically addressed by this permit more frequently than required by this permit using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or using other test procedures approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or using procedures specified in this permit, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or reporting form specified by the department.

4. Calculations for all limitations that require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this permit.

D. Duty to provide information. The permittee shall furnish to the department, within a reasonable time, any information that the board may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating coverage under this permit or to determine compliance with this permit. The board may require the permittee to furnish, upon request, such plans, specifications, and other pertinent information as may be necessary to determine the effect of the wastes from its discharge on the quality of state waters, or such other information as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the State Water Control Law. The permittee shall also furnish to the department, upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.

E. Compliance schedule reports. Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date.

F. Unauthorized discharges. Except in compliance with this permit or another permit issued by the board, it shall be unlawful for any person to:

1. Discharge into state waters sewage, industrial wastes, other wastes, or any noxious or deleterious substances; or

2. Otherwise alter the physical, chemical or biological properties of such state waters and make them detrimental to the public health, or to animal or aquatic life, or to the use of such waters for domestic or industrial consumption, or for recreation, or for other uses.

G. Reports of unauthorized discharges. Any permittee who discharges or causes or allows a discharge of sewage, industrial waste, other wastes or any noxious or deleterious substance into or upon state waters in violation of Part III F (unauthorized discharges); or who discharges or causes or allows a discharge that may reasonably be expected to enter state waters in violation of Part III F, shall notify the department of the discharge immediately upon discovery of the discharge, but in no case later than 24 hours after said discovery. A written report of the unauthorized discharge shall be submitted to the department within five days of discovery of the discharge. The written report shall contain:

1. A description of the nature and location of the discharge;

2. The cause of the discharge;

3. The date on which the discharge occurred;

4. The length of time that the discharge continued;

5. The volume of the discharge;

6. If the discharge is continuing, how long it is expected to continue;

7. If the discharge is continuing, what the expected total volume of the discharge will be; and

8. Any steps planned or taken to reduce, eliminate and prevent a recurrence of the present discharge or any future discharges not authorized by this permit.

Discharges reportable to the department under the immediate reporting requirements of other regulations are exempted from this requirement.

H. Reports of unusual or extraordinary discharges. If any unusual or extraordinary discharge including a bypass or upset should occur from a treatment works and the discharge enters or could be expected to enter state waters, the permittee shall promptly notify (see NOTE in Part III I), in no case later than 24 hours, the department after the discovery of the discharge. This notification shall provide all available details of the incident, including any adverse effects on aquatic life and the known number of fish killed. The permittee shall reduce the report to writing and shall submit it to the department within five days of discovery of the discharge in accordance with Part III I 2. Unusual and extraordinary discharges include but are not limited to any discharge resulting from:

1. Unusual spillage of materials resulting directly or indirectly from processing operations;

2. Breakdown of processing or accessory equipment;

3. Failure or taking out of service some or all of the treatment works; and

4. Flooding or other acts of nature.

I. Reports of noncompliance.

<u>1.</u> The permittee shall report any noncompliance that may adversely affect state waters or may endanger public health.

1. <u>a.</u> An oral report shall be provided within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The following shall be included as information that shall be reported within 24 hours under this subdivision:

 $\frac{1}{1}$  Any unanticipated bypass; and

b. (2) Any upset that causes a discharge to surface waters.

2. <u>b.</u> A written report shall be submitted within five days and shall contain:

 $\frac{1}{2}$  A description of the noncompliance and its cause;

b. (2) The period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and

e. (3) Steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.

The board may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports of noncompliance under Part III I if the oral report has been received within 24 hours and no adverse impact on state waters has been reported.

3. <u>2.</u> The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Parts III I 1 or 2, in writing, at the time the next monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Part III I 2.

NOTE: The immediate (within 24 hours) reports required in Parts Part III G, H and I may be made to the department's regional office. Reports may be made by telephone, FAX, or online at http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/PollutionResponsePreparedness/MakingaReport.aspx. For reports outside normal working hours, leave a message and this shall fulfill the immediate reporting requirement. For emergencies, the Virginia Department of Emergency Services maintains a 24-hour telephone service at 1-800-468-8892.

J. Notice of planned changes.

1. The permittee shall give notice to the department as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required only when:

a. The permittee plans alteration or addition to any building, structure, facility, or installation from which there is or may be a discharge of pollutants, the construction of which commenced:

(1) After promulgation of standards of performance under § 306 of the federal Clean Water Act that are applicable to such source; or

(2) After proposal of standards of performance in accordance with § 306 of the federal Clean Water Act that are applicable to such source, but only if the standards are promulgated in accordance with § 306 within 120 days of their proposal;

b. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are subject neither to effluent limitations nor to notification requirements specified elsewhere in this permit; or

c. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the permittee's sludge use or disposal practices and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit applicationregistration process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan.

2. The permittee shall give advance notice to the department of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with permit requirements.

K. Signatory requirements.

1. Registration statement. All registration statements shall be signed as follows:

a. For a corporation: by a responsible corporate officer. For the purposes of this section, a responsible corporate officer means: (i) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy- making or decision-

making functions for the corporation, or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities provided the manager is authorized to make management decisions that govern the operation of the regulated facility including having the explicit or implicit duty of making capital investment recommendations, and initiating and directing other comprehensive measures to assure long-term environmental compliance with environmental laws and regulations; the manager can ensure that the necessary systems are established or actions taken to gather complete and accurate information for permit application registration requirements; and where authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures;

b. For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or

c. For a municipality, state, federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this section, a principal executive officer of a public agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency.

2. Reports<del>, etc</del> and other information. All reports required by permits, and other information requested by the board, shall be signed by a person described in Part III K 1 or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Part III K 1;

b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position; and

c. The written authorization is submitted to the department.

3. Changes to authorization. If an authorization under Part III K 2 is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Part III K 2 shall be submitted to the department prior to or together with any reports or information to be signed by an authorized representative.

4. Certification. Any person signing a document under Part III K 1 or 2 shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

L. Duty to comply. The permittee shall comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the State Water Control Law and the federal Clean Water Act, except that noncompliance with certain provisions of this permit may constitute a violation of the State Water Control Law but not the federal Clean Water Act. Permit noncompliance is grounds for enforcement action; for permit coverage termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or for denial of permit coverage.

M. Duty to reapply. If the permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the permittee shall <u>apply for and obtain coverage under a new permit. All permittees with currently effective permit coverage shall</u> submit a new registration statement at least 210 <u>60</u> days before the expiration date of the existing permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the board. The board shall not grant permission for registration statements to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.

N. Effect of a permit. This permit does not convey any property rights in either real or personal property or any exclusive privileges, nor does it authorize any injury to private property or invasion of personal rights or any infringement of federal, state or local laws or regulations.

O. State law. Nothing in this permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action under, or relieve the permittee from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties established pursuant to, any other state law or regulation or under authority preserved by § 510 of the federal Clean Water Act. Except as provided in permit conditions on "bypass" (Part III U) and "upset" (Part III V), nothing in this permit shall be construed to relieve the permittee from civil and criminal penalties for noncompliance.

P. Oil and hazardous substance liability. Nothing in this permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action or relieve the permittee from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties to which the permittee is or may be subject under §§ 62.1-44.34:14 through 62.1-44.34:23 of the State Water Control Law.

Q. Proper operation and maintenance. The permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) that are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance also includes effective plant performance, adequate funding, adequate staffing, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by the permittee only when the operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit.

R. Disposal of solids or sludges. Solids, sludges or other pollutants removed in the course of treatment or management of pollutants shall be disposed of in a manner so as to prevent any pollutant from such materials from entering state waters.

S. Duty to mitigate. The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this permit that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

T. Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense. It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.

U. Bypass.

1. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. The permittee may allow any bypass to occur that does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded, but only if it also is for essential maintenance to ensure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions of Parts III U 2 and U 3.

2. Notice.

a. Anticipated bypass. If the permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, prior notice shall be submitted if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.

b. Unanticipated bypass. The permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Part III I (reports of noncompliance).

3. Prohibition of bypass.

a. Bypass is prohibited, and the board may take enforcement action against a permittee for bypass, unless:

(1) Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;

(2) There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance; and

(3) The permittee submitted notices as required under Part III U 2.

b. The board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Part III U 3 a.

V. Upset.

1. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with technology-based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Part III V 2 are met. A determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is not a final administrative action subject to judicial review.

2. A permittee who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that:

a. An upset occurred and that the permittee can identify the cause(s) cause of the upset;

b. The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated;

c. The permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in Part III I; and

d. The permittee complied with any remedial measures required under Part III S.

3. In any enforcement proceeding, the permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

W. Inspection and entry. The permittee shall allow the director or an authorized representative, upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:

1. Enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted or where records must be kept under the conditions of this permit;

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;

3. Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices,

or operations regulated or required under this permit; and

4. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of ensuring permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the federal Clean Water Act and the State Water Control Law, any substances or parameters at any location.

For purposes of this section, the time for inspection shall be deemed reasonable during regular business hours and whenever the facility is discharging. Nothing contained herein shall make an inspection unreasonable during an emergency.

X. Permit actions. <u>Permits Permit coverage</u> may be <u>modified</u>, <u>revoked and reissued</u>, <u>or</u> terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit condition.

Y. Transfer of permits permit coverage.

Permits are <u>1. Permit coverage is</u> not transferable to any person except after notice to the department.

2. Coverage under this permit may be automatically transferred to a new permittee if:

<u>1. a.</u> The current permittee notifies the department at least 30 days in advance of the proposed transfer of the title to the facility or property unless permission for a later date has been granted by the department;

2. <u>b.</u> The notice includes a written agreement between the existing and new permittees containing a specific date for transfer of permit responsibility, coverage, and liability between them; and

3. <u>c.</u> The board does not notify the existing permittee and the proposed new permittee of its intent to deny the permittee coverage under the permit. If this notice is not received, the transfer is effective on the date specified in the agreement mentioned in Part III Y 2 <u>b</u>.

Z. Severability. The provisions of this permit are severable, and if any provision of this permit or the application of any provision of this permit to any circumstance is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances and the remainder of this permit shall not be affected thereby.

## VIRGINIA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (VPDES) GENERAL PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES OF STORMWATER ASSOCIATED WITH INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY, 9VAC25-151: The

current VPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit will expire on June 30, 2019 and the regulation establishing this general permit is being amended to reissue another five-year permit. The staff is bringing this final regulation before the Board to request adoption. This regulation took into consideration the recommendations of a technical advisory committee (TAC) formed for this regulatory action. The technical advisory committee consisted of industry representatives, consultants, local government representatives, environmental groups, and DEQ staff.

The Board's authorization of the proposal was received at the September 20, 2018 meeting. A Notice of Public Comment Period (NOPC) was issued on October 29, 2018 and the comment period ran from October 29, 2018 to December 28, 2018 with public hearings on November 27 and 28, 2018. Six members of the public attended the November 27, 2018 public hearing held in Glen Allen with two persons commenting on the proposed regulation. Nine members of the public attended the November 28, 2018 public hearing held in Glen Allen with two persons commenting on the proposed regulation. Nine members of the public attended the November 28, 2018 public hearing held in Roanoke with one person commenting on the proposed regulation. Numerous written public comments were received during the comment period.

The comments and responses are summarized below:

Commenter	Comment	Agency response
Melissa	Comment made at 11/28/2018 Public	- DEQ staff believes that
Johnson,	Hearing- paraphrased by staff:	permittees that met the industrial
Citizen,	-Requests quarterly monitoring for all sites	stormwater general permit Bay
Volunteer for		monitoring requirements have

Chesapeake Bay	-Requests that sites that have nutrient loads	reasonably quantified their loads
Foundation	greater than allowed in the Bay TMDL be	to the Chesapeake Bay.
	issued individual VPDES stormwater permits	- Permittees have until June 30,
		2024 to meet the necessary
		nutrient load reductions as
		documented through the required
		TMDL action plans. At that point,
		if DEQ determines that adequate
		reductions have not been
		achieved, DEQ may pursue
		compliance action or require
		individual permit coverage with
		site-specific conditions to achieve
		the reductions.
Kelly Boyle,	Comment made at 11/27/2018 Public	- The proposed regulation only
Fredericksburg	Hearing- paraphrased by staff:	contains additional nutrient
Scrap and	-Disagrees that further nutrient monitoring	monitoring requirements for new
Virginia Auto	requirements beyond the 2014 Industrial	facilities, permittees who did not
Recyclers	Stormwater General Permit would be	meet the monitoring requirements
Association	beneficial in relation to Virginia's	in the 2014 general permit, or
	commitment under the Chesapeake Bay	facilities that have made changes
	TMDL restoration	to their site.
	-Requests that permittees who demonstrated	- Benchmark monitoring targets
	and obtained benchmark monitoring waivers	pollutants known or suspected to
	under the 2014 Industrial Stormwater General	be present in association with the
	Permit should have those waivers continued	specific industrial activity covered
	under the proposed regulation without the	under each sector. DEQ staff
	need to further demonstrate the conditions	believes that further demonstrating
	under which the permittee obtained the	the conditions under which the
	benchmark waiver	waiver was granted each permit
		term is not an excessive burden
		due to the potential for the
		pollutant to be present at or above
		the benchmark and the financial
		benefit gained by receiving the
T TZ 11		waiver.
Logan Kendle,	As a concerned citizen I would like to see the	The Virginia DEQ is dedicated to
Citizen	reissued permit still contain water quality	meeting the Commonwealth of
	testing, particularly for N, P, and sediment.	Virginia's commitment to
	There most definitely should be testing of the	restoration of the Chesapeake Bay.
	most egregious violators. Anyone found to	Staff believes that permittees that
	have violated the standards previously should	met the industrial stormwater
	also be required to test their outflow. I hope	general permit Bay monitoring
	that continued testing, more enforcement, and	requirements have reasonably
	stronger reprimands for violations will	quantified their loads to the
	continue to help Virginia clean up its many	Chesapeake Bay. However, the
	impaired waterways.	proposed regulation does contain
		additional provisions applicable to
		industrial dischargers within the
		Chesapeake Bay watershed. In the
		proposed regulation, facilities who discharge TP, TN, or TSS in
		exceedance of the loading rates in
		the regulation shall submit an

Catherine Lukaszewicz, Citizen	This general permit is vital in continuing to make progress in the clean up of the Chesapeake Bay & for clean water in Virginia. Clean water and a health Bay is an important positive resource for Virginia's economy and indeed for the quality of life of Virginians. The existing permit for the first time included nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment monitoring for these facilities. The data collected was extremely useful and identified about 15 facilities with extremely high loads of 10-200 times their target levels. Without such monitoring these facilities would not have been identified. Unfortunately, the proposal does not continue this monitoring on compliance areas for these	Action Plan that details a schedule to achieve reductions by June 30, 2024. The Virginia DEQ is dedicated to meeting the Commonwealth of Virginia's commitment to restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. The proposed regulation contains provisions applicable to industrial stormwater dischargers within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. In the proposed regulation, facilities who discharge TP, TN, or TSS in exceedance of the loading rates in the regulation shall submit an Action Plan that details a schedule to achieve reductions by June 30, 2024. DEQ staff believes that permittees who comply with the proposed general permit have reasonably characterized their nutrient loads.
	this monitoring or sampling even for those facilities with extremely high loads. Please include some level of nutrient and sediment monitoring for all permittees with higher frequency requirements at facilities where elevated loads have been found to be high. Monitoring data is helpful for demonstrating where issues arise, as has clearly been shown here and should not be looked at as a 1- time event. You can't confirm improvements or identify problems if you don't measure!	nutrient loads.
Catherine Lukaszewicz, Citizen	Also, facilities producing load more than 10 times higher than the WLA-basis should be required to have Individual Permits. These facilities play a significant role in the overall pollutant load, and represent a critical opportunity to achieve nutrient reductions in a very difficult sector. As such, these permits deserve extra attention.	In the proposed regulation permittees have until June 30, 2024 to meet the necessary nutrient reductions as documented through the required TMDL action plans. At that point, if DEQ determines that adequate reductions have not been achieved, DEQ may pursue compliance action or require individual permit coverage with site-specific conditions to achieve the reductions.
Emily Goodwin, Associate Scientist, SLR International Corporation	Part I.A.1.a.(1) of the permit states that "The visual examination shall be made during normal working hours, where practicable, and when considerations for safety and feasibility allows." We request that this or similar language be added to Part I.A.1.a.(2) or Part I.A.1.b.(3) so that the collection of analytical samples is also limited to normal working	DEQ staff believes that due to Virginia's climate, and the fact that each monitoring period requiring an analytical sample is six months, there is ample opportunity for permittees to plan and collect analytical samples during the monitoring period

	hours. This change would provide for	under safe conditions. In addition,
	consistency in the rule and mirror other state	the permit does provide an adverse
	permit such as the Oregon Department of	climatic conditions waiver (Part
	Environmental Quality 1200-Z (Part B.2.d),	I.A.3), allowing a substitute
	Washington Department of Ecology General	sample to be collected in the
	Industrial Stormwater Permit (Part S4.B.1e)	following monitoring period.
	and many other which do not require sampling	DEQ staff does not believe a
	outside of normal business hours or when	change to the proposed regulation
	conditions are unsafe.	is necessary.
Robert Goode,	First, I believe elimination of the annual	DEQ staff agrees with the
Environmental	comprehensive site evaluation is a good thing.	comment and have removed the
Permitting	It appeared to be a redundant effort with no	provision from the proposed
Assistance, LLC	added value.	regulation.
Robert Goode,	Second, I do not understand the reasoning	DEQ staff has not removed
Environmental	behind facilities that have gone from some	benchmark monitoring
Permitting	benchmark monitoring to none; there seems to	requirements from any of the
Assistance, LLC	be no rhyme or reason.	facilities referenced in the
	For examples:	comment. It should be noted that
	I find it odd that small bulk oil storage	some facilities (SIC Codes) have
	terminals retained monitoring for TSS yet	been moved to new sectors that
	refineries, which typically have a lot of bulk	aligned with monitoring
	oil storage, have been exempt from all	requirements.
	monitoring (unless, of course, all their	requirements.
	discharges from these areas go through an	
	outfall with treated wastewater). Anyway, if	
	refineries are exempt, I would think that the	
	bulk oil facilities would be exempt also.	
	I would think that cut stone and stone	
	products (3281) would have dust associated	
	with it, even with wet cutting, thus TSS	
	monitoring.	
	Most of the industries dealing with wood	
	(2411, 2421, 2426, 2429, 2431-2433, 2435-	
	2439, 2441, 2448, 2449, 2451 and 2452)	
	retained monitoring for TSS while industries	
	like wood kitchen cabinets (2434) along with	
	pulp and paper mills 2611, 2621) and	
	paperboard products (2652-2657) have no	
	monitoring. If it comes down to the sawing	
	operations then I would think that 2434 would	
	get monitoring also.	
	I'm sure the response will be because that is	
	what was reflected in the EPA multisector	
	permit and that's fineI understand. My	
	biggest issue is really with the bulk oil storage	
	facilities; I would be surprised if Virginia data	
	supported the need for TSS monitoring as I	
	would think that most bulk facilities, if not all,	
	discharge from their bermed areas through an	
	oil-water separator. And yes, I realize they	
	can request a waiver based on monitoring data	
	but the two facilities (refineries and bulk	
	facilities) do not seem to be on an equal	
	footing.	
	tooting.	

Joe Wood,	It should be noted that Joe Wood, Ph.D.	Virginia is the only state in the
,		
Ph.D., Virginia	provided verbal comment during the	Chesapeake Bay watershed that
Staff Scientist &	11/27/2018 Public Hearing on behalf of the	has required all industrial
Margaret L.	Chesapeake Bay Foundation. Dr. Wood's	stormwater general permittees in
Sanner, Virginia	verbal comments were substantively similar to	the Bay to collect and analyze
Assistant	the written comments provided and	stormwater samples in an effort to
Director &	summarized in the following.	quantify loads. DEQ staff
Senior Attorney,		believes that permittees that met
Chesapeake Bay	1. Recommendation # 1: Require continued	the industrial stormwater general
Foundation	nutrient monitoring for all facilities with	permit Bay monitoring
	enhanced monitoring requirements for	requirements have reasonably
	facilities with higher documented loads; and	quantified their loads to the
	require individual permits for facilities which	Chesapeake Bay. The proposed
	demonstrate clear water quality problems (i.e.	regulation also contains new
	facilities with loads greater than ten times the	provisions that would require
	WLA basis).	industrial facilities that modify
	In the most recent issuance of this permit,	their sites to collect samples to
	which was the first issuance since the	further quantify these new loads
	adoption of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, the	and adjust or develop action plans
	State Water Control Board ("Board"	if additional reductions are
	hereafter) required all permittees to collect	required.
	four water quality samples at each stormwater	In addition, EPA's Chesapeake
	outlet over the course of 5 years to be	Bay TMDL aggregated industrial
	analyzed for nitrogen, phosphorous and	stormwater with other regulated
	sediment. CBF appreciates this requirement	stormwater for the purpose of
	and the data acquired as a result of this effort	assigning a waste load allocation
	provides critical insights for identifying	(WLA). The proposed permit
	facilities with the largest impact to water	requires development of a TMDL
	quality. This information will help DEQ	action plan for any permittees that
	effectively reduce pollution loads at the	individually exceed the loading
	highest pollutant loading facilities.	assumptions that contributed to
	This data set indicates current protections at	the aggregate WLA. With two
	most facilities ( $\sim 2/3$ of all monitored	thirds of the monitored facilities
	facilities) are resulting in loading rates	currently demonstrating loading
	consistent with the sector's aggregate current	rates below the TMDL
	Waste Load Allocation (WLA) of 12.3 lbs.	assumptions, reducing loads from
	per acre for nitrogen 1.5 lbs. per acre for	the remaining one third of
	phosphorous and 440 lbs. per acre for TSS,	facilities to the assumed loads will
		result in a total load for the sector
	which represents a positive evaluation of	significantly less than the
	current management. However, a substantial properties $(-1/3 \text{ of all monitored})$	e .
	proportion of facilities ( $\sim$ 1/3 of all monitored facilities) have pollution loading rates above	aggregate WLA. DEQ staff
	facilities) have pollution loading rates above the WLA and further a small subset of	believes the Bay requirements in the proposed regulation go above
	the WLA and further, a small subset of facilities (<1% of all monitored facilities)	the proposed regulation go above
	facilities (<1% of all monitored facilities)	and beyond other Bay states and
	have pollution loads that are substantially $(>10x)$ greater than the WLA. This small	demonstrate Virginia's
	(>10x) greater than the WLA. This small	commitment to achieving reductions from the industrial
	proportion of high loading facilities accounts	
	for 29% of the overall phosphorous load and	stormwater sector in an effort to
	20% of the overall nitrogen load of all	meet the goals of a restored
	facilities despite accounting for less than 1%	Chesapeake Bay.
	of the overall acreage of facilities covered	Permittees have until June 30,
	under this permit. These facilities discharge	2024 to meet the necessary
	approximately one third of the overall	reductions as documented through
	nitrogen and phosphorous load (Figure 1)	required TMDL action plans. At

 1. (1 0 000 11 D	
corresponding to more than 8,000 lbs. P per	that point, if DEQ determines that
year above the WLA. To put this number into	adequate reductions have not been
context, Virginia's total Stormwater Local	achieved, DEQ may pursue
Assistance Fund grant program, which	compliance action or require
represents an investment of over	individual permit coverage with
\$120,000,000 in local and state tax dollars,	site-specific conditions to achieve
have achieved only approximately 14,000 lbs.	the reductions.
of P reductions since its inception with an	
average cost efficiency of \$8-15,000 per lb	
P.1 Governor Northam just announced that	
\$50 Million would be included in his budget	
for 2020 in the coming session. If this	
investment were to achieve 8,000 lbs, of	
phosphorous reductions it would be widely	
viewed as a success. And yet these water	
quality monitoring results demonstrate actions	
at just 6 facilities could achieve similar	
results.	
Thus the pollutant loads coming from these	
facilities are substantial relative to the state's	
overall efforts to address stormwater pollution	
and will produce a benefit that has tremendous	
value for Chesapeake Bay clean-up efforts.	
Even if there is capacity to address these	
pollutant loads via credit acquisition (as	
suggested by DEQ at TAC Meetings), such an	
action would deplete available credits and	
thus exacerbate challenges for storm water	
entities working to address pollutant loading.	
Further, addressing problematic facilities	
which are accounting for a large proportion of	
the sector's WLA will help ensure sufficient	
allocations to allow for future growth.	
Now that these facilities have been identified,	
there is a clear plan for addressing these loads	
through TMDL action plans. However, it is	
important to recognize that water quality	
monitoring was an essential part of this	
process. The small proportion of high loading	
facilities across N P & S. represents 20	
different Standard Industrial Classification	
(SIC) codes across the state, and there would	
have been no obvious way to identify these	
facilities in the absence of this data. Simply	
put, the state would not know about these	
highly concentrated pollution sources in the	
absence of facility wide monitoring. This	
clearly demonstrates the value that	
comprehensive water quality monitoring of	
stormwater can provide.	
These monitoring results are a promising start	
to effective management of this permit, but	
over the next 5 years and subsequent permit	
cycles, innumerable factors which don't	

<ul> <li>qualify facilities for new required monitoring</li> <li>(i.e. facility operating procedures and conditions, precipitation patterns, etc.) will change and have the potential to alter</li> <li>stormwater discharges in ways that cannot be predicted. As such, the data collected to date</li> <li>will become outdated and less effective at</li> <li>guiding the state, unless it is supplemented</li> <li>with continued monitoring. Continued efforts</li> <li>to monitor effluent can be used to identify</li> <li>where problematic changes to nutrient loads</li> <li>occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must</li> <li>develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has</li> <li>the capacity to comprehensively ground truth</li> <li>the success of clean-up efforts and improve</li> <li>the precision of the reduction target.</li> <li>In summary, monitoring results indicate</li> <li>several attributes about the role industrial</li> <li>stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment</li> <li>loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that</li> <li>industrial facilities of many different types</li> <li>have the capacity to operate under conditions</li> <li>that are consistent with the WLA established</li> <li>for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.</li> <li>Second, this limited frequency of sampling</li> <li>has provided meaningful results despite</li> <li>substantial variability across date, facility</li> <li>type, and individual operations. Finally, the</li> <li>distribution of data demonstrates that a small</li> <li>number of problematic facilities can</li> <li>substantially influence the overall pollutant</li> <li>loading associated with this permit thus</li> <li>highlighting the importance of reducing</li> <li>pollution at these facilities through nutrient</li> <li>monitoring to identify forture problematic</li> <li>facilities.</li> <li>Despite the critical insights provided by this</li> <li>data, the current proposed draft permit does</li> <li>not industria can will negatively impact</li> <li>the state's ability to effectivel</li></ul>		
conditions, precipitation patterns, etc.) will change and have the potential to alter stormwater discharges in ways that cannot be predicted. As such, the data collected to date will become outdated and less effective at guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly		
change and have the potential to alter stormwater discharges in ways that cannot be predicted. As such, the data collected to date will become outdated and less effective at guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage mutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for		
stormwater discharges in ways that cannot be predicted. As such, the data collected to date will become outdated and less effective at guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities not continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have decumented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for t		
predicted. As such, the data collected to date will become outdated and less effective at guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities that a small number of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any tarient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
<ul> <li>will become outdated and less effective at guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can an substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to offectively manage nutrient loads for the set to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from</li> </ul>	stormwater discharges in ways that cannot be	
guiding the state, unless it is supplemented with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these premits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	predicted. As such, the data collected to date	
<ul> <li>with continued monitoring. Continued efforts to monitor effluent can be used to identify</li> <li>where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collectd samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from</li> </ul>	will become outdated and less effective at	
to monitor effluent can be used to identify where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities trovid by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	guiding the state, unless it is supplemented	
where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	with continued monitoring. Continued efforts	
where problematic changes to nutrient loads occur. Furthermore, for facilities which must develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	to monitor effluent can be used to identify	
develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively mange nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	where problematic changes to nutrient loads	
develop TMDL action plans, monitoring has the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively mange nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	· · · · ·	
the capacity to comprehensively ground truth the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
the success of clean-up efforts and improve the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unerplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	· · · · ·	
the precision of the reduction target. In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
In summary, monitoring results indicate several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesspeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	· · ·	
several attributes about the role industrial stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	· · ·	
stormwater plays in nutrient and sediment loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
loads to Chesapeake Bay. First, it is clear that industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
<ul> <li>industrial facilities of many different types have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from</li> </ul>	1 7	
have the capacity to operate under conditions that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
that are consistent with the WLA established for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
for this sector in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
Second, this limited frequency of sampling has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
has provided meaningful results despite substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	- · ·	
substantial variability across date, facility type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
type, and individual operations. Finally, the distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
distribution of data demonstrates that a small number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	•	
number of problematic facilities can substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
substantially influence the overall pollutant loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
loading associated with this permit thus highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	-	
highlighting the importance of reducing pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
<ul> <li>pollution at these facilities and continued screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities.</li> <li>Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from</li> </ul>	<b>e</b> 1	
screening of facilities through nutrient monitoring to identify future problematic facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
<ul> <li>monitoring to identify future problematic facilities.</li> <li>Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from</li> </ul>		
facilities. Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	<u> </u>	
Despite the critical insights provided by this data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
data, the current proposed draft permit does not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
not include any nutrient monitoring requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
requirements for any facility that has already collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
collected samples required in the previous permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
permit, including those facilities which have documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
documented very high loads. The lack of continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
continued monitoring in these permits is highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
highly problematic and will negatively impact the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
the state's ability to effectively manage nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	e 1	
nutrient loads from these facilities going forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
forward. Water quality monitoring results, as demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from	• • •	
demonstrated here, clearly provides a critical and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
and unreplaceable tool for the state to utilize in managing future pollution reductions from		
in managing future pollution reductions from		
LIDOUSTERAL STOFFINWALPE	• • •	
industrial storiniwater.	muusutat stormwater.	

As such, CBF recommends the Board require nutrient monitoring for all facilities in this permit with variable frequency on the basis of previous results (see table 1). An explanation for how we derived this list of sampling frequencies is found in the attached memo as discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outsida factors fully explained high pollutant loads, Ph.D., Virginia Assistant Director & Samer, Virginia Yhile no combination of the monitored facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L.2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist perm	
permit with variable frequency on the basis of previous results (see table 1). An explanation for how we derived this list of sampling frequencies is found in the attached memo as discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with germit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the factors fully explained high pollutant loads, there were a few factors that correlated with senior Attorney, higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above FoundationIt is DEQ staff's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
jrevious results (see table 1). An explanation for how we derived this list of sampling frequencies is found in the attached memo as discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the facilities.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Assistant Director & Senner, Virginia Assistant Director & Senior Attormey, Chesapeake Bay Foundation2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high rolutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See TableIt is DEQ staff's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
for how we derived this list of sampling frequencies is found in the attached memo as discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff s input and will taction fully explained high pollutant loads, Director & there were a few factors that correlated with Senior Attorney, HoundationIt is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees utaget and will take the suggestions into codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See TableIt is deploy the the were a few facilities are seen aspecial code and were aspecial codes with there were a few factors that correlated with shigh repollutant loading rates seen aspecial codes in the ture. Although guidance is outside the suggestions into consideration.	
Joe Wood, Ph.D., VirginiaFrequencies is found in the attached memo as discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the facilities.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L. Sanner, Virginia Assistant Director & Senior Attorney, Chesapeake Bay FoundationIt is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
discussed at a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff s input and will take the suggestions into codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See TableIt is DEQ staff's intention.	
Advisory Committee for this permit. This would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into condes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Table	
would result in only a single sample per outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L. Sanner, Virginia Director & bigher pollutant loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
outfall for all facilities which have previously demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staffJoe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L. Sanner, Virginia Assistant Director & While no combination of the monitored factors fully explained high pollutant loads, Director & higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See TableIt is used tacilities.	
demonstrated low potential for pollutant loading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into codes had average loading rates well above FoundationIt is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
Ioading rates (which represents the majority of facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff sinput and will take the suggestions into codes had average loading rates well above FoundationIt is DEQ staff's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
facilities). For facilities with higher loading rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
rates, increased monitoring should be used to refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff sinput and will take the suggestions into consideration.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L. Sanner, Virginia Assistant Director & Senior Attorney, FoundationIt is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
refine TMDL action plan targets and to ensure progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff sinput and will Senior Attorney, higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC Chesapeake Bay FoundationIt is ULL at the suggestions into codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Table	
progress. Finally, we recommend facilities with extremely high nutrient loads (>10x WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff s input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L. Sanner, Virginia Assistant Director & Senior Attorney, Higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC Chesapeake Bay FoundationIt is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
with extremely high nutrient loads (>10xWLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
WLA basis) be transitioned to individual permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
permits. Management of such facilities is critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia Staff Scientist & Margaret L.2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
Image: critical to the states effort to reduce pollution and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff' s intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff' s input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
and thus should receive more dedicated, individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff s input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
individualized attention due to their propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permitteesJoe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
propensity for impacting water quality.It is DEQ staff's intention toJoe Wood,2. Develop SIC specific guidance onIt is DEQ staff's intention toPh.D., Virginiamanaging nutrient loads for SIC codes withdevelop tools to assist permitteesStaff Scientist &high loading rates and for highly imperviouswith permit compliance in theMargaret L.facilities.future. Although guidance isSanner, VirginiaWhile no combination of the monitoredoutside the scope of thisAssistantfactors fully explained high pollutant loads,regulatory action, DEQ staffDirector &there were a few factors that correlated withappreciates CBF's input and willSenior Attorney,higher pollutant loading rates well abovetake the suggestions intoChesapeake Baycodes had average loading rates well aboveconsideration.	
Joe Wood, Ph.D., Virginia2. Develop SIC specific guidance on managing nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.It is DEQ staff's intention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff sintention to develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
Ph.D., Virginiamanaging nutrient loads for SIC codes with high loading rates and for highly impervious Margaret L.develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Ph.D., Virginia Margaret L.high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.develop tools to assist permittees with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	
Staff Scientist & Margaret L.high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Staff Scientist & Margaret L.high loading rates and for highly impervious facilities.with permit compliance in the future. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	oe Wood,
Margaret L.facilities.fullSanner, VirginiaWhile no combination of the monitored factors fully explained high pollutant loads, Director & there were a few factors that correlated with higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC Chesapeake Bay Foundationfuture. Although guidance is outside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	D., Virginia
Sanner, Virginia AssistantWhile no combination of the monitored factors fully explained high pollutant loads, Director & there were a few factors that correlated with higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC Chesapeake Bay Foundationoutside the scope of this regulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	ff Scientist &
Assistant Director &factors fully explained high pollutant loads, there were a few factors that correlated with Senior Attorney, Chesapeake Bay Foundationfactors fully explained high pollutant loads, there were a few factors that correlated with appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.Assistant Director &factors fully explained high pollutant loads, there were a few factors that correlated with higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Tableregulatory action, DEQ staff appreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	largaret L.
Director &there were a few factors that correlated with Senior Attorney, Higher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Tableappreciates CBF's input and will take the suggestions into consideration.	ner, Virginia
Senior Attorney, Chesapeake Bay Foundationhigher pollutant loading rates. Several SIC codes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Tabletake the suggestions into consideration.	Assistant
Chesapeake Bay Foundationcodes had average loading rates well above the WLA basis across all facilities (See Tableconsideration.	Director &
Foundation the WLA basis across all facilities (See Table	ior Attorney,
	esapeake Bay
2, averages above 5x WLA). The data	oundation
suggests a select number of industry types (i.e.	
SIC Codes) produce loading rates that present	
higher risks (Figure 3). These facility types	
represent a large proportion of the overall	
pollution load covered under this permit	
(Figure 4). As such we recommend DEQ	
provides specific guidance for management	
strategies that might be utilized at such	
facilities.	
Facilities with high proportions of impervious	
surfaces also had higher pollutant loading	
rates across facilities (Figure 5). While this is	
not a surprising finding, imperviousness	
clearly represent a risk factor which can be	
used to improve management of these	
facilities. As such, we recommend DEQ	
provides specific guidance for how to best	
prevent nutrient loading rates under conditions	
of high imperviousness (i.e. $> 60\%$	
impervious) and also recommend efforts to	

	validate reporting data related to	
	imperviousness, through maps and other	
	means necessary.	
Joe Wood,	3. Enhanced enforcement is needed to ensure	DEQ staff recognizes the permit
Ph.D., Virginia	compliance with permits; a large proportion of	compliance concerns presented by
Staff Scientist &	facilities did not submit monitoring data	CBF. DEQ permitting staff has
Margaret L.	however this did not result in any known	relayed these concerns to DEQ
Sanner, Virginia	enforcement action.	compliance and enforcement
Assistant	In review of the data submitted by permittees,	management.
Director &	perhaps the most striking finding was the	The proposed regulation will
Senior Attorney,	number of facilities which simply did not	require all permittees with
Chesapeake Bay Foundation	submit data despite the permit requirements.	Chesapeake Bay TMDL
roundation	This was referenced several times by our industrial partners in the technical advisory	monitoring requirements to submit nutrient loading calculations to
	industrial partners in the technical advisory committee who requested for DEQ to step up	DEQ. This requirement is
	enforcement actions against facilities not	proposed as an effort to increase
	complying with the current permit. In	compliance with the Chesapeake
	response, DEQ has enhanced what	Bay TMDL requirements in the
	calculations will be required to be submitted	general permit.
	in the next permit cycle, however, there needs	DEQ staff oversees compliance
	to be a stronger response from the agency to	for over 12,000 NPDES permitted
	ensure all appropriate facilities are covered	entities, of which 1,265 are
	under and comply with the permits. As a	industrial stormwater. The agency
	result of this non-compliance, the state lacks	uses a risk-based strategy to
	valuable information for managing pollution	manage inspection and
	loads from these facilities.	compliance resources.
Trenton M.	Overall, VAA is pleased with the proposed	Noted.
Clark, P.E.,	revisions, which clarify and streamline many	
Executive Vice	aspects of the permit. VAA is particularly	
President,	supportive of the proposed changes to the	
Virginia Asphalt	Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load	
Association	("TMDL") monitoring requirements in 9 VAC	
	25-151-70, Part I (B)(8). VAA supports the	
	proposal to cease monitoring for total	
	suspended solids ("TSS"), total nitrogen ("TN"), and total phosphorus ("TP") once four	
	samples have been collected that demonstrate	
	that a TMDL action plan is not triggered.	
	Further, VAA supports the flexibility	
	provided for those facilities that did not	
	complete all four samples during the 2014	
	permit term to be able to use those samples	
	towards satisfying the four sample	
	requirement in the next permit term.	
	This approach offers a practical way to ensure	
	that facilities with discharges that impact	
	compliance with the Bay TMDL are	
	identified, while reducing unnecessary	
	monitoring costs and regulatory burdens for	
	those that do not. It is unlikely that a facility's	
	stormwater discharges are likely to	
	demonstrably change unless a modification	
	has occurred at the facility. In instances where	
	"monitoring is no longer representative of the	

Trenton M. Clark, P.E., Executive Vice President, Virginia Asphalt Association	modified facility" the Permit rightfully requires additional monitoring. This solution prevents facilities with no changes from being subject to duplicative monitoring while capturing the few facilities where a change in stormwater discharges relative to TSS, TN, and TP is likely to have occurred. This approach was thoroughly vetted during the TAC meetings. VAA, along with the other members of the TAC, agreed that the proposed changes to the Bay TMDL monitoring requirements are appropriate and beneficial. VAA seeks clarification or modification of several minor issues that will further improve the Permit. In 9 VAC 25-151-60 (C)(13)(c) requiring the registration statement to include a site map depicting certain information including "[a]ll water bodies or MS4 conveyances, labeled with names if applicable, receiving stormwater discharges from the site," VAA requests that DEQ simplify this requirement to only apply to the receiving water bodies and not the MS4 conveyances. Many affected facilities have a multitude of stormwater conveyances that would be difficult to accurately map when the focus is really on the outfalls and the waterbodies to which the outfalls discharge (both of which require labeling under Section 13(c)). VAA requests that the requirement in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPP") at 9 VAC 25-151-80(B)(2)(b)(8)(d) be similarly limited. Also in the SWPPP, VAA requests that DEQ consider modifying the requirement at 9 VAC 25-151- 80(B)(2)(b)(8)(c) to only require submission of longitude and latitude information for each	The MS4 conveyance information and latitude/ longitude requirements referenced in the comment are necessary for DEQ staff to issue general permit coverage to facilities. In an effort to mitigate regulatory burden, DEQ staff has updated the registration statement for the proposed regulation and has provided detailed instructions including links to websites where MS4 information and latitude/ longitude can be obtained free of charge.
	outfall if such information is already available by the permittee.	
Frederick W. Cornell, Business Partner, SIMS Metal Management	PROPOSED LANGUAGE: 9VAC25-151- 50.C.4.a. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. The following "nonstormwater" discharges are authorized by this permit: a. Discharges from emergency firefighting activities. SMM COMMENT #1: The proposal includes the addition of "emergency". SMM's disagrees with the prohibition of non- emergency firefighting water discharges. Effective emergency firefighting requires practice activities. Therefore, by prohibiting non-emergency firefighting water discharges, we substantially restrict the readiness of our	The proposed regulation contains language ("Discharges from emergency firefighting activities") which is equivalent to requirements in EPA's 2015 Multi-Sector General Permit ("Discharges from emergency/unplanned fire-fighting activities"). DEQ staff does not believe a change to the proposed regulation is appropriate given the federal permit.

firefighting force. SMM offers its facilities to	
the local fire department for firefighting	
practice. The proposed change would prohibit	
SMM from providing this public service.	
SMM's opinion is that this broad prohibition	
for non-emergency firefighting discharges	
creates an immediate danger to human life and	
safety. SMM recommends either:	
•Not making the change, or	
•Explicitly stating that discharges from non-	
emergency firefighting activities are	
authorized, provided the discharge is managed	
in a manner that avoids an adverse instream	
impact. This qualifying statement is similar to	
that used to authorize fire hydrant flushing.	
Frederick W. SMM COMMENT #2: SMM recommends DEQ staff believes the d	lefinition
Cornell, the addition of the following definition in found in § 58.1-3660 is	
Business 9VAC25-151-10 Definitions. satisfactory and has no i	ntention to
Partner, SIMS "Pollution control equipment and facilities" define "Pollution control	
Metal shall mean any stormwater control used to equipment and facilities	
Management prevent or abate stormwater pollution at the proposed regulation.	in the
facility in accordance with the designated	
facility's storm water pollution prevention	
plan (SWPPP), which controls may include	
real or personal property, equipment,	
facilities, or devices, used primarily for the	
purpose of abating or preventing pollution of	
waters of the Commonwealth, which may be	
evidenced by the control's description or	
depiction in (a) the facility's SWPPP as a best	
management practice (BMP) or (b) site map	
as a means for controlling the direction of or	
channeling storm water toward a storm water	
treatment system (e.g. sedimentation pond or	
oil-water separator) or diverting stormwater	
from a potential pollution source, in each case	
by such means as curbs, berms, or concrete or	
asphalt surfacing graded to direct storm water	
toward such treatment system, whereby such	
controls also include piping, drain inlets	
and/or treatment systems intended for such	
stormwater control.	
The rationale for this request pertains to VA	
Code § 58.1-609.3 which exempts "certified	
pollution control equipment and facilities"	
from state and local sales taxes in the	
Commonwealth. The technical portion of the	
definition relevant to this permit is "any	
property, including real or personal property,	
equipment, facilities, or devices, used	
primarily for the purpose of abating or	
preventing pollution ofwaters of the	
Commonwealth". The definition is clearly	
broad and would include any items purchased	

	to implement any stormwater best management practices (BMPs) that would be implemented as part of this permit. By including this definition in the permit, we make the applicability of this provision more transparent, which will provide the regulated community with more funds for stormwater pollution prevention projects and encourage companies to invest in structural and non- structural BMPs to prevent stormwater pollution in the Commonwealth.	
Brooks M. Smith, Andrea W. Wortzel, Patrick J. Fanning, Counsel to Virginia Manufacturers Association Water Subcommittee	The proposed amendments streamline the Permit by reorganizing the sector-specific provisions. This is a beneficial change that minimizes confusion and redundancy. VMA supports the reorganization of the Permit as proposed.	Noted.
Brooks M. Smith, Andrea W. Wortzel, Patrick J. Fanning, Counsel to Virginia Manufacturers Association Water Subcommittee	VMA also supports the proposed changes to the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load ("TMDL") monitoring requirements in 9 VAC 25-151-70, Part I (B)(8). These proposed changes allow permittees to cease Bay TMDL-related monitoring once four samples have been collected that demonstrate that a TMDL action plan is not triggered. This provision ensures that facilities contributing total suspended solids ("TSS"), total nitrogen ("TN"), and total phosphorus ("TP") are identified and subject to an action plan, protecting water quality and aquatic life. At the same time, it removes the burden and cost of continuing such sampling from facilities that demonstrate that they do not trigger an action plan. The approach also ensures that, where there are modifications to a facility in the Bay watershed, and the original monitoring is no longer representative of the facility's discharge, additional monitoring is triggered.	Noted.
Brooks M. Smith, Andrea W. Wortzel, Patrick J. Fanning, Counsel to Virginia Manufacturers Association	Additionally, VMA supports the flexibility provided to facilities that did not complete all four samples during the 2014 permit term, allowing the samples that were collected during the 2014 permit term to be counted toward the four-sample requirement in the next permit term.	Noted.

Water		
Subcommittee		
Brooks M.	In addition to monitoring clarifications, VMA	Noted.
Smith, Andrea	also supports the addition of the waiver	
W. Wortzel,	provision in 9 VAC 25-151-70, Part I	
Patrick J.	(B)(8)(h). This provision enables facilities to	
Fanning,	request a waiver to the annual Bay TMDL	
Counsel to	monitoring requirements if they implement	
Virginia	certain BMPs or purchase perpetual nonpoint	
Manufacturers	source credits.	
Association		
Water		
Subcommittee		
Brooks M.	There are several comments VMA raised	Noted.
Smith, Andrea	during the TAC process that were not directly	DEQ VPDES Guidance and
W. Wortzel,	addressed by the amendments. While VMA is	Regulation staff will add these
Patrick J.	not seeking changes to the amendments	comments to the file of materials
Fanning,	regarding these topics, they are noted here for	to be addressed during the next
Counsel to	future consideration, particularly if DEQ	general permit reissuance process.
Virginia	issues guidance regarding implementation and	
Manufacturers	compliance with the amended Permit.	
Association	First, the amended Permit includes a list of	
Water	authorized non-stormwater discharges. 9 VAC	
Subcommittee	25-151-50. This provision is of critical	
	importance to manufacturers, because it	
	recognizes incidental discharges that may	
	commingle with stormwater and provides	
	flexibility in the management of such	
	discharges. Preserving this list and the related	
	flexibility it provides is paramount. Second, VMA remains concerned about the	
	conservative approach taken in the	
	development of benchmark criteria. While it is	
	understood that the benchmarks derive from	
	the EPA multisector general permit, there is	
	increasing concern about the fact that the	
	benchmarks, given their conservative basis, go	
	beyond the desired goal of protecting water	
	quality (determined by attaining water quality	
	standards and designated uses). EPA itself	
	acknowledges that exceedance of benchmarks	
	does not indicate that a discharge is causing or	
	contributing to a violation of a water quality	
	standard. EPA 2015 Multi-Sector General	
	Permit Fact Sheet, page 54. The conservative	
	nature of the benchmarks should factor in to	
	how they are applied to determine when a	
	stormwater pollution prevention plan should	
	be modified or, conversely, when a sampling	
	waiver may be granted. VMA would be	
	interested in seeing this addressed in any	
	implementation or compliance guidance	
	developed for the amended Permit.	

Sandra Collins, Principal Conservator, Friends of Accotink Creek	Third, as discussed during the TAC, VMA is concerned about how and when reference is made in the amended Permit to "eliminating discharges." There are several instances in the housekeeping portion of the regulation where the term "eliminate" is used. However, the term "minimize" is defined to encompass the elimination of discharges and, particularly in the context of stormwater, is the term that is most appropriate to use. The understanding reached on the TAC was that the reference to "eliminate" relates to attempting to eliminate to the extent possible. This is another clarification that it may be helpful to include in any implementation guidance. 1. Permittees with demonstrated high nutrient and sediment loads being discharged to surface waters should be required to monitor more frequently than the 4 times required for the current Industrial General Permit but should instead be required to monitor for each permit reissuance. In this way, it can be determined what discharges may not be in compliance with a TMDL and contributing to failures in meeting nutrient and sediment water quality standards for the receiving water body, and where modifications in a SWPPP may be necessary. 2. Permitees generating loads 10-fold higher than the Waste Load Allocation should not be regulated under the General Permit and should instead be required to apply for coverage under an Individual Permit as they contribute a significant portion of the overall pollutant load to the receiving water body.	<ol> <li>DEQ staff believes that facilities that comply with the monitoring requirements of the proposed regulation have reasonably characterized their nutrient loads. It should be noted that Chesapeake Bay TMDL did not assign industrial stormwater dischargers individual wasteload allocations for compliance purposes.</li> <li>In the proposed regulation permittees have until June 30, 2024 to meet the necessary nutrient reductions. At that point, if DEQ determines that adequate reductions have not been achieved, DEQ may pursue</li> </ol>
		compliance action or require individual permit coverage with site-specific conditions to achieve the reductions.
Phillip Musegaas, Vice President of Programs and Litigation, Potomac Riverkeeper Network	PRKN supports many of the proposed revisions of the Industrial Stormwater General Permit ("Industrial GP"), including changes made to ensure consistency with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2015 Multi-Sector General Permit ("EPA MSGP"). We also appreciate the input provided by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) during the development of these revisions, and formally support the comments provided by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation in writing and during the TAC process. As detailed in our comments below, PRKN also has significant concerns about the sufficiency of	DEQ recognizes PRKN's support of many of the changes in the proposed regulation and PRKN's support of CBF's comments.

permit requirements relating to discharges of nutrients and sediment from permitted facilities located in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and thus governed by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. The timing of this permit reissuance also presents certain challenges that should be considered by DEQ before finalizing the Industrial GP. First, the Agency Background Document for this permit reissuance states that the Industrial GP was developed and is being revised consistent with Virginia's 2010 Phase 1 Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan ("WIP 1"). While the 2019 Industrial GP would require current dischargers within the Chesapeake Bay watershed to submit loading calculations to DEQ based on 4 sampling events during the 2014 Industrial GP permit term, there is no requirement for all permittees to continue sampling under the 2019 Industrial GP. DEQ appears content to rely on the limited data generated by 4 sampling events at each permitted facility over a five year permit term as a basis for determining whether the loading targets for industrial stormwater facilities are being met. In addition, there is no mention, much less discussion of Virginia's WIP 3, currently under development and due for public release in spring of 2019. The WIP 3 is the final phase of the state's plan to meet the 2025 goals of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, and is supposed to reflect the most current scientific and regulatory data on the progress made by Bay states to reduce nutrient and sediment pollution, along with revised targets to ensure the 2025 goals are met. Given the fact that pollution loads from stormwater are actually projected to increase, not decrease, it is critically important that DEQ has the best available loading data, and that sampling data on industrial stormwater discharges continue to be collected during this crucial, final phase of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL implementation. At a minimum, DEQ should include a reopener clause in the 2019 Industrial GP, that requires reopening and modifying the permit if Virginia's WIP 3 dete	1.) ("First") The proposed regulation was developed prior to Virginia's WIP III. The proposed regulation will be in effect for a 5- year term. Any necessary changes due to the to-be-released WIP III will be addressed in the reissuance of the next iteration of the general permit (2024-2029).

	Second, DEQ should take note of the National Academy of Science's (NAS) pending study of the 2015 EPA MSGP, which is tentatively slated for public release in 2019.4 The Water Science and Technology Board was tasked with assessing how to improve the MSGP, with a focus on improvements to the benchmark monitoring requirements.5 Within this focus area, the study is looking at increasing the frequency of monitoring, the scope of industrial pollutants being monitored, and adjusting the benchmark threshold levels of pollutants.6 Given the fact that Virginia's Industrial GP must be consistent with EPA's MSGP, PRKN urges DEQ to carefully consider the recommendations of the final study and use them to inform any future modifications of the 2019 Industrial GP, or reissuance of the permit in 2024.	2.) ("Second") The NAS study referenced in PRKN's comment was not completed and published during the development of the proposed regulation. According to EPA, they will be potentially utilizing information from the NAS study during the development of EPA's MSGP. Typically, DEQ uses the current version of EPA's MSGP as a template for the general permit. Any changes made to EPA's MSGP due to suggestions made in the NAS study will be considered by DEQ during the next general permit reissuance (2024-2029).
Phillip Musegaas, Vice President of Programs and Litigation, Potomac Riverkeeper Network	The 2019 Industrial GP should continue requiring benchmark monitoring for nutrients and sediment for all facilities covered by this permit. The 2019 Industrial GP discontinues the nutrient and sediment benchmark monitoring requirement for dischargers within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, as long as they have completed the sampling requirement of the 2014 Industrial GP – four samples over the permit term. Permittees who did not complete the sampling during the current permit term, for whatever reason, are allowed to complete the sampling regimen during the 2019 Industrial GP term. However, DEQ provides no rationale or discussion of why the limited sampling conducted under the 2014 Industrial GP is deemed sufficient to accurately project pollution loading over the next five year permit term. PRKN disagrees with DEQ's decision to discontinue nutrient and sediment sampling requirements for several reasons. First is the issue of timing – the Chesapeake Bay TMDL is at the midpoint assessment stage, when it is critically important for the Bay states, EPA and local governments to accurately assess the progress they've made, refine the pollution reduction targets to meet the 2025 goals, and develop a WIP 3 that commits the state to achieving those targets. Presumably the accuracy of these reduction targets depends on having the best, most current data available on pollution loading	("First") Virginia is the only state in the Chesapeake Bay watershed that has required all industrial stormwater general permittees in the Bay to collect and analyze stormwater samples in an effort to quantify loads. DEQ staff believes that permittees that met the industrial stormwater general permit Bay monitoring requirements have reasonably

from all sectors, including industrial	quantified their loads to the
stormwater. DEQ's decision to relax sampling	Chesapeake Bay. The proposed
requirements for dischargers in the Bay	regulation also contains new
watershed is baffling, to say the least, and	provisions that require industrial
contrary to the Commonwealth's oft stated	facilities that modify their sites to
goals of using the best science and data	collect samples to further quantify
available to inform its permitting decisions.	any new loads and adjust or
available to inform its permitting decisions.	develop action plans if additional
	reductions are required
	EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL
	aggregated industrial stormwater
	with other regulated stormwater
	for the purposed of assigning a
	waste load allocation. The
	proposed permit requires
	development of a TMDL action
	plan for any permittees that
	individually exceed the loading
	assumptions that contributed to
	the aggregate WLA. With two
	thirds of the monitored facilities
	currently demonstrating loading
	rates below the TMDL
	assumptions, reducing loads from
	the remaining one third of
	facilities to the assumed loads will
	result in a total load for the sector
	significantly less than the
	aggregate WLA. DEQ staff
	believes the Bay requirements in
	the proposed regulation go above
	and beyond other Bay states and
	demonstrate Virginia's
	commitment to achieving
	reductions from the industrial
	stormwater section in an effort to
	meet the goals of a restored
Second, reliance on an extremely limited	Chesapeake Bay.
sampling dataset to project future pollution	("Second") DEQ staff believes
loading is scientifically suspect, and may	that the data analysis of all
result in either under- or overestimating	industrial discharges, when taken
discharges of nutrients from industrial	as a whole and aggregated, as
facilities. It also fails to take into account	EPA did with sector in the Bay
changing regional precipitation patterns due to	TMDL, reasonably quantifies the
climate change, particularly the increasing	industrial stormwater discharges
trend of intense, localized high precipitation	to the Bay. The rainfall data used
events that could result in severe stormwater	for the load calculations in the
runoff and pollution from industrial facilities	permits was a Virginia average
into Virginia's waterways. For example, 2018	rainfall value used to simplify and
was the wettest year on record for the District	normalize the calculation for
of Columbia, and among the top five wettest	permittees. The proposed
years for Virginia.8	regulation does not relax the
The EPA Chesapeake Bay Program modeling	necessary load reductions facilities
of climate change impacts conducted as part	must meet by 2024 if monitoring

	of the 2017 Midpoint Assessment found that an additional 9 million pounds of nutrients would be discharged to the Bay under updated rainfall scenarios.9 Bay states, including Virginia, committed to updating their pollution reduction targets to reflect the increased loading, in each states' WIP 3. In this context, it makes little sense for DEQ to relax sampling of nutrient and sediment discharges and rely only on data collected from 2014-2018 to inform future permitting requirements, particularly for stormwater pollution. PRKN urges DEQ to revise the 2019 Industrial GP to reflect this reality, and require ongoing sampling of nutrient and sediment discharges from all industrial sites governed by this general permit.	indicated facilities were above the nutrient loading rates in the proposed regulation.
Phillip Musegaas, Vice President of Programs and Litigation, Potomac Riverkeeper Network	DEQ should require individual discharge permits for any facilities found to have nutrient and sediment loading rates that are significantly higher than the relevant Wasteload Allocation (WLA) targets under the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Results from the 2014 Industrial GP nutrient and sediment sampling showed that while many facilities' loading was within limits, there were a small number that exceeded wasteload targets by orders of magnitude. These facilities have a disproportionate impact on local and downstream water quality, and conversely, ratcheting down their stormwater pollution through individual permit limits could lead to significant reductions in stormwater pollution from the industrial sector as a whole. As a result, DEQ should require individual stormwater discharge permits for facilities that reported pollution loading significantly higher than the wasteload target.	Permittees have until June 30, 2024 to meet the necessary nutrient load reductions as documented through the required TMDL action plans. At that point if DEQ determines that adequate reductions have not been achieved, DEQ may pursue compliance action or require individual permit coverage with site specific conditions to achieve the reductions
Phillip Musegaas, Vice President of Programs and Litigation, Potomac Riverkeeper Network	Determination of outfalls to be "substantially identical" for purposes of compliance with sampling and monitoring discharges should be limited to outfalls discharging to the same receiving waters. The current language in the draft GP is ambiguous and must be clarified. Under the current proposal, permittees may be allowed to sample only one of two outfalls found to be "substantially identical" under the regulatory definition, and apply the monitoring results of the sampled outfall to both outfalls.10	Representative outfalls – substantially identical discharges are characterized based on substantially identical effluents independent of any receiving stream considerations. If a facility utilized the representative outfall provision, and discharged to two unique receiving streams, each discharge would be held to the impairment requirements of each unique receiving stream.

Phillip	While PRKN generally does not oppose this provision as long as the factors are met (substantially identical effluents, frequency of discharges, etc.), the regulation does not specify that the two outfalls must be discharging in proximity, into the same receiving water. In order to accurately measure industrial stormwater discharges into local waterways that are often impaired, DEQ must make it clear that this provision only applies to discharges into the same receiving water. The 2019 Industrial GP should specify how a permittee will verify that purchase of nutrient credits to offset exceedances of the facility's loading limit will not result in unregulated discharges of other pollutants (e.g. metals) that would typically be carried in sediment, in a way that would cause or contribute to a contravention of water quality standards, or contribute to the impairment of the receiving waters. The 2019 Industrial GP allows permittees to	Permittees are required to comply
Musegaas, Vice President	utilize any nutrient credit trading or offset program currently available under Virginia	with applicable metals limits or benchmark monitoring
of Programs and	state law. 9 VAC25-151.70(7)(c)(iii).	independent of the required Bay
Litigation,	However, the use of nutrient credit trading by	nutrient monitoring and applicable
Potomac Riverkeeper Network Henry R.	industrial facilities to offset exceedances of their nutrient loading limits runs the risk of allowing unregulated and unmonitored discharges of other pollutants that are typically carried by sediment runoff into receiving waters. Unless DEQ is able to verify that exceedances of sediment discharge loading limits would not result in other pollutants being discharged in the sediment, industrial facilities should not be allowed to utilize the nutrient credit trading provisions available to other dischargers such as wastewater treatment plants, where the effluent is treated to remove other pollutants in addition to sediment prior to discharge. 1. Reorganize sectors, including moving	reductions. DEQ staff may utilize tools such as TMDLs or individual permits to address local water quality issues. Additionally, the proposed regulation contains new Sector AD language ( <i>The board</i> <i>shall establish any additional</i> <i>monitoring requirements for your</i> <i>facility prior to authorizing</i> <i>coverage under this permit.</i> ) that was added in an effort to require monitoring not adequately addressed in other sectors.
Pollard, V	SIC codes with no analytical sampling	1. 110100.
Chairman,	requirements to a new Sector AE and facilities	
Environmental	with only total suspended solids (TSS)	
Affairs	sampling requirements to new Sector AF.	
Committee,	COMMENT: The Association supports	
Virginia	clearer organization of industry sector	
Maritime	classifications that help make it easier to	
Association	understand the relative duties of members of	
Association	different industry sectors pursuant to the	2. The requirement to notify MS4s
	ISWGP.	of discharges to their systems is a
		cooperative effort between DEQ

	<b></b>
2. Require permittees to notify municipal separate storm sewer systems of discharges at time of registration.	and local governments. It should be noted that this requirement is being inserted in each VPDES
COMMENT: This new requirement seems to put the cart before the horse. Until coverage	general permit as they are reissued.
under the ISWGP is confirmed by the Department or becomes effective by passage	
of time pursuant to the ISWGP regulation, it appears premature to notify the MS4 of the	
industrial stormwater discharge. The Association believes it is best to retain the	
current requirement that notification to the MS4 occur within 30 days of filing the	
registration with the Department. At most, at	
the time of registration, the facility owner or operator can only inform the MS4 of its intent	3. Noted
to discharge and that it has filed or is filing its registration for ISWGP coverage.	
3. Remove benchmark parameters that are not required in the U.S. Environmental	
Protection Administration (EPA) Multisector General Permit (MSGP) for Stormwater	
Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity and where data analysis from the	
current permit term determines that these	
constituents are not a water quality concern. COMMENT: The Association supports these	
revisions.	
4. Require all dischargers with a Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load to	
submit calculations to regional permit staff. Those that are above TSS, total nitrogen, or	
total phosphate loading values must submit	
and implement an action plan with annual	
reporting requirements. Reductions must be	
met by June 30, 2024.	
COMMENT: The Association agrees that	
meeting Bay TMDL objectives is a very important step toward a cleaner Bay.	
However, the Association is concerned about	
the practicality and potential for misalignment	
of regulatory burdens associated with	
implementation of several facets of the newly	
proposed requirement to prepare calculations	
of nutrient loads and action plans and submit	
them to regional permit staff Chief among	4. a. DEQ staff believes the time
these concerns are the following: a. 9 VAC 25-151-70.13.8 — 60-day/90-	requirements for action plan submittal are reasonable and were
day deadline for submission of waste load	discussed at length during the
calculations and action plans for Bay TMDL	TAC meetings. TAC membership
Facilities. Such calculations and action plans	did not demonstrate concern with
are proposed to be submitted within (i) 60	the proposed requirements. In
days of coverage under the new permit for	addition, action plans will be
facilities with four samples taken for TSS,	prepared on a form to be provided

TN, and TP during the 2014 industrial stormwater general permit term; (ii) 90 days of completion of four monitoring periods under the new ISWGP coverage; or (iii) 90 days of completion of four monitoring periods after modification to a facility that is expected to change the nutrient loading of the facility. These time periods are likely too short for many Association members covered by the ISWGP. In particular, more time will be needed in many cases to consider alternative steps to be pursued and incorporated into the action plan based on the results of the load calculations. By example, if on-site nutrient reduction using BMPs cannot be achieved (an evaluation that can take some time in its own right), time will be needed to determine availability of nutrient credits or whether the area of industrial activity at the facility can be reduced. Securing funding for the appropriate mix of action plan options also takes time. For complex facilities, this evaluation and funding process can take several months before the action plan can be properly developed and submitted. The Association requests that the action plan deadline be changed from 60	by the department. This form will be as brief as possible in an effort to reduce regulatory burden while providing the required action plan elements. The action plans are intended to be "living documents" that may be modified annually as BMP implementation dictates with required reductions being met in 2024.
days/90 days, respectively, to 180 days so that a reasonable assessment of cost-effective	
a reasonable assessment of cost-effective options and acquisition of any needed funding for a proposed action plan can occur. b. 9 VAC 25-151-70.B.8 — Need for exemption from nutrient and sediment monitoring, waste load calculations, action plan submissions and annual reporting for action plan implementation for Bay TMDL Facilities. A facility that is not reasonably expected to contribute to nutrient and sediment loading in excess of the assumed loading rates set forth in 9 VAC 25-151- 70.B.8.c(1) should not be compelled to incur the costs and procedural regulatory compliance risk associated with the monitoring, load calculation, action plan development, and action plan implementation reporting obligations. Indeed, imposing such obligations and costs on facilities that are not expected to create such loads results in unfair and arbitrary misallocation of regulatory burdens and costs. Therefore, in addition to the proposed waiver from annual reporting	4.b. Nutrient discharges occur off all lands. DEQ does not believe the required nutrient load demonstration to be overly burdensome to permittees and is an essential piece of Virginia's commitment to Chesapeake Bay restoration. It should be noted that the proposed regulation does not require additional monitoring or reductions for permittees who have demonstrated they are not contributing nutrient loads to the Bay in excess of the assumptions of the TMDL.
requirements noted in item 5 below, there should be an exemption or waiver from the monitoring, waste load calculations, action plan submissions and annual reporting for	

action plan implementation for facilities that are not reasonably expected to discharge nutrients and sediment at levels exceeding the assumed levels in 9 VAC 25-151-70.B.8.c(1). This exemption or waiver could be based on a demonstration by the facility of the reasonable expectation that loadings of these pollutants will not exceed the assumed levels in 9 VAC 25-151-70.B.8.c(1). This demonstration could be based on facility industry type, facility design, operational measures and/or other relevant factors. Such an approach would reflect a reasonable balancing of regulatory and Bay cleanup objectives and practical and economic considerations. It would also minimize unnecessary administrative burdens on the Department by reducing paperwork and review time for facilities that do not warrant the proposed level of oversight. 5. Add new waiver conditions for an annual reporting requirement. Waivers are for installing and maintaining the Chesapeake Bay program or best management practice (BMP) clearinghouse BMPs, purchasing perpetual credits, or other BMPs where four samples are used to demonstrate a facility has met required reductions. COMMENT: The Association generally supports the waiver concept as proposed in 9 VAC 25-151-70.B.8.h. However, the waiver for annual reporting should also be allowed in cases of facility reliance on purchase of term nutrient credits applicable to that reporting year to achieve nutrient loading and limit	5. Permittees may ut term credits to meet with the Chesapeak reduction requirement the annual nature of credits, and the fact credits must be gen annual basis, DEQ determined that the transactions shall be an annual basis and documentation may required annual rep
<ul> <li>requirements. Emerging nutrient credit</li> <li>options involving term credits can play an</li> <li>important role in facility compliance and</li> <li>should be incorporated into the waiver</li> <li>provision. Also, see item 4.b above.</li> <li>6. Add new e-reporting requirements to</li> <li>meet 9 VAC 25-31-1020. COMMENT: The</li> <li>Association is generally amenable to these</li> <li>proposed changes.</li> <li>7. Require new housekeeping language</li> <li>in conformance with the 2015 EPA MSGP</li> <li>(waste disposal, material storage, minimize</li> <li>material exposure to stormwater, and</li> <li>eliminate discharge of plastics).</li> <li>COMMENT: The Association is generally</li> <li>amenable to these proposed revisions to the</li> <li>degree necessary to maintain consistency with</li> <li>the 2015 EPA MSGP. However, see</li> <li>comments for item 11 below. Also, the</li> <li>Association has the following concerns</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6. Noted</li> <li>7. As referenced in ("Unless infeasible, shall implement the requirements were a the proposed regula EPA's Multi-Sector Permit. Per the Mu General Permit "Th <i>infeasible</i> means not technologically pose economically practia achievable in light of</li> </ul>

use annual/ et compliance ke Bay TMDL nents. Due to of annual/term t that these nerated on an staff has ese credit be reported on d the y serve as the port.

the comment, e, the facilities e following:....) added to align ation with or General ulti-Sector he term ot ssible or not ticable and achievable in light of the best

associated with the proposed addition of the following language to 9 VAC 25-151- 80.B.4.b(2): "Unless infeasible, facilities shall implement the following: (a) Use grading, berming, or curbing to prevent runoff of contaminated flows and divert run-on away from potential sources of pollutants;" This new clause (a) appears to require such measures unless they are "infeasible." Of course, what may be "infeasible" for purposes of this provision should be a case-by-case determination based on site-specific factors. Regardless, however, facility owners and operators should not be compelled to make capital improvements such as these, even if feasible, if other on-site measures are sufficient to keep stormwater from contacting potential sources of pollutants at the site. Even if these measures were feasible, grading, berming or curbing may not be the most effective or cost-efficient measures, but the current proposed language does not appear to allow for any deviation from this requirement in such cases. This language should be revised to allow facilities to use other means and methods to achieve the goals contemplated by	industry practices". DEQ staff believes the proposed language allows regulatory flexibility and is not unduly burdensome to permittees. Permittees that provide an infeasibility analysis to the department may be afforded compliance discretion in relation to the requirement on a case-by- case basis.
this section, particularly where grading, berming or curbing are not effective or cost-	
<ul> <li>efficient.</li> <li>8. Add new control measures language in conformance with the 2015 EPA MSGP (prevent or divert run-on, contain or divert spills before discharge, clean up spills immediately, store leaking equipment under cover, use overflow protection, and perform vehicle maintenance under cover).</li> <li>COMMENT: The Association is amenable to these proposed revisions to the degree necessary to maintain consistency with the 2015 EPA MSGP. However, see comments for item 11 below.</li> <li>9. Remove comprehensive site</li> </ul>	8. Noted 9. Noted
<ul> <li>compliance evaluation per 2015 EPA MSGP, which was found to be redundant, and add additional language to routine site inspection.</li> <li>COMMENT: The Association is amenable to these changes.</li> <li>10. Remove sector specific and stormwater pollution protection plan requirement redundant language.</li> <li>COMMENT: The Association supports these revisions to the degree they help to avoid confusion in implementation of the ISWGP.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>10. Noted</li><li>11. The additional language in the proposed regulation was added in</li></ul>

	20
11. Make this general permit similar to	an effort to allow flexibility for
the 2015 EPA MSGP and consistent with	industrial permittees while also
other VPDES general permits and respond to	maintaining water quality.
technical advisory committee suggestions.	
COMMENT: The Association generally	
supports improving consistency with the 2015	
EPA MSGP and other VPDES general	
permits to enhance ease of use of the ISWGP	
and avoid confusion and potential	
noncompliance based on sometimes subtle but	
-	
material differences between the two permits.	
However, the Association notes the following	
concerns with certain of these proposed	
changes:	
a. 9 VAC 25-151-50.C.4.b, -50.C.4.c,	
and -50.C.4.g; 9 VAC 25-151-70.B.1.b, -	
70.B.1.c, and -703.1.h — Authorized	
nonstormwater discharges. While these	
proposed amendments to these subsections	
may be designed to increase consistency with	
the EPA MSGP, the amendments addressing	
hydrant flushing, potable water, and pavement	
washwater discharges need to be further	
clarified: it is unclear from the added clause	
for these subsections — "managed in a	
manner to avoid an instream impact" — what	
"instream impact" means, and that term is not	
defined elsewhere in the current ISWGP or	
the Proposed Amendments. Indeed, relatively	
small degrees of these types of discharges	
may technically cause a "instream impact,"	
but that impact will often be negligible and of	
no consequence to instream water quality or	
aquatic life or other instream beneficial uses.	
Accordingly, the proposed additional clause	
should also include the word "adverse" before	
"instream impact." This will help to ensure the	
intent of these provisions are fulfilled and to	
prevent unwarranted loss of authorized	
nonstormwater discharge status for these	
kinds of immaterial discharges.	
12. Address staff requests to simplify, clarify,	
and update permit requirements.	
COMMENT: The Association supports	
reasonable efforts to simplify, clarify and	
update permit requirements to ensure ease of	
understanding and improve regulated parties'	
ability to comply with ISWGP terms and	
conditions. The following specific comments	12. a. The proposed definition for
are offered in this vein:	BMPs is intended to address
a. 9 VAC 25-151-10 — Definition of	practices or structures that prevent
"Best management practice" or "BMP." To	
- ·	or reduce stormwater pollution from the site and is consistent with
the degree that the proposed amendments to	
the definition of "Best management practice"	BMP definitions in other DEQ

	or "BMP" reflect such efforts by the Department and the Board, the Association notes that these amendments, while improving the definition, only clarify that "structural and nonstructural practices" that "prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters" are allowed. These amendments still fail to account for the use of BMPs that result in in-situ removal of nutrients from state waters (e.g., "shellfish aquaculture, algal harvesting, and other established or innovative methods of nutrient control or removal") and generation of and reliance upon nutrient credits generated by such BMPs, as is contemplated by the State Water Control law at Va. Code §§ 62.1-44.19:20.B.1.b, 62.1- 44.19:20.C, 62.1-44.19:21 and 62.1- 44.19:21.1. Ensuring that these emerging options for in-situ removal of nutrients may also be considered as BMPs within the scope of the ISWGP will allow regulated dischargers, including Association members, to utilize the full range of authorized BMPs and nutrient credit options to achieve compliance with ISWGP nutrient limits and contribute to meeting Bay TMDL goals. b. 9 VAC 25-151-70.A.1 — Effluent limitations and monitoring requirements. The Association appreciates this change to reduce redundant sampling obligations so that one sample may be used to satisfy multiple testing needs. c. 9 VAC 25-151-70.A.6.b — Corrective actions. The Association supports the proposed revision to seek consistency in using 60 days as the timeline for updates to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	<ul> <li>programs. As noted in Part I.B.8,h of the proposed general permit, DEQ intends to accept reductions generated by any BMP approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program, which includes aquaculture.</li> <li>12. b. Noted</li> <li>12. c. Noted</li> </ul>
Bill Bukevicz, Executive Vice President, Davis Industries, Inc	For your review, if we could add the following definition to 9VAC25-151-10 Definitions section of the new permit regulations. Add the definition: "Pollution control equipment and facilities" shall mean any stormwater control used to prevent or abate stormwater pollution at the facility in accordance with the designated facility's storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), which controls may include real or personal property, equipment, facilities, or devices, used primarily for the purpose of abating or preventing pollution of waters of the Commonwealth, which may be evidenced	DEQ staff believes the definition found in § 58.1-3660 is satisfactory and has no intention define "Pollution control equipment and facilities" in the proposed regulation.

r		
	by the control's description or depiction in (a)	
	the facility's SWPPP as a best management	
	practice (BMP) or (b) site map as a means for	
	controlling the direction of or channeling	
	storm water toward a storm water treatment	
	system (e.g. sedimentation pond or oil-water	
	separator) or diverting stormwater from a	
	potential pollution source, in each case by	
	such means as curbs, berms, or concrete or	
	asphalt surfacing graded to direct storm water	
	toward such treatment system, whereby such controls also include piping, drain inlets	
	· · ·	
	and/or treatment systems intended for such stormwater control.	
Jamie Brunkow,	Virginia recently passed the midpoint of the	Noted
James	Chesapeake Bay Cleanup and is crafting the	Noted
Riverkeeper and	phase III Watershed Implementation Plan for	
Sr. Advocacy	meeting our Total Maximum Daily Load	
Manager, James	(TMDL) goals by 2025. Reducing pollution in	
River	stormwater runoff is a challenging but critical	
Association	component to meeting the TMDL and	
11000010000	restoring water quality. As an organization	
	dedicated to connecting Virginians with a	
	healthy James River, we understand the	
	impact that runoff pollution has on Virginia's	
	water, its wildlife, and its outdoor recreation	
	industry. This proposed permit, which will	
	cover a wide array of industrial activities	
	through 2024, is an opportunity to	
	demonstrate the importance of the data	
	gathered during the previous permit cycle and	
	apply the lessons learned to ensure future	
	stormwater runoff reductions.	
	Under the Industrial General Permit in effect	
	from 2014-2019, the Department of	
	Environmental Quality took a valuable step	
	forward in stormwater monitoring by	
	requiring industrial facilities across the	
	Commonwealth to sample each stormwater	
	outlet for nitrogen, phosphorous, and TSS a total of four times over the 5 year period of	
	the permit. Notwithstanding the variability	
	inherent in this monitoring regime, the data	
	collected has proven insightful and essential	
	towards the Chesapeake Bay cleanup effort.	
	During the Technical Advisory Committee	
	meetings convened for the reissuance of this	
	general permit, both DEQ and the Chesapeake	
	Bay Foundation presented summaries of the	
	nitrogen, phosphorus and TSS data collected	
	by permitees over the previous permit cycle.	
	We were pleased to find that almost two thirds	
	of monitored facilities recorded waste loads	
	below the industrial sector's allocation. But	

	about one third remain above pollution levels set in Virginia's aggregate Waste Load Allocation (12.3 lb/ac nitrogen, 1.5 lb/ac phosphorus and 440 lb/ac TSS) and a smaller subset of these facilities were found to be discharging well-above these loads. In effect, less than 1% of all monitored facilities discharge approximately one third of the overall nitrogen and phosphorous load for the entire sector, and more than 8,000 pounds of phosphorous per year above the WLA. We are grateful that under the Industrial General Permit, these facilities are on a path to reducing these loads through Total Maximum Daily Load action plans. These reductions, given the size of the loads, will be a substantial contribution to ensuring that Virginia meets its clean-up goals within the stormwater sector. And we owe much of this result to DEQ's industrial water quality monitoring requirement.	
Jamie Brunkow, James Riverkeeper and Sr. Advocacy Manager, James River Association	To meet Virginia's goals under the Chesapeake Bay Cleanup plan, DEQ and the industrial sector will need every tool available to effectively manage stormwater runoff from these facilities. Water quality monitoring has proven to be one such tool. We recommend that DEQ continue to require nitrogen, phosphorus and TSS testing for industrial facilities covered by the proposed General Permit, with particular attention to enhanced monitoring of facilities with documented waste loads above the aggregate WLA. Continued monitoring of all facilities would strengthen DEQ's ability to identify if conditions at a particular facility have changed its stormwater discharges in a way that needs to be addressed by a TMDL action plan. Moreover, enhanced monitoring of high load facilities under a TMDL action plan would better allow the agency to determine if the action plan is adequate to reduce loads or if additional action is needed. We recommend that DEQ take steps to require individual industrial stormwater permits for facilities which have shown to far exceed their WLA.	Virginia is the only state in the Chesapeake Bay watershed that has required all industrial stormwater general permittees in the Bay to collect and analyze stormwater samples in an effort to quantify loads. DEQ staff believes that permittees that met the industrial stormwater general permit Bay monitoring requirements have reasonably quantified their loads to the Chesapeake Bay. The proposed regulation also contains new provisions that would require industrial facilities that modify their sites to collect samples to further quantify these new loads adjust or develop action plans if additional reductions are required EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL aggregated industrial stormwater with other regulated stormwater for the purpose of assigning a waste load allocation (WLA). The proposed permit requires development of a TMDL action plan for any permittees that individually exceed the loading assumptions that contributed to the aggregate WLA. Because two thirds of the monitored facilities

Jamie Brunkow, James Riverkeeper and Sr. Advocacy Manager, James River Association	We further recommend that DEQ strengthen its enforcement of the permit requirements regarding monitoring. A number of facilities did not submit data despite their obligation to do so over the previous permit cycle. Data gaps from these facilities may hinder DEQ's ability to adequately manage waste loads at these locations and from the industrial sector in general.	demonstrated loading rates below the TMDL assumptions, this practice of individual accountability for an aggregate WLA results in aggregate reductions below the established WLA. DEQ staff believes the Bay requirements in the proposed regulation go above and beyond other Bay states and demonstrate Virginia's commitment to achieving reductions from the industrial stormwater section in an effort to meet the goals of a restored Chesapeake Bay. Permittees have until June 30, 2024 to meet the necessary reductions as documented through required TMDL action plans. At that point if DEQ determines that adequate reductions have not been achieved, DEQ may pursue compliance action or require individual permit coverage with site specific conditions to achieve the reductions. DEQ staff recognizes the permit compliance concerns presented by CBF. DEQ permitting staff has relayed these concerns to DEQ compliance and enforcement management. The proposed regulation will require all permittees with Chesapeake Bay TMDL monitoring requirements to submit nutrient loading calculations to DEQ. This requirement is proposed as an effort to increase compliance with the Chesapeake Bay TMDL requirements in the general permit. DEQ staff oversees compliance for over 12,000 NPDES permitted entities, of which 1,265 are industrial stormwater. The agency uses a risk-based strategy to manage inspection and compliance resources.
Scott J. Thomas,	I am writing in support of the proposed	Noted.
Citizen	regulation for the general permit and requirements for a stormwater pollution prevention plan for the discharge of stormwater from industrial activities.	

Virginia During		
	the current permit term (2014-2019),	It should be noted that Bay
	ers of covered facilities in the	monitoring requirements were
	eake Bay Watershed were required to	applied across all sectors covered
	discharges for total nitrogen (TN),	by the general permit that were
	osphorus (TP), and total suspended	located within the Chesapeake
	TSS) over four monitoring periods,	Bay watershed. By their nature,
-	onding to the first two years of	wastewater treatment plants are
coverag		sources of nutrients and nutrients
-	xplained in the Town Hall Agency	are present in all types of
	ound Document prepared for the final	stormwater runoff. The proposed
	n of the current General Permit that it	regulation contains provisions that
	d to require this monitoring to fill in	allow facilities to demonstrate,
	ps for the industrial sector. Virginia	through monitoring, that they are
	ed loadings for TN, TP, and TSS	not a source of excessive nutrient
	the development of the Chesapeake	discharges to the Bay and thus
Bay TM	IDL Watershed Implementation Plan.	have no further Bay monitoring
	nposed monitoring requirements in the	requirements or reporting
2014 G	eneral Permit to better "characterize	requirements for the permit term.
the load	lings from these facilities." (p. 32).	
In 2013	, VAMWA submitted comments	
requesti	ing that DEQ delete this monitoring	
entirely	, based on the fact that industrial	
facilitie	s are regulated under the ISWGP	
because	e their stormwater discharges may	
contain	particular pollutants of concern	
relating	to the industrial activity (i.e., metals),	
and not	because their stormwater may contain	
nutrient	s or sediment at a level higher than an	
unregul	ated industrial facility. VAMWA	
suggest	ed that the proposed Bay monitoring	
requirer	ments were excessive, expensive	
(VAMV	WA estimated it would cost over	
	00 to run the minimum number of	
tests), a	nd unnecessary.	
Althoug	gh DEQ made several other changes in	
respons	e to VAMWA's 2013 comments, it did	
not dele	ete the Bay monitoring requirement.	
DEQ is:	sued the 2014 General Permit with the	
	ring requirements intact.	
During	the TAC discussions regarding the	
2019-20	024 ISWGP reissuance, DEQ provided	
	Chesapeake Bay monitoring that	
	d during the 2014-2019 permit period.	
	A appreciated DEQ's transparency in	
	ng these details to all TAC members.	
VAMW	A reviewed the data for the POTWs	
	l by the ISWGP during the monitoring	
-	and located in the Bay Watershed, and	
	ed that POTW loadings were on	
	well below the loadings that DEQ	
assume	d for TN and TP for industrial facilities	
when it	developed the aggregated wasteload	
allocation	on for the sector in the Chesapeake	
Bay TM	IDL. Based on these results, VAMWA	

	requested that DEO rom and the Observe of	
	requested that DEQ remove the Chesapeake	
	Bay monitoring requirement for the 2019-	
	2024 permit cycle.	
	DEQ has included text in the proposed	
	ISWGP reissuance to exempt facilities that	
	submit the calculations to support their	
	loadings from any further Bay monitoring:	
	(2) Facilities that completed four samples for	
	TSS, TN, and TP during the 2014 industrial	
	stormwater general permit term shall utilize	
	the procedures in Part I B 8 c (2) to calculate	
	their facility stormwater loads. The permittee	
	shall submit a copy of the calculations and	
	Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan if	
	required under Part I B 8 f to the department	
	within 60 days of coverage under this general	
-	permit. (4) Excilitions that monitored for TSS_TN_or	
	(4) Facilities that monitored for TSS, TN, or TP may use the applicable compling data	
	TP may use the applicable sampling data collected during the 2014 industrial	
	stormwater general permit term to satisfy all	
	or part of the four monitoring periods	
	requirement in accordance with Part I B 8 a.	
	9VAC25-151-70, Part I.B.8.b.2, b.4	
	VAMWA supports DEQ's decision to remove	
	Chesapeake Bay monitoring for facilities that	
	conducted monitoring during the 2014-2019	
	permit cycle. It is appropriate and reasonable	
-	to discontinue this monitoring at this time.	
	While VFPA and our members are sensitive to	-As referenced in the comment,
	the need to protect Virginia's environment, we	("Unless infeasible, the facilities
	must remind you that the large majority of our	shall implement the following:)
e e	mills are still small businesses, most with less	requirements were added to align
,	than 50 employees, and that the regulatory	the proposed regulation with
-	burdens imposed by these stormwater	EPA's Multi-Sector General
	permitting regulations have a real, hard,	Permit. Per the Multi-Sector
	documented cost to these operations. Water	General Permit "The term
	quality testing alone costs our members	"infeasible" means not
	literally hundreds of dollars a year. The	technologically possible or not
	alterations to a mill yard required by a SWPP	economically practicable and
	can literally costs thousands of dollars to	achievable in light of the best
	implement, depending on the particular	industry practices". DEQ intends
	situation.	that the requirement to "Perform
		ALL vehicle maintenance or
'	Therefore, we have particular concern with	equipment cleaning operations
	language on Page 62 of the proposed	indoors, undercover, or in bermed
	regulation that states "unless unfeasible,	areas that prevent run-off and
	facilities SHALL implement the following:	run-on and also capture any
	(f) Perform ALL vehicle maintenance or	overspray" means that permittees
	equipment cleaning operations indoors,	will make all reasonable efforts to
	undercover, or in bermed areas that prevent	mitigate the exposure of this
	run-off and run-on and also capture any	activity to stormwater. This could
	overspray."	simply mean temporally covering
		the work area or not performing

What does "unfeasible" mean to the agency,	vehicle maintenance during a
and who determines feasibility, DEQ or the	precipitation event.
business? While a mill may have the acreage	-The proposed regulation states: 1.
to build a vehicle maintenance garage, the	Prohibition of nonstormwater
cost of doing so would be financially	discharges. Discharges of
unfeasible. There is concern that we are	stormwater from areas where
headed down a path of requiring businesses to	there may be contact with
manage stormwater (rainwater) regardless of	chemical formulations [ <del>sprayed</del>
the costs.	applied] to provide surface
	protection are not authorized by
In addition, most sawmills treat rough green	this permit. [Surface protection]
or finished lumber with an anti-stain	includes chemical application to
treatment. Is it the intent of this revised	control sap stain, mold, mildew,
regulation that this material be dipped and	and insects.] These discharges
stored under cover? Again, making this type	must be covered under a separate
of production adjustment may not be	VPDES permit. Discharge of wet
physically possible and/or cost prohibitive.	dye drippings from mulch dyeing
physically possible and of cost promotive.	operations are also prohibited.
Page 70 of the proposed regulation states	2. Authorized nonstormwater
"Discharges of stormwater from areas where	discharges. In addition to the
there may be contact with chemical	discharges described in Part I B 1,
formulations sprayed to provide surface	the following nonstormwater
protection are not authorized by this permit.	discharges may be authorized by
These discharges must be covered under a	
separate VPDES permit." While this is not	this permit provided the nonstormwater component of the
new language, it has prompted questions	× •
	discharge is in compliance with
about anti-stain dip tanks, dipped lumber	<i>9VAC25-151-90 C and the effluent limitations described in 9VAC25-</i>
storage, and if this activity necessitates an	
additional discharge permit even though anti-	151-90 D: discharges from the
stain treatments are not applied by spraying.	spray down of lumber and wood
Einelly, our other concerns records news	product storage yards where no
Finally, our other concern regards new	chemical additives are used in the
language on page 57:	spray down waters and no
W. Inspection and entry. The permittee shall	chemicals are applied to the wood
allow the director, or an authorized	during storage.
representative, including an authorized	The proposed regulation does not
contractor acting as a representative of the	state that material must be dipped
administrator;	or sprayed under cover, but does
Is it the agency's intention to hire outside	state discharges of stormwater
consultants to perform inspections? In	from these areas are not
Governor Northam's proposed budget, there is	authorized. Simply stated the
\$2.5 million included for DEQ enforcement	permittee must prevent contact
staff. Will this money be used to hire state	with stormwater in these areas or
employees at the agency to perform these	these areas must be covered under
inspections, or will all or part of this funding	a VPDES individual permit.
go to outside contractors? Regardless, VFPA	-DEQ acknowledges that "anti-
monitored the Executive Order 6 meetings	stain treatments are applied by
and we have grave concerns that the agency	spraying". In an effort to provide
will pursue inspections and punitive	clarification to permittees DEQ
enforcement actions to appease the	staff has modified the proposed
environmental organizations driving the EO6	regulation to replace "sprayed"
agenda, at the expense of small businesses	with "applied".
struggling to meet never-ending regulatory	-As referenced in the comment
burdens.	("W. Inspection and entry. The

		1 1 11 11 11 11 11
	Again, the agency must keep in mind that most of Virginia's sawmills and forest product operations are still small, family-owned businesses. We are not international paper companies with hundreds of employees and entire departments dedicated to environmental permitting and compliance. Our environmental compliance director is typically the mill owner or office manager with little to no expertise in managing stormwater. We are very concerned that the costs of environmental regulation will ultimately be a deciding factor as to whether a family business tries to remain viable for the next generation, or simply closes its doors or sells to a multi-state company with enough staff - and enough money - to chase down every drop of rain.	permittee shall allow the director, or an authorized representative, including an authorized contractor acting as a representative of the administrator"), the added language is being added to all VPDES general permits during reissuance. This language was added as requested by EPA and as required by federal regulation. -DEQ staff is sensitive to the regulatory challenges facing small businesses. It should be noted that in an effort to reduce regulatory burden the proposed regulation removed a significant amount of unnecessary conditions and unnecessary language.
Whitness	*	I. The reductions detailed in the
Whitney S. Katchmark, PE, Principal Water Resources Engineer, Hampton Roads Planning District Commision	I. BMP Reporting Part I B(8) describes the special conditions for facilities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. If a facility determines that their nutrient or sediment load requires an action plan, they are provided three options for achieving pollutant reductions: 1) implement Virginia Clearinghouse BMPs or BMPs approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program, 2) implement site-specific BMPs with sampling, or 3) acquire credits. The facility is also required to submit an annual report to the Department of Environmental Quality ("DEQ") describing the progress in making the required reductions. However, this information has not been reported to the Chesapeake Bay Program's database to receive credit for the Bay TMDL. The suggested revision is to add a requirement for facilities to report Virginia Clearinghouse and Chesapeake Bay Program-approved BMPs in the BMP Warehouse so that they can be credited to the state in the Chesapeake Bay model. In Hampton Roads alone, there are over 200 facilities with Industrial GPs. There are on-the-ground BMPs that are not credited in the Bay model. Given the costs of urban BMPs, the pounds of pollutants removed by industrial facilities should not be overlooked.	I: The reductions detailed in the proposed regulation are to be achieved by June 30, 2024. DEQ staff will take the comment and suggestions into consideration as we evaluate future data reporting commitments to the Chesapeake Bay Program.
	II. Reference to Ordinances Part I B(9) requires a permittee to "incorporate measures and controls into the SWPPP to comply with applicable local TMDL ordinance requirements." The language in this section is unclear because	II: DEQ proposes to clarify this language in guidance.

many localities do not have local TMDL	
ordinances and instead use their stormwater	
management ordinance to comply with	
TMDLs.	
The suggested revision is to replace "local	
TMDL ordinance" with "local stormwater	
management ordinance."	III: DEQ VPDES staff recognizes
III. Nonpoint Source Pollution Beyond	HRPDC's recommendations and
the Industrial Area	will take the recommendations
The HRPDC recognizes that the Industrial	into consideration in the
VPDES program is limited to reducing	development of DEQ Chesapeake
pollution from point source discharges;	Bay restoration initiatives.
however, the Commonwealth's focus on	Day restoration initiatives.
unregulated developed land for the Phase III	
Watershed Implementation Plan has raised a	
concern that is related to industrial facilities.	
The runoff from the impervious areas beyond	
the industrial activity areas of the facilities,	
such as parking lots, is an unregulated source	
of pollutant loads because it is excluded from	
the Industrial VPDES permits and the MS4	
permits. The total acres covered by Industrial	
VPDES permits were excluded from MS4	
service areas in accordance with DEQ	
Guidance Memo No. 15-2005. Additionally,	
some of the industrial VPDES permittees are	
located along waterways and the runoff from	
these facilities directly discharges to surface	
waters instead of through an MS4.	
DEQ should initiate a mapping exercise to	
determine the extent of the impervious area	
outside of the industrial activities. In Hampton	
Roads, over 13,000 acres of urban land are	
covered by industrial VPDES permits. It	
would be reasonable to estimate that a quarter	
of those lands are impervious outside of the	
industrial activity areas. Treating over 3,000	
acres of impervious private property would	
provide significant pollutant reductions in	
Hampton Roads and progress for the state	
towards TMDL compliance.	
The HRPDC recommends DEQ develop a	
new incentive program or expand the existing	
Virginia Environmental Excellence Program	
(VEEP) to encourage facility owners to treat	
their runoff from their parking lots and other	
· •	
non-industrial impervious areas. Cost-share	
programs or other incentives could improve	
water quality and benefit facilities. An	
important aspect of the program, which is	
already built into the VEEP framework, would	
be to require reporting so that the creditable	
practices could be included in the Chesapeake	
Bay model. There are Industrial VPDES	

permittees who are willing to implement	
voluntary stormwater management practices,	
as demonstrated through the Elizabeth River	
Project's River Star Businesses program.	
Twenty-seven River Star Businesses have	
industrial VPDES permits and have	
implemented projects such as rainwater	
harvesting, shoreline restoration, and	
bioretention basins that are unaccounted for	
with respect to the Bay TMDL.	

Substantive changes to the existing regulation are:

- Reorganize sectors to simplify regulation, which includes moving Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes with no analytical sampling requirements to a new Sector AE and SIC Codes with only total suspended solids (TSS) sampling requirements to new Sector AF;
- Require permittees to notify Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) of discharges at time of registration;
- Removal of benchmark parameters that are not required in the EPA Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (MSGP) and where data analysis from the current permit term determine that these constituents are not a water quality concern;
- Require all dischargers with the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) to submit calculations to regional permit staff. Those who are above TSS, total nitrogen (TN), total phosphorus (TP) loading values must submit and implement an action plan with annual reporting requirements. Reductions must be met by June 30, 2024. Added new waiver conditions for an annual reporting requirement. Waivers are for installing and maintaining Bay program or Best Management Practice (BMP) clearing house BMPs, purchasing perpetual credits, or other BMPs where 4 samples are used to demonstrate the facility has met required reductions;
- Added new E-reporting requirements to meet 9VAC25-31-1020;
- Require new housekeeping language in conformance with the 2015 EPA MSGP (waste disposal, material storage, minimize material exposure to stormwater, eliminate discharge of plastics);
- Added new control measures language in conformance with the 2015 EPA MSGP (prevent or divert run-on, spills shall be contained or diverted before discharge, clean up spills immediately, store leaking equipment under cover, use overflow protection, perform vehicle maintenance under cover);
- Remove comprehensive site compliance evaluation per 2015 EPA MSGP, which was found to be redundant and added additional language to routine site inspection; and,
- Remove redundant Part IV language which consists mostly of sector specific housekeeping and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements. This was done for simplicity and to minimize confusion for permittees. Some sector specific language was retained, even though it was redundant. These sectors were identified by regional staff as higher risk and larger industry sectors and needed the extra emphasis (ship yards, landfills, scrap yards and metal recyclers).

Regulatory Text:

### **Project 5397 - Proposed**

### STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD 2019 Amend and Reissue Existing General Permit Regulation

### CHAPTER 151

GENERAL VIRGINIA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (VPDES) GENERAL PERMIT

# <u>REGULATION</u> FOR DISCHARGES OF <del>STORM WATER</del> <u>STORMWATER</u> ASSOCIATED WITH INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY

### 9VAC25-151-10. Definitions.

The words and terms used in this chapter shall have the meanings defined in the State Water Control Law (§ 62.1-44.2 et seq. of the Code of Virginia) and the VPDES Permit Regulation (9VAC25-31) unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, except that for the purposes of this chapter:

"Best management practices" or "BMPs" means schedules of activities, practices (and prohibitions of practices), prohibitions of practices, structures, vegetation, maintenance procedures, and other management practices, including both structural and nonstructural practices, to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters. BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site runoff, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

"Board" means the Virginia State Water Control Board or State Water Control Board.

"Closed landfill" means a landfill that, on a permanent basis, will no longer receive waste and has completed closure in accordance with applicable federal, state, or local requirements.

"Coal pile runoff" means the rainfall runoff from or through any coal storage pile.

"Colocated industrial activity" means any industrial activity, excluding the facility's primary industrial activity, located on-site that meets the description of a category included in the "industrial activity" definition. An activity at a facility is not considered colocated if the activity, when considered separately, does not meet the description of a category included in the "industrial activity" definition or identified by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code list in Table 50-2 in 9VAC25-151-50.

"Commercial treatment and disposal facilities" means facilities that receive, on a commercial basis, any produced hazardous waste (not their own) and treat or dispose of those wastes as a service to the generators. Such facilities treating or disposing exclusively residential hazardous wastes are not included in this definition.

"Control measure" means any best management practice or other method (including effluent limitations) used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

"Corrective action" means any action to (i) repair, modify, or replace any stormwater control used at the facility, (ii) clean up and properly dispose of spills, releases, or other deposits at the facility, or (iii) return to compliance with permit requirements.

"Department" or "DEQ" means the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

"Director" means the Director of the Department of Environmental Quality or an authorized representative.

"Existing discharger" means an operator applying for coverage under this permit for discharges authorized previously under a VPDES general or individual permit.

"Impaired water" means, for purposes of this chapter, a water that has been identified by Virginia pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act as not meeting applicable water quality standards (these waters are called "water quality limited segments" under 40 CFR 30.2(j)). Impaired waters include both waters with approved or established TMDLs, and those for which a TMDL has not yet been approved or established.

"Impervious surface" means a surface composed of any material that significantly impedes or prevents natural infiltration of water into the soil.

"Industrial activity" - the following categories of facilities are considered to be engaging in "industrial activity":

1. Facilities subject to stormwater effluent limitations guidelines, new source performance standards, or toxic pollutant effluent standards under 40 CFR Subchapter N (except facilities with toxic pollutant effluent standards which are exempted under category 10 of this definition);

2. Facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) 24 (except 2434), 26 (except 265 and 267), 28 (except 283 and 285), 29, 311, 32 (except 323), 33, 3441, and 373 (Office of Management and Budget (OMB) SIC Manual, 1987);

3. Facilities classified as SIC 10 through 14 (mineral industry) (OMB SIC Manual, 1987) including active or inactive mining operations (except for areas of coal mining operations no longer meeting the definition of a reclamation area under 40 CFR 434.11(l) because the performance bond issued to the facility by the appropriate Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) (30 USC § 1201 et seq.) authority has been released, or except for areas of noncoal mining operations which have been released from applicable state or

federal reclamation requirements after December 17, 1990) and oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that discharge stormwater contaminated by contact with or that has come into contact with, any overburden, raw material, intermediate products, finished products, byproducts or waste products located on the site of such operations[;] (inactive mining operations are mining sites that are not being actively mined, but which have an identifiable <u>owner/operator</u> <u>owner or operator</u>; inactive mining sites do not include sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, benefication, or processing of mined materials, nor sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim);

4. Hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities, including those that are operating under interim status or a permit under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 USC § 6901 et seq.);

5. Landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that receive or have received any industrial wastes (waste that is received from any of the facilities described under this definition, and <del>debris/wastes</del> <u>debris or wastes</u> from VPDES regulated construction <del>activities/sites</del> <u>activities or sites</u>), including those that are subject to regulation under Subtitle D of RCRA;

6. Facilities involved in the recycling of materials, including metal scrapyards, battery reclaimers, salvage yards, and automobile junkyards, including but limited to those classified as Standard Industrial Classification Codes 5015 and 5093 (OMB SIC Manual, 1987);

7. Steam electric power generating facilities, including coal handling sites;

8. Transportation facilities classified as SIC Codes 40, 41, 42 (except 4221-4225), 43, 44, 45, and 5171 (OMB SIC Manual, 1987) which have vehicle maintenance shops, equipment cleaning operations, or airport deicing operations. Only those portions of the facility that are either involved in vehicle maintenance (including vehicle rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling, and lubrication), equipment cleaning operation, airport deicing operation, or which are otherwise identified under categories 1 through 7 or 9 and 10 of this definition are associated with industrial activity;

9. Treatment works treating domestic sewage or any other sewage sludge or wastewater treatment device or system used in the storage treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal or domestic sewage, including land dedicated to the disposal of sewage sludge that is located within the confines of the facility, with a design flow of 1.0 MGD or more, or required to have an approved [POTW] [Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)] pretreatment program under 9VAC25-31. Not included are farm lands, domestic gardens or lands used for sludge management where sludge is beneficially reused and which are not physically located in the confines of the facility, or areas that are in compliance with 9VAC25-31-420 through 9VAC25-31-720;

10. Facilities under SIC Codes 20, 21, 22, 23, 2434, 25, 265, 267, 27, 283, 285, 30, 31 (except 311), 323, 34 (except 3441), 35, 36, 37 (except 373), 38, 39, 4221-4225 (OMB SIC Manual, 1987).

"Industrial stormwater" means stormwater runoff from industrial activity.

"Land application unit" means an area where wastes are applied onto or incorporated into the soil surface (excluding manure spreading operations) for treatment or disposal.

"Landfill" means an area of land or an excavation in which wastes are placed for permanent disposal, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile.

"Measurable storm event" means a storm event that results in an actual a discharge from a site an outfall.

"Minimize" means reduce or eliminate to the extent achievable using control measures (including best management practices) that are technologically available and economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practice.

#### "MS4" means a municipal separate storm sewer system.

"Municipal separate storm sewer <u>system</u>" or "MS4" means a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains): (i) owned or operated by a state, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to state law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, stormwater, or other wastes, including special districts under state law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under § 208 of the CWA that discharges to surface waters of the state; (ii) designed or used for collecting or conveying

stormwater; (iii) which is not a combined sewer; and (iv) which is not part of a [Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)] [POTW].

"No exposure" means all industrial materials or activities are protected by a storm-resistant shelter to prevent exposure to rain, snow, snowmelt, or runoff.

"Primary industrial activity" includes any activities performed on-site which are:

1. Identified by the facility's primary SIC code; or

2. Included in the narrative descriptions of the definition of "industrial activity."

Narrative descriptions in the "industrial activity" definition include: category 1 activities subject to stormwater effluent limitations guidelines, new source performance standards, or toxic pollutant effluent standards; category 4 hazardous waste treatment storage or disposal facilities, including those that are operating under interim status or a permit under subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); category 5 landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that receive or have received industrial wastes; category 7 steam electric power generating facilities; and category 9 sewage treatment works with a design flow of 1.0 mgd or more.

For colocated activities covered by multiple SIC codes, the primary industrial determination should be based on the value of receipts or revenues, or, if such information is not available for a particular facility, the number of employees or production rate for each process may be compared. The operation that generates the most revenue or employs the most personnel is the operation in which the facility is primarily engaged. In situations where the vast majority of on-site activity falls within one SIC code, that activity may be the primary industrial activity.

"Runoff coefficient" means the fraction of total rainfall that will appear at the conveyance as runoff.

"Significant materials" includes, but is not limited to: raw materials; fuels; materials such as solvents, detergents, and plastic pellets; finished materials such as metallic products; raw materials used in food processing or production; hazardous substances designated under § 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 USC § 9601 et seq.); any chemical the facility is required to report pursuant to [EPCRA] [the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA)] § 313; fertilizers; pesticides; and waste products such as ashes, slag and sludge that have the potential to be released with stormwater discharges.

"Significant spills" includes, but is not limited to: releases of oil or hazardous substances in excess of reportable quantities under § 311 of the Clean Water Act (see 40 CFR 110.10 and 40 CFR 117.21) or § 102 of CERCLA (see 40 CFR 302.4).

"Site" means the land or water area where any facility or activity is physically located or conducted, including adjacent land used in connection with the facility or activity.

"Stormwater" means stormwater runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.

"Stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity" means the discharge from any conveyance which is used for collecting and conveying stormwater and that is directly related to manufacturing, processing or raw materials storage areas at an industrial plant. The term does not include discharges from facilities or activities excluded from the VPDES program under 9VAC25-31. For the categories of industries identified in the "industrial activity" definition, the term includes, but is not limited to, stormwater discharges from industrial plant yards; immediate access roads and rail lines used or traveled by carriers of raw materials, manufactured products, waste material, or by-products used or created by the facility; material handling sites; refuse sites; sites used for the application or disposal of process wastewaters; sites used for the storage and maintenance of material handling equipment; sites used for residual treatment, storage, or disposal; shipping and receiving areas; manufacturing buildings; storage areas (including tank farms) for raw materials, and intermediate and final products; and areas where industrial activity has taken place in the past and significant materials remain and are exposed to stormwater. For the purposes of this definition, material handling activities include the storage, loading and unloading, transportation, or conveyance of any raw material, intermediate product, final product, by-product or waste product. The term excludes areas located on plant lands separate from the plant's industrial activities, such as office buildings and accompanying parking lots, as long as the drainage from the excluded areas is not mixed with stormwater drained from the above described areas. Industrial facilities include those that are federally, state, or municipally owned or operated that meet the description of the facilities listed in the "industrial activity" definition. The term also includes those facilities designated under the provisions of 9VAC25-31-120 A 1 c, or under 9VAC25-31-120 A 7 a (1) or (2) of the VPDES Permit Regulation.

"SWPPP" means stormwater pollution [prevention] plan.

"Total maximum daily load" or "TMDL" means a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards, and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant's sources. A TMDL includes wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point source discharges, load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources and/or or natural background, and must include a margin of safety (MOS) and account for seasonal variations.

"Virginia Environmental Excellence Program" or "VEEP" means a voluntary program established by the department to provide public recognition and regulatory incentives to encourage higher levels of environmental performance for program participants that develop and implement environmental management systems (EMSs). The program is based on the use of EMSs that improve compliance, prevent pollution, and utilize other measures to improve environmental performance.

"Waste pile" means any noncontainerized accumulation of solid, nonflowing waste that is used for treatment or storage.

### 9VAC25-151-15. Applicability of incorporated references based on the dates that they became effective.

Except as noted, when a regulation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency set forth in Title 40 CFR is referenced and incorporated herein, that regulation shall be as it exists and has been published as of July 1, 2013 2018.

### 9VAC25-151-40. Effective date of the permit.

This general permit will become effective on July 1, 2014 2019. This general permit will expire on June 30, 2019 2024.

### 9VAC25-151-50. Authorization to discharge.

A. To be eligible to discharge under this permit, an owner must (i) have a stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity from the facility's primary industrial activity, as defined in 9VAC25-151-10 (Definitions), provided the primary industrial activity is included in Table 50-2 of this section, or (ii) be notified that discharges from the facility have been designated by the board for permitting under the provisions of 9VAC25-31-120 A 1 c, or under 9VAC25-31-120 A 7 a (1) or (2) of the VPDES Permit Regulation, and are eligible for coverage under Sector AD of this permit.

Any owner governed by this general permit is hereby authorized to discharge stormwater associated with industrial activity, as defined in this chapter, to surface waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia provided that:

1. The owner submits a registration statement in accordance with 9VAC25-151-60, and that registration statement is accepted by the board;

2. The owner submits the required permit fee;

3. The owner complies with the applicable requirements of 9VAC25-151-70 et seq.; and

4. The board has not notified the owner that the discharge is ineligible for coverage in accordance with subsection B of this section.

B. The board will notify an owner that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit in the event of any of the following:

1. The owner is required to obtain an individual permit in accordance with 9VAC25-31-170 B 3 of the VPDES Permit Regulation;

2. The owner is proposing to discharge to state waters specifically named in other board regulations that prohibit such discharges;

3. The discharge violates or would violate the antidegradation policy in the Water Quality Standards at 9VAC25-260-30; or

4. The discharge is not consistent with the assumptions and requirements of an approved TMDL. Note: Virginia's Phase I Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan (November 29, 2010) states that wasteloads for future growth for new facilities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed with industrial stormwater discharges cannot exceed the nutrient and sediment loadings that were discharged prior to the land being developed for the new industrial activity. For purposes of this permit regulation, facilities that commence construction after June 30, 2014 2019, must be consistent with this requirement to be eligible for coverage under this general permit.

C. 1. Facilities with colocated industrial activities on-site shall comply with all applicable effluent limitations, monitoring and pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements of each section of 9VAC25-151-70 et seq. in which a colocated industrial activity is described.

2. Stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity that are mixed with other discharges (both stormwater and nonstormwater) requiring a VPDES permit are authorized by this permit, provided that the owner obtains coverage under this VPDES general permit for the industrial activity discharges, and a VPDES general or individual permit for the other discharges. The owner shall comply with the terms and requirements of each permit obtained that authorizes any component of the discharge.

3. The stormwater discharges authorized by this permit may be combined with other sources of stormwater which are not required to be covered under a VPDES permit, so long as the combined discharge is in compliance with this permit.

4. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. The following "nonstormwater" discharges are authorized by this permit:

a. Discharges from <u>emergency</u> firefighting activities;

b. Fire hydrant flushings flushing, managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

c. Potable water, including water line flushings flushing, managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

d. Uncontaminated condensate from air conditioners, coolers, and other compressors and from the outside storage of refrigerated gases or liquids;

e. Irrigation drainage;

f. Landscape watering provided all pesticides, herbicides, and [fertilizer fertilizers] have been applied in accordance with the approved labeling;

g. Pavement wash waters where no detergents <u>or hazardous cleaning products</u> are used and no spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have occurred (unless all spilled material has been removed). Pavement wash waters shall be managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

h. Routine external building washdown that does not use detergents or hazardous cleaning products;

i. Uncontaminated ground water or spring water;

j. Foundation or footing drains where flows are not contaminated with process materials; and

k. Incidental windblown mist from cooling towers that collects on rooftops or adjacent portions of the facility, but not intentional discharges from the cooling tower (e.g., "piped" cooling tower blowdown or drains).

5. Stormwater discharges associated with construction activity that are regulated under a VPDES permit are not authorized by this permit.

6. Discharges subject to stormwater effluent limitation guidelines under 40 CFR Subchapter N (Effluent Guidelines and Standards). Only those stormwater discharges subject to stormwater effluent limitation guidelines under 40 CFR Subchapter N that are identified in Table 50-1 of this subsection are eligible for coverage under this permit.

Effluent Limitation Guideline	Sectors with Affected Facilities
Runoff from material storage piles at cement manufacturing facilities (40 CFR Part 411 Subpart C (established February 20, 1974))	Е
Contaminated runoff from phosphate fertilizer manufacturing facilities (40 CFR Part 418 Subpart A (established April 8, 1974))	С
Coal pile runoff at steam electric generating facilities (40 CFR Part 423 (established November 19, 1982))	0
Discharges resulting from spray down or intentional wetting of logs at wet deck storage areas (40 CFR Part 429 Subpart I (established January 26, 1981))	А

 TABLE 50 - 1

 STORMWATER-SPECIFIC EFFLUENT LIMITATION GUIDELINES.

Runoff from asphalt emulsion facilities (40 CFR Part 443 Subpart A (established July 24, 1975))	D
Runoff from landfills (40 CFR Part 445 Subparts A and B (established January 19, 2000))	K and L
Discharges from airport deicing operations (40 CFR Part 449 (established May 16, 2012))	S Facilities subject to the effluent limitation guidelines in 40 CFR Part 449 are not authorized under this permit.

7. Permit eligibility is limited to discharges from facilities in the "sectors" of industrial activity summarized in Table 50-2 of this subsection. These sector descriptions are based on Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes and Industrial Activity Codes. References to "sectors" in this permit (e.g., sector specific monitoring requirements) refer to these groupings.

# TABLE 50 - 2SECTORS OF INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY COVERED BY THIS PERMIT

SIC Code or Activity Code	Activity Represented	
Sector A: Timber Products		
[2411]	[Log Storage and Handling (wet deck storage areas are only authorized if no chemical additives are used in the spray water or applied to the logs).]	
[2421]	[General Sawmills and Planing Mills.]	
[2426]	[Hardwood Dimension and Flooring Mills.]	
[2429]	[Special Product Sawmills, Not Elsewhere Classified.]	
[2431-2439 (except 2434 - <del>see Sector</del> ₩)]	[Millwork, Veneer, Plywood, and Structural Wood.]	
[2441, 2448, 2449]	[Wood Containers.]	
[2451, 2452]	[Wood Buildings and Mobile Homes.]	
2491	Wood Preserving.	
[2493]	[Reconstituted Wood Products.]	
2499	Wood Products, Not Elsewhere Classified (includes SIC Code 24991303 - Wood, Mulch and Bark facilities).	
Sector B: Paper and Allied Pro	oducts	
<del>2611</del>	Pulp Mills.	
<del>2621</del>	Paper Mills.	
2631	Paperboard Mills.	
<del>2652-2657</del>	Paperboard Containers and Boxes.	
<del>2671-2679</del>	Converted Paper and Paperboard Products, except Containers and Boxes.	
Sector C: Chemical and Allied Products		

2812-2819	Industrial Inorganic Chemicals.
2821-2824	Plastics Materials and Synthetic Resins, Synthetic Rubber, Cellulosic and Other <del>Manmade</del> <u>Synthetic</u> Fibers, except Glass.
<del>2833-2836</del>	Medicinal Chemicals and Botanical Products; Pharmaceutical Preparations; In Vitro and In Vivo Diagnostic Substances; Biological Products, except Diagnostic Substances.
2841-2844	Soaps, Detergents, and Cleaning Preparations; Perfumes, Cosmetics, and Other Toilet Preparations.
<del>2851</del>	Paints, Varnishes, Lacquers, Enamels, and Allied Products.
<del>2861-2869</del>	Industrial Organic Chemicals.
2873-2879	Agricultural Chemicals (includes SIC Code 2875 - Composting Facilities).
<del>2891-2899</del>	Miscellaneous Chemical Products.
<del>3952 (limited to list)</del>	Inks and Paints, Including China Painting Enamels, India Ink, Drawing Ink, Platinum Paints for Burnt Wood or Leather Work, Paints for China Painting, Artist's Paints and Artist's Watercolors.
Sector D: Asphalt Paving and	Roofing Materials and Lubricants
2951, 2952	Asphalt Paving and Roofing Materials.
2992, 2999	Miscellaneous Products of Petroleum and Coal.
Sector E: Glass Clay, Cement	, Concrete, and Gypsum Products
<del>3211</del>	Flat-Glass.
<del>3221, 3229</del>	Glass and Glassware, Pressed or Blown.
<del>3231</del>	Glass Products Made of Purchased Glass.
<del>3241</del>	Hydraulic Cement.
3251-3259	Structural Clay Products.
3261-3269	Pottery and Related Products.
3274, 3275	Concrete, Gypsum and Plaster Products, Except: Concrete Block and Brick; Concrete Products, except Block and Brick; and Ready- Mixed Concrete Facilities (SIC <u>Codes</u> 3271-3273).
<del>3281</del>	Cut Stone and Stone Products
<del>3291-3299</del>	Abrasive, Asbestos, and Miscellaneous Non-Metallic Mineral Products.
Sector F: Primary Metals	
3312-3317	Steel Works, Blast Furnaces, and Rolling and Finishing Mills.
3321-3325	Iron and Steel Foundries.
<del>3331-3339</del>	Primary Smelting and Refining of Nonferrous Metals.
<del>33</del> 41	Secondary Smelting and Refining of Nonferrous Metals.
3351-3357	Rolling, Drawing, and Extruding of Nonferrous Metals.

3363-3369	Nonferrous Foundries (Castings).	
<del>3398, 3399</del>	Miscellaneous Primary Metal Products.	
Sector G: Metal Mining (Ore Mining and Dressing)		
1011	Iron Ores.	
1021	Copper Ores.	
1031	Lead and Zinc Ores.	
1041, 1044	Gold and Silver Ores.	
1061	Ferroalloy Ores, except Vanadium.	
1081	Metal Mining Services.	
1094, 1099	Miscellaneous Metal Ores.	
Sector H: Coal Mines and Coa	al Mining Related Facilities	
1221-1241	Coal Mines and Coal Mining-Related Facilities.	
Sector I: Oil and Gas Extraction	on and Refining	
<del>1311</del>	Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas.	
<del>1321</del>	Natural Gas Liquids.	
<del>1381-1389</del>	Oil and Gas Field Services.	
<del>2911</del>	Petroleum Refineries.	
Sector J: Mineral Mining and this permit)	Dressing Facilities (SIC Codes 1411-1499 are not authorized under	
Sector K: Hazardous Waste T	reatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities	
HZ	Hazardous Waste Treatment Storage or Disposal.	
Sector L: Landfills and Land	Application Sites	
LF	Landfills, Land Application Sites, and Open Dumps.	
Sector M: Automobile Salvag	e Yards	
5015	Automobile Salvage Yards.	
Sector N: Scrap Recycling Facilities		
5093	Scrap Recycling Facilities.	
4499 (limited to list)	Dismantling Ships, Marine Salvaging, and Marine Wrecking - Ships for Scrap.	
Sector O: Steam Electric Generating Facilities		
SE	Steam Electric Generating Facilities.	
Sector P: Land Transportation	and Warehousing	
4 <del>011, 4013</del>	Railroad Transportation.	
4111-4173	Local and Highway Passenger Transportation.	
4212-4231	Motor Freight Transportation and Warehousing.	

4311	United States Postal Service.
<del>5171</del>	Petroleum Bulk Stations and Terminals.
Sector Q: Water Transportation and Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards.	
4412-4499 (except 4499 facilities as specified in Sector N)	Water Transportation.
<u>3731, 3732</u>	Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards.
Sector R: Ship and Boat Build	ing or Repairing Yards
<del>3731, 3732</del>	Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards.
Sector S: Air Transportation	
4 <del>512-4581</del>	Air Transportation Facilities.
Sector T: Treatment Works	
TW	Treatment Works.
Sector U: Food and Kindred P	roducts
<del>2011-2015</del>	Meat Products.
2021-2026	Dairy Products.
<del>2032-2038</del>	Canned, Frozen, and Preserved Fruits, Vegetables, and Food Specialties.
2041-2048	Grain Mill Products.
<del>2051-2053</del>	Bakery Products.
<del>2061-2068</del>	Sugar and Confectionery Products.
2074-2079	Fats and Oils.
<del>2082-2087</del>	Beverages.
<del>2091-2099</del>	Miscellaneous Food Preparations and Kindred Products.
<del>2111-2141</del>	Tobacco Products.
Sector V: Textile Mills, Apparel, and Other Fabric Product Manufacturing, Leather and Leather Products	
<del>2211-2299</del>	Textile Mill Products.
<del>2311-2399</del>	Apparel and Other Finished Products Made from Fabrics and Similar Materials.
<del>3131-3199 (except</del> <del>3111 - see Sector Z)</del>	Leather and Leather Products, except Leather Tanning and Finishing.
Sector W: Furniture and Fixtures	
2434	Wood Kitchen Cabinets.
<del>2511-2599</del>	Furniture and Fixtures.
Sector X: Printing and Publish	ing
<del>2711-2796</del>	Printing, Publishing, and Allied Industries.

3011	Tires and Inner Tubes.	
3021	Rubber and Plastics Footwear.	
3052, 3053	Gaskets, Packing, and Sealing Devices and Rubber and Plastics Hose and Belting.	
3061, 3069	Fabricated Rubber Products, Not Elsewhere Classified.	
<del>3081-3089</del>	Miscellaneous Plastics Products.	
<del>3931</del>	Musical Instruments.	
<del>3942-3949</del>	Dolls, Toys, Games, and Sporting and Athletic Goods.	
<del>3951-3955 (except</del> <del>3952 facilities as</del> <del>specified in Sector C)</del>	Pens, Pencils, and Other Artists' Materials.	
<del>3961, 3965</del>	Costume Jewelry, Costume Novelties, Buttons, and Miscellaneous Notions, Except Precious Metal.	
<del>3991-3999</del>	Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries.	
Sector Z: Leather Tanning and	1 Finishing	
<del>3111</del>	Leather Tanning, Currying, and Finishing.	
Sector AA: Fabricated Metal I	Products	
<del>[3411-3499]</del> [ <u>3411-</u> <u>3471, 3482-3499]</u>	Fabricated Metal Products, except Machinery and Transportation Equipment.	
[3479]	[Fabricated Metal Coating and Engraving]	
3911-3915	Jewelry, Silverware, and Plated Ware <u>.</u>	
Sector AB: Transportation Equ	uipment, Industrial or Commercial Machinery	
3511-3599 (except 3571-3579 - see Sector AC) [(except 3731, <u>3732)]</u> [(except 3571- 3579)]	Industrial and Commercial Machinery (except Computer and Office Equipment).	
<del>3711-3799 (except 3731, 3732 - see</del> <del>Sector R)</del>	Transportation Equipment (except Ship and Boat Building and Repairing).	
Sector AC: Electronic, Electri	cal, Photographic, and Optical Goods	
<del>3571-3579</del>	Computer and Office Equipment.	
	Electronic and Other Electrical Equipment and Components,	
<del>3612-3699</del>	except Computer Equipment.	

N/A	Stormwater Discharges Designated by the Board for Permitting under the Provisions of 9VAC25-31-120 A 1, or under 9VAC25- 31-120 A 7 a (1) or (2) of the VPDES Permit Regulation. Note: Facilities may not elect to be covered under Sector AD. Only the board may assign a facility to Sector AD.
Sector AE: Facilities with No	Analytical Benchmark Monitoring Requirements
<u>2611</u>	Pulp Mills.
<u>2621</u>	Paper Mills.
<u>2652-2657</u>	Paperboard Containers and Boxes.
<u>2671-2679</u>	Converted Paper and Paperboard Products, except Containers and Boxes.
<u>2833-2836</u>	Medicinal Chemicals and Botanical Products; Pharmaceutical Preparations; In Vitro and In Vivo Diagnostic Substances; Biological Products, except Diagnostic Substances.
<u>2851</u>	Paints, Varnishes, Lacquers, Enamels, and Allied Products.
<u>2861-2869</u>	Industrial Organic Chemicals.
<u>2891-2899</u>	Miscellaneous Chemical Products.
<u>3952 (limited to list)</u>	Inks and Paints, Including China Painting Enamels, India Ink, Drawing Ink, Platinum Paints for Burnt Wood or Leather Work, Paints for China Painting, Artist's paints, and Artist's Watercolors.
[ <del>2992, 2999]</del>	[Miscellaneous Products of Petroleum and Coal.]
<u>3211</u>	Flat Glass.
<u>3221, 3229</u>	Glass and Glassware, Pressed or Blown.
<u>3231</u>	Glass Products Made of Purchased Glass.
<u>3241</u>	Hydraulic Cement.
<u>3281</u>	Cut Stone and Stone Products.
<u>3291-3299</u>	Abrasive, Asbestos, and Miscellaneous Nonmetallic Mineral Products.
<u>3331-3339</u>	Primary Smelting and Refining of Nonferrous Metals.
<u>3398, 3399</u>	Miscellaneous Primary Metal Products.
<u>3341</u>	Secondary Smelting and refining of Nonferrous Metals.
<u>1311</u>	Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas.
<u>1321</u>	Natural Gas Liquids.
<u>1381-1389</u>	Oil and Gas Field Services.
<u>2911</u>	Petroleum Refineries.

<u>4512-4581</u>	Air Transportation Facilities.
TW	Treatment Works.
2011-2015	Meat Products.
<u>2032-2038</u>	Canned, Frozen, and Preserved Fruits, Vegetables, and Food Specialties.
<u>2051-2053</u>	Bakery Products.
<u>2061-2068</u>	Sugar and Confectionary Products.
<u>2082-2087</u>	Beverages.
<u>2091-2099</u>	Miscellaneous Food Preparations Kindred Products.
<u>2111-2141</u>	Tobacco Products.
<u>2211-2299</u>	Textile Mill Products.
<u>2311-2399</u>	Apparel and Other Finished Products Made from Fabrics and Similar Materials.
<u>3131-3199 <del>[(except</del></u> <u>3111-Z)]</u>	Leather and Leather Products, except Leather Tanning and Finishing.
2434	Wood Kitchen Cabinets.
2511-2599	Furniture and Fixtures.
2711-2796	Printing, Publishing, and Allied Products.
<u>3081-3089</u>	Miscellaneous Plastics Products.
<u>3931</u>	Musical Instruments.
<u>3942-3949</u>	Dolls, Toys, Games, and Sporting and Athletic Goods.
<u>3951-3955 (except</u> <u>3952 [facilities as</u> specified in Sector C])	Pens, Pencils, and Other Artist's Materials.
<u>3961, 3965</u>	Costume Jewelry, Costume Novelties, Buttons, and Miscellaneous Notions, except Precious Metal.
<u>3991-3999</u>	Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries.
<u>3111</u>	Leather Tanning, Currying, and Finishing.
<u>3711-3799 (except</u> <u>3731, 3732 – see</u> <u>Sector Q)</u>	Transportation Equipment, except Ship and Boat Building and Repairing.
<u>3571-3579</u>	Computer and Office Equipment.
<u>3612-3699</u>	Electronic and Other Electrical Equipment and Components, except Computer Equipment.
<u>3812-3873</u>	Measuring, Analyzing, and Controlling Instruments; Photographic, Medical, and Optical Goods; Watches and Clocks.
Sector AF: Facilities Limited	to Total Suspended Solids Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

[ <u>2411]</u>	[Log Storage and Handling (wet deck storage areas are only authorized if no chemical additives are used in the spray water or applied to the logs).]
[ <u>2421]</u>	[General Sawmills and Planing Mills.]
[ <u>2426]</u>	[Hardwood Dimension and Flooring Mills.]
[ <u>2429]</u>	[Special Products Sawmills Not Elsewhere Classified.]
[ <u>2431-2433, 2435-</u> <u>2439]</u>	[Millwork, Veneer, Plywood, and Structural Wood.]
[ <u>2441, 2448, 2449</u> ]	[Wood Containers.]
[ <u>2451, 2452]</u>	[Wood Buildings and Mobile Homes.]
[ <u>2493]</u>	[Reconstituted Wood Products.]
<u>4011, 4013</u>	Railroad Transportation.
<u>4111-4173</u>	Local and Highway Passenger Transportation.
<u>4212-4231</u>	Motor Freight Transportation and Warehousing.
<u>4311</u>	United State Postal Service.
<u>5171</u>	Petroleum Bulk Stations and Terminals.

D. Conditional exclusion for no exposure. Any owner covered by this permit who becomes eligible for a no exposure exclusion from permitting under 9VAC25-31-120 E may file a no exposure certification. Upon submission and acceptance by the board of a complete and accurate no exposure certification, the permit requirements no longer apply, and the owner is not required to submit a notice of termination. A no exposure certification must be submitted to the board once every five years.

E. Compliance with this general permit constitutes compliance with the federal Clean Water Act and the State Water Control Law, with the exceptions stated in 9VAC25-31-60 of the VPDES Permit Regulation. Approval for coverage under this general permit does not relieve any owner of the responsibility to comply with any other applicable federal, state, or local statute, ordinance, or regulation.

F. Continuation of permit coverage.

1. Any owner that was authorized to discharge under the industrial activity stormwater general permit issued in 2009 and that submits a complete registration statement before July 1, 2014, is authorized to continue to discharge under the terms of the 2009 general permit until such time as the board either Permit coverage shall expire at the end of its term. However, expiring permit coverages are automatically continued if the owner has submitted a complete registration statement at least 60 days prior to the expiration date of the permit or a later submittal date established by the board, which cannot extend beyond the expiration date of the original permit. The permittee is authorized to continue to discharge until such time as the board either:

a. Issues coverage to the owner under this general permit; or

b. Notifies the owner that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit.

2. When the owner that was covered under the expiring or expired general permit has violated or is violating the conditions of that permit, the board may choose to do any or all of the following:

a. Initiate enforcement action based upon the 2009 general permit coverage that has been continued;

b. Issue a notice of intent to deny coverage under the reissued <u>amended</u> general permit. If the general permit coverage is denied, the owner would then be required to cease the discharges authorized by <del>administratively</del> <u>the</u> continued <u>general permit</u> coverage <del>under the terms of the 2009 general permit</del> or be subject to enforcement action for discharging without a permit;

c. Issue an individual permit with appropriate conditions; or

d. Take other actions authorized by the VPDES Permit Regulation (9VAC25-31).

# 9VAC25-151-60. Registration statement and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP).

A. An owner seeking coverage under this general permit shall submit a complete VPDES general permit registration statement in accordance with this section, which shall serve as a notice of intent for coverage under the <u>VPDES</u> general <u>VPDES</u> permit [regulation] for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activity.

Any owner that was authorized to discharge under the industrial stormwater general permit that became effective on July 1, 2009 2014, and that intends to continue coverage under this general permit shall review and update the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to meet all provisions of the general permit (9VAC25-151-70 et seq.) within 90 days of the board granting coverage under this permit. Owners of new facilities, facilities previously covered by an expiring individual permit, and existing facilities not currently covered by a VPDES permit who wish to obtain coverage under this general permit shall prepare and implement a written SWPPP for the facility in accordance with the general permit (9VAC25-151-70 et seq.) prior to submitting the registration statement.

B. Deadlines for submitting registration statements.

1. Existing facilities.

a. Any owner that was authorized to discharge under the industrial stormwater general permit that became effective on July 1, 2009 2014, and that intends to continue coverage under this general permit shall submit a complete registration statement to the board on or before May 2, 2014 2019.

b. Any owner covered by an <u>a VPDES</u> individual <del>VPDES</del> permit for stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity that is proposing to be covered under this general permit shall submit a complete registration statement at least 240 days prior to the expiration date of the <u>VPDES</u> individual <del>VPDES</del> permit.

c. Any owner of an existing facility with stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity, not currently covered by a VPDES permit, that is proposing to be covered under this general permit shall submit a complete registration statement to the board.

2. New facilities. Any owner proposing a new discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activity shall submit a complete registration statement at least 60 days prior to the date planned for the commencement of the industrial activity at the facility.

3. New owners of existing facilities. Where the owner of an existing facility that is covered by this permit changes, the new owner of the facility shall submit a complete registration statement within 30 days of the ownership change.

4. Late registration statements. Registration statements for existing facilities covered under subdivision 1 a of this subsection will be accepted after June 30, 2014 2019, but authorization to discharge will not be retroactive. Owners described in subdivision 1 a of this subsection that submit registration statements after May 2, 2019, are authorized to discharge under the provisions of 9VAC25-151-50 F (Continuation of permit coverage) if a complete registration statement is submitted before July 1, 2014 2019.

C. The required registration statement shall contain the following information:

1. Name, mailing address, email address (where available), and telephone number of the:

### a. Facility owner; and

b. Operator applying for permit coverage (if different than the facility owner);

1. Facility name and mailing address, owner name and mailing address, telephone number, and email address[;]

2. Facility name, street address, county (or city), contact name, email address (where available), phone number, and FAX number (where available) Facility street address (if different from mailing address) or location (if the facility location does not have a mailing address);

3. Facility operator (local contact) name, address, telephone number, and email address (if available) if different than owner;

3. 4. The nature of the business conducted at the facility to be covered under this general permit;

4. 5. The receiving waters of the industrial activity discharges;

5. Whether the facility discharges, or will discharge, to an MS4. If so, provide the name of the MS4 owner. (Note: Permit special condition 13 requires the permittee to notify the MS4 owner in writing of the existence of the discharge within 30 days of coverage under this permit. The notification shall include the following

information: the name of the facility, a contact person and phone number, the location of the discharge, the nature of the discharge, and the facility's VPDES general permit registration number) <u>6</u>. A determination of whether the facility will discharge to an MS4. If the facility discharges to an MS4, the facility owner must notify the owner of the MS4 of the existence of the discharge information at the time of registration under this permit and include that notification with the registration statement. The notice shall include the following information: the name of the facility, a contact person and telephone number, the location of the discharge, the nature of the discharge, and the facility's VPDES general permit number [(if assigned by DEQ)];

6. 7. The permit number for any existing VPDES permit assigned to the facility;

7. Whether an <u>8. Indicate that a</u> SWPPP has been prepared prior to submitting this registration statement by the owner of a new facility, a facility previously covered by an expiring individual permit, or an existing facility not currently covered by a VPDES permit;

8. 9. Whether or not this facility will discharge stormwater runoff from coal storage piles;

9. 10. Identification of up to four 4-digit four-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes or 2-letter Industrial Activity Codes that best represent the principal products or services rendered by the facility and major colocated industrial activities (2-letter Industrial Activity Codes are: HZ – hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities; LF – landfills and disposal facilities that receive or have received any industrial wastes; SE – steam electric power generating facilities; or TW – treatment works treating domestic sewage);

10. <u>11.</u> Identification of all applicable industrial sectors in this permit (as designated in Table 50-2) that cover the industrial activities at the facility, and major colocated industrial activities to be covered under this permit, and the stormwater outfalls associated with each industrial sector.

a. If the facility is a landfill (sector L), indicate the type of landfill (i.e., MSWLF (municipal solid waste landfill), CDD (construction debris and demolition), or other), and which outfalls (if any) receive contaminated stormwater runoff;

b. If the facility is a timber products operation (sector A), indicate which outfalls (if any) receive discharges from wet decking areas;

c. For all facilities, indicate which any outfalls (if any) receive receiving discharges from coal storage piles;

d. If the facility manufactures asphalt paving and roofing materials (sector D), indicate which outfalls (if any) receive discharges from areas where production of asphalt paving and emulsions or roofing emulsions occurs;

e. If the facility manufactures cement (sector E), indicate which outfalls (if any) receive discharges from material storage piles;

f. If a scrap recycling and waste recycling facility (sector N - SIC 5093) only receives source-separated recyclable materials, indicate which outfalls (if any) receive discharges from this activity. List the metals (if any) that are received; or

g. For primary airports (sector S), list the average deicing season and indicate which outfalls (if any) receive discharges from deicing of non-propeller aircraft, and the annual average departures of non-propeller aircraft. It should be noted that airport facilities subject to the effluent limitation guidelines in 40 CFR Part 449 are not authorized under this permit;

11. Facility <u>12. List the following facility</u> area information. List the total area of the facility (in acres), the area of industrial activity at the facility (in acres), the total impervious area of the industrial activity at the facility (in acres), and the area (in acres) draining to each industrial activity outfall at the facility. Outfalls shall be numbered using a unique numerical identification code for each outfall (e.g., Outfall No. 001, No. 002, etc.);:

a. The total area of the facility in acres;

b. The total area of industrial activity of the facility in acres;

c. The total impervious surface area of the industrial activity of the facility in acres; [and]

<u>d.</u> The impervious and total areas in acres draining to each industrial activity outfall at the facility. Outfalls shall be numbered using a unique numerical identification code for each outfall. For example: Outfall Number 001, Outfall Number 002, etc.; [and]

[e. The latitude and longitude of each outfall location.]

12. The following maps 13. A site map depicting the following shall be included with the registration statement:

a. General location map. A USGS 7.5 minute topographic map, or other equivalent computer generated map, with sufficient resolution to clearly show the location of the facility and the surrounding locale; and <u>The</u> property boundaries;

b. Site map. A map showing the property boundaries, the location of all industrial activity areas, all stormwater outfalls, and all water bodies receiving stormwater discharges from the site. Outfall numbering shall be the same as that used for the facility area information in subdivision 11 of this subsection; <u>All</u> industrial activity outfalls labeled with unique numerical identification for each outfall. Outfall numbering shall be the same as that used for the facility area information in subdivision 12 of this subsection; and

c. All water bodies or MS4 conveyances, labeled with names if applicable, receiving stormwater discharges from the site;

13. 14. Virginia's Phase I Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan (November 29, 2010) states that wasteloads for future growth for new facilities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed with industrial stormwater discharges cannot exceed the nutrient and sediment loadings that were discharged prior to the land being developed for the industrial activity. For purposes of this permit regulation, facilities that commence construction after June 30, 2014 2019, must be consistent with this requirement to be eligible for coverage under this general permit.

If this is a new facility that commenced construction after June 30, 2014 2019, in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and applying for first time general permit coverage, attach documentation to the registration statement to show demonstrate:

a. That the total phosphorus load does not exceed the greater of: (i) the total phosphorus load that was discharged from the industrial area of the property prior to the land being developed for the new industrial activity, or (ii) 0.41 pounds per acre per year (VSMP water quality design criteria). The documentation must include the measures and controls that were employed to meet this requirement, along with the supporting calculations. The owner may include additional nonindustrial land on the site as part of any plan to comply with the no net increase requirement. Consistent with the definition of "site," this includes adjacent land used in connection with the facility. Compliance with the water quality design criteria may be determined utilizing the Virginia Runoff Reduction Method or another equivalent methodology approved by the board. Design specifications and pollutant removal efficiencies for specific BMPs can be found on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc; or

b. The owner may consider utilization of any pollutant trading or offset program in accordance with §§ 62.1-44.19:20 through 62.1-44.19:23 of the Code of Virginia, governing trading and offsetting, to meet the no net increase requirement;

15. State Corporation Commission entity identification number if the facility is required to obtain an entity identification number by law; and

14. <u>16.</u> The following certification: "I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

D. The registration statement shall be signed in accordance with 9VAC25-31-110 A of the VPDES Permit Regulation.

E. Where to submit. The registration statement may be delivered to the department by either postal or electronic mail and shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located.

#### 9VAC25-151-70. General permit.

Any owner whose registration statement is accepted by the director will receive the following general permit and shall comply with the requirements therein and be subject to the VPDES Permit Regulation, 9VAC25-31. Facilities with colocated industrial activities shall comply with all applicable monitoring and pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements of each industrial activity sector of this chapter in which a colocated industrial activity is described. All pages of 9VAC25-151-70 and 9VAC25-151-80 apply to all stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity

covered under this general permit. Not all pages of 9VAC25-151-90 et seq. will apply to every permittee. The determination of which pages apply will be based on an evaluation of the regulated activities located at the facility.

General Permit No.: VAR05 Effective Date: July 1, <del>2014</del> <u>2019</u> Expiration Date: June 30, <del>2019</del> <u>2024</u>

### [VPDES] GENERAL PERMIT FOR STORMWATER DISCHARGES ASSOCIATED WITH INDUSTRIAL

ACTIVITY

# AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE VIRGINIA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM AND THE VIRGINIA STATE WATER CONTROL LAW

In compliance with the provisions of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and pursuant to the State Water Control Law and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, owners of facilities with stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity are authorized to discharge to surface waters within the boundaries of the Commonwealth of Virginia, except those waters specifically named in board regulation that prohibit such discharges.

The authorized discharge shall be in accordance with this cover page, <u>the registration statement</u>, Part I-Effluent Limitations, Monitoring Requirements and Special Conditions, Part II-Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits, Part III-Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Part IV-Sector-Specific Permit Requirements, as set forth herein in this general permit.

### Part I

### Effluent Limitations, Monitoring Requirements and Special Conditions

A. Effluent limitations and monitoring requirements.

There are four individual and separate categories of monitoring requirements that a facility may be subject to under this permit: (i) quarterly visual monitoring; (ii) benchmark monitoring of discharges associated with specific industrial activities; (iii) compliance monitoring for discharges subject to numerical effluent limitations; and (iv) monitoring of discharges to impaired waters, both those with an approved TMDL and those without an approved TMDL. The monitoring requirements and numeric effluent limitations applicable to a facility depend on the types of industrial activities generating stormwater runoff from the facility, and for TMDL monitoring, the location of the facility's discharge or discharges. Part IV of the permit (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.) identifies monitoring requirements applicable to specific sectors of industrial activity. The permittee shall review Part I A 1 and Part IV of the permit to determine which monitoring requirements and numeric limitations apply to his facility. Unless otherwise specified, limitations and monitoring requirements under Part I A 1 and Part IV are additive.

Sector-specific monitoring requirements and limitations are applied discharge by discharge at facilities with colocated activities. Where stormwater from the colocated activities are commingled, the monitoring requirements and limitations are additive. Where more than one numeric limitation for a specific parameter applies to a discharge, compliance with the more restrictive limitation is required. Where <u>benchmark</u>, <u>numerical effluent limitations</u>, or <u>TMDL</u> monitoring requirements for a monitoring period overlap (e.g., need to monitor TSS twice per year for a limit and also twice per year for benchmark monitoring), the permittee may use a single sample to satisfy both monitoring requirements.

1. Types of monitoring requirements and limitations.

a. Quarterly visual monitoring. The requirements and procedures for quarterly visual monitoring are applicable to all facilities covered under this permit, regardless of the facility's sector of industrial activity.

(1) The permittee shall perform and document a quarterly visual examination of a stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity from each outfall, except discharges exempted in Part I A 3 or Part I A 4. The examination(s) examinations shall be made at least once in each of the following three-month periods: January through March, April through June, July through September, and October through December. The visual examination shall be made during normal working hours, where practicable, and when considerations for safety and feasibility allow. If no storm event resulted in runoff from the facility during a monitoring quarter, the permittee is excused from visual monitoring for that quarter provided that documentation is included with the monitoring records indicating that no runoff occurred. The documentation shall be signed and certified in accordance with Part II K of this permit.

(2) Samples shall be collected in accordance with Part I A 2. The <u>Sample</u> examination shall document observations of color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and

other obvious indicators of stormwater pollution. The <u>visual</u> examination <u>of the sample</u> shall be conducted in a well-lit area. No analytical tests are required to be performed on the samples.

(3) The visual examination reports shall be maintained on-site with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) SWPPP. The report shall include the outfall location, the examination date and time, examination personnel, the nature of the discharge (i.e., runoff or snow melt), visual quality of the stormwater discharge (including observations of color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, and other obvious indicators of stormwater pollution), and probable sources of any observed stormwater contamination.

b. Benchmark monitoring of discharges associated with specific industrial activities.

Table 70-1 identifies the specific industrial sectors subject to the benchmark monitoring requirements of this permit and the industry-specific pollutants of concern. The permittee shall refer to the tables found in the individual sectors in Part IV (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.) for benchmark monitoring concentration values. Colocated industrial activities at the facility that are described in more than one sector in Part IV shall comply with all applicable benchmark monitoring requirements from each sector.

The results of benchmark monitoring are primarily for the permittee to use to determine the overall effectiveness of the SWPPP in controlling the discharge of pollutants to receiving waters. Benchmark concentration values, included in Part IV of this permit, are not effluent limitations. Exceedance of a benchmark concentration does not constitute a violation of this permit and does not indicate that violation of a water quality standard has occurred; however, it does signal that modifications to the SWPPP are necessary, unless justification is provided in the comprehensive site compliance evaluation (Part III E) a routine facility inspection. In addition, exceedance of benchmark concentrations may identify facilities that would be more appropriately covered under an individual, or alternative general permit where more specific pollution prevention controls could be required.

Industry Sector <sup>1</sup>	Industry Sub-sector SIC Code or Activity Code	Benchmark Monitoring Parameters
А	General Sawmills and Planing Mills [2421]	[TSS.]
	Wood Preserving Facilities 2491	Arsenic, Chromium, Copper.
	Log Storage and Handling [2411]	[TSS.]
	Hardwood Dimension and Flooring Mills [2426]	[TSS.]
	Mulch, Wood and Bark Facilities <u>2499</u> (24991303)	<del>BOD</del> <u>COD</u> , TSS.
	Mulching Dying Operations <u>2499 (Mulch</u> Dyeing)	BOD, TSS, COD, Aluminum, Arsenic, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Iron, <del>Lead, Manganese,</del> <del>Mercury, Nickel,</del> Selenium, Silver, Zinc, Total N, Total P.
В	Paperboard Mills 2631	BOD.
С	Industrial Inorganic Chemicals 2812-2819	Aluminum, Iron, Total N.
	Plastics, Synthetic Resins, etc. 2821-2824	Zinc.
	Soaps, Detergents, Cosmetics, Perfumes 2841-2844	Total N, Zinc.
	Agricultural Chemicals 2873-2879	Total N, Iron, Zinc, Total P.

TABLE 70-1 INDUSTRIAL SECTORS SUBJECT TO BENCHMARK MONITORING

	Composting Facilities 2875 (Composting Facilities)	TSS, BOD, COD, Ammonia, Total N, Total P.
[D]	Asphalt Paving and Roofing Materials [2951, 2952]	[TSS.]
Е	Clay Products 3251-3259[, 3261-3269]	Aluminum.
	Lime and Gypsum Products 3274, 3275	TSS, pH, Iron.
F	Steel Works, Blast Furnaces, and Rolling and Finishing Mills <u>3312-3317</u>	Aluminum, Zinc.
	Iron and Steel Foundries 3321-3325	Aluminum, TSS, Copper, Iron, Zinc.
	Nonferrous Rolling and Drawing 3351-3357	Copper, Zinc.
	Nonferrous Foundries (Castings) 3363-3369	Copper, Zinc.
$G^2$	Copper Ore Mining and Dressing 1021	TSS.
Н	Coal Mines and Coal-Mining Related Facilities <u>1221-1241</u>	TSS, Aluminum, Iron.
K	Hazardous <u>HZ (Hazardous</u> Waste Treatment, Storage <u>,</u> or <del>Disposal</del> <u>Disposal</u> )	TKN, TSS, TOC, Arsenic, Cadmium, Cyanide, Lead, Magnesium, Mercury, Selenium, Silver.
L	Landfills <u>LF (Landfills</u> , Land Application Sites, and Open <del>Dumps</del> <u>Dumps</u> )	TSS.
М	Automobile Salvage Yards 5015	TSS, Aluminum, Iron, Lead.
N	Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities 5093	Copper, Aluminum, Iron, Lead, Zinc, TSS, Cadmium, Chromium.
	Ship Dismantling, Marine Salvaging and Marine Wrecking <u>4499</u>	Aluminum, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Iron, Lead, Zinc, TSS.
0	Steam <u>SE (Steam</u> Electric Generating Facilities <u>Facilities</u> )	Iron.
P	Land Transportation and Warehousing	<del>TPH, TSS.</del>
Q	Water Transportation Facilities <u>4412-4499</u> (except 4499 facilities as specified in Sector <u>N</u> )	TSS, Copper, Zinc.
	3731, 3732	TSS, Copper, Zinc.
R	Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards	TSS, Copper, Zinc.
<del>S</del>	Airports	<del>TSS, TPH.</del>
U	Dairy Products 2021-2026	BOD, TSS.
	Grain Mill Products 2041-2048	TSS, TKN.
	Fats and Oils 2074-2079	BOD, Total N, TSS.

Υ	Rubber Products 3011-3069	Zinc.
Z	Leather Tanning and Finishing	<del>TKN.</del>
AA	Fabricated Metal Products Except Coating 3411-3471, 3482-3499, 3911-3915	Iron, Aluminum, Copper, Zinc.
	Fabricated Metal Coating and Engraving 3479	Zinc.
AB	Transportation Equipment, Industrial, or Commercial Machinery <u>3511-3599 (except</u> <u>3571-3579)</u>	TSS, TPH, Copper, Zinc.
AD	Nonclassified Facilities/Stormwater Discharges Designated by the Board as Requiring Permits	TSS: As determined by the director.
<u>AE</u>	2611, 2621, 2652-2657, 2671-2679, 2833- 2836, 2851, 2861-2869, 2891-2899, 3952, [2992, 2999,] 3211, 3221, 3229, 3231, 3241, 3281, 3291-3299, 3331-3339, 3398, 3399, 3341, 1311, 1321, 1381-1389, 2911, 4512-4581, (TW) Treatment Works, 2011-2015, 2032-2038, 2051-2053, 2061-2068, 2082-2087, 2091-2099, 2111-2141, 2211-2299, 2311-2399, 3131-3199, 2434, 2511-2599, 2711-2796, 3081-3089, 3931, 3942-3949, 3951-3955 (except 3952 [facilities as specified in Sector C]), 3961, 3965, 3991-3999, 3111, 3711-3799 (except 3731, 3732 see Sector Q), 3571-3579, 3612-3699, 3812-3873	Facilities in Sector AE are not subject to benchmark monitoring requirements.
AF	[2411,] [2421,] [2426,] [2429,] [2431-2433, 2435-2439,] [2441, 2448, 2449, 2451, 2452, 2493,] 4011, 4013, 4111-4173, 4212-4231, 4311, 5171	<u>TSS.</u>

<sup>1</sup>Table does not include parameters for compliance monitoring under effluent limitations guidelines.

<sup>2</sup>See Sector G (Part IV G) for additional monitoring discharges from waste rock and overburden piles from active ore mining or dressing facilities, inactive ore mining or dressing facilities, and sites undergoing reclamation.

(1) Benchmark monitoring shall be performed for all benchmark parameters specified for the industrial sector or sectors applicable to a facility's discharge. Monitoring shall be performed at least once during each of the first four, and potentially all, monitoring periods after coverage under the permit begins. Monitoring commences with the first full monitoring period after the owner is granted coverage under the permit. Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2.

Depending on the results of four consecutive monitoring periods, benchmark monitoring may not be required to be conducted in subsequent monitoring periods (see subdivision Part I A 1 b (2) below).

(2) Benchmark monitoring waivers for facilities testing below benchmark concentration values. Waivers from benchmark monitoring are available to facilities whose discharges are below benchmark concentration values on an outfall by outfall basis. Sector-specific benchmark monitoring is not required to be conducted in subsequent monitoring periods during the term of this permit provided:

(a) Samples were collected in four consecutive monitoring periods, and the average of the four samples for all parameters at the outfall is below the applicable benchmark concentration value in Part IV. (Note: facilities Facilities that were covered under the 2009 2014 industrial stormwater general permit may use sampling data from the last two monitoring periods of that permit and the first two monitoring periods of this permit to satisfy the four consecutive monitoring periods requirement); and

(b) The facility is not subject to a numeric effluent limitation established in Part I A 1 c (1) (Stormwater Effluent Limitations) (stormwater effluent limitations), Part I A 1 c (2) (Coal Pile Runoff) (coal pile runoff), or Part IV (Sector Specific Permit Requirements) for any of the parameters at that outfall; and

(c) A waiver request is submitted to and approved by the board. The waiver request shall be sent to the appropriate DEQ regional office, along with the supporting monitoring data for four consecutive monitoring periods, and a certification that, based on current potential pollutant sources and control measures used, discharges from the facility are reasonably expected to be essentially the same (or cleaner) compared to when the benchmark monitoring for the four consecutive monitoring periods was done.

Waiver requests will be evaluated by the board based upon: (i) benchmark monitoring results below the benchmark concentration values; (ii) a favorable compliance history (including inspection results); and (iii) no outstanding enforcement actions.

The monitoring waiver may be revoked by the board for just cause. The permittee will be notified in writing that the monitoring waiver is revoked, and that the benchmark monitoring requirements are again in force and will remain in effect until the permit's expiration date.

(3) Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C and retained in accordance with Part II B.

c. Compliance monitoring for discharges subject to numerical effluent limitations or discharges to impaired waters.

(1) Facilities subject to stormwater effluent limitation guidelines.

(a) Facilities subject to stormwater effluent limitation guidelines (see Table 70-2) are required to monitor such discharges to evaluate compliance with numerical effluent limitations. Industry-specific numerical limitations and compliance monitoring requirements are described in Part IV of the permit (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.). Permittees with colocated industrial activities at the facility that are described in more than one sector in Part IV shall comply on a discharge-by-discharge basis with all applicable effluent limitations from each sector.

(b) Permittees shall monitor the discharges for the presence of the pollutant subject to the effluent limitation at least once during each of the monitoring periods after coverage under the permit begins. Monitoring commences with the first full monitoring period after the owner is granted coverage under the permit. Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2. The substantially identical outfall monitoring provisions (Part I A 2 f) are not available for numeric effluent limits monitoring.

(c) Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C, and retained in accordance with Part II B.

Effluent Limitation Guideline	Sectors with Affected Facilities
Runoff from material storage piles at cement manufacturing facilities (40 CFR Part 411 Subpart C (established February 20, 1974))	Е
Contaminated runoff from phosphate fertilizer manufacturing facilities (40 CFR Part 418 Subpart A (established April 8, 1974))	С
Coal pile runoff at steam electric generating facilities (40 CFR Part 423 (established November 19, 1982))	О

# TABLE 70-2 STORMWATER-SPECIFIC EFFLUENT LIMITATION GUIDELINES

Discharges resulting from spray down or intentional wetting of logs at wet deck storage areas (40 CFR Part 429, Subpart I (established January 26, 1981))	А
Runoff from asphalt emulsion facilities (40 CFR Part 443 Subpart A (established July 24, 1975))	D
Runoff from landfills (40 CFR Part 445, Subpart A and B (established January 19, 2000))	K and L
Discharges from airport deicing operations (40 CFR Part 449 (established May 16, 2012))	S Facilities subject to the effluent limitation guidelines in 40 CFR Part 449 are not authorized under this permit.

(2) Facilities subject to coal pile runoff monitoring.

(a) Facilities with discharges of stormwater from coal storage piles shall comply with the limitations and monitoring requirements of Table 70-3 for all discharges containing the coal pile runoff, regardless of the facility's sector of industrial activity.

(b) Permittees shall monitor such stormwater discharges at least once during each of the monitoring periods after coverage under the permit begins. Monitoring commences with the first full monitoring period after the owner is granted coverage under the permit. Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2. The substantially identical outfall monitoring provisions (Part I A 2 f) are not available for coal pile numeric effluent limits monitoring.

(c) The coal pile runoff shall not be diluted with other stormwater or other flows in order to meet this limitation.

(d) If a facility is designed, constructed and operated to treat the volume of coal pile runoff that is associated with a 10-year, 24-hour rainfall event, any untreated overflow of coal pile runoff from the treatment unit is not subject to the 50 mg/L limitation for total suspended solids.

(e) Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C, and retained in accordance with Part II B.

Parameter	Limit	Monitoring Frequency	Sample Type
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	50 mg/l, max.	1/6 months	Grab
рН	6.0 min 9.0 max.	1/6 months	Grab

TABLE 70-3 NUMERIC LIMITATIONS FOR COAL PILE RUNOFF

(3) Facilities discharging to an impaired water with an approved TMDL wasteload allocation.

Owners of facilities that are a source of the specified pollutant of concern to waters for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has been approved prior to the term of this permit will be notified as such by the department when they are approved for coverage under the general permit.

(a) Upon written notification from the department, facilities subject to TMDL wasteload allocations will shall be required to monitor such discharges to evaluate compliance with the TMDL requirements.

(b) Permittees shall monitor the discharges for the pollutant subject to the TMDL wasteload allocation [at least] once [during each of the monitoring periods every six months] after coverage under the permit begins[-, unless otherwise determined by the department for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).] Monitoring commences with the first full monitoring period after the owner is granted coverage under the permit. Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2.

(c) Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C, and retained in accordance with Part II B.

(d) If the pollutant subject to the TMDL wasteload allocation is below the quantitation level in all of the samples from the first four monitoring periods (i.e., the first two years of coverage under the permit), the permittee may request to the board in writing that further sampling be discontinued, unless the TMDL has specific instructions to the contrary (in which case those instructions shall be followed). The laboratory certificate of analysis shall be submitted with the request. If approved, documentation of this shall be kept with the SWPPP.

If the pollutant subject to the TMDL wasteload allocation is above the quantitation level in any of the samples from the first four monitoring periods, the permittee shall continue the scheduled TMDL monitoring throughout the term of the permit.

(4) Facilities discharging to an impaired water without an approved TMDL wasteload allocation.

Owners of facilities that discharge to waters listed as impaired in the  $\frac{2012}{2016}$  Final  $\frac{305(b)}{303(d)}$  Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report, and for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has not been approved prior to the term of this permit, will be notified as such by the department when they are approved for coverage under the general permit.

(a) Upon written notification from the department, facilities discharging to an impaired water without an approved TMDL wasteload allocation will shall be required to monitor such discharges for the pollutant(s) pollutants that caused the impairment.

(b) Permittees shall monitor the discharges for all pollutants for which the waterbody is impaired, and for which a standard analytical method exists, at least once during each of the monitoring periods after coverage under the permit begins. Monitoring commences with the first full monitoring period after the owner is granted coverage under the permit. Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2.

(c) If the pollutant for which the waterbody is impaired is suspended solids, turbidity, or sediment, or sedimentation, monitor for total suspended solids (TSS). If the pollutant for which the waterbody is impaired is expressed in the form of an indicator or surrogate pollutant, monitor for that indicator or surrogate pollutant. No monitoring is required when a waterbody's biological communities are impaired but no pollutant, including indicator or surrogate pollutants, is specified as causing the impairment, or when a waterbody's impairment is related to hydrologic modifications, impaired hydrology, or temperature.

Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C, and retained in accordance with Part II B.

(d) If the pollutant for which the water is impaired is below the quantitation level in the discharges from the facility, or it is above the quantitation level but its presence is caused solely by natural background sources, the permittee may request to the board in writing that further impaired water monitoring be discontinued. The laboratory certificate of analysis shall be submitted with the request. If approved, documentation of this shall be kept with the SWPPP.

To support a determination that the pollutant's presence is caused solely by natural background sources, the following documentation shall be submitted with the request and kept with the SWPPP: (i) an explanation of why it is believed that the presence of the impairment pollutant in the facility's discharge is not related to the activities at the facility; and (ii) data or studies that tie the presence of the impairment pollutant in the facility's discharge to natural background sources in the watershed. Natural background pollutants include those substances that are naturally occurring in soils or groundwater. Natural background pollutants do not include legacy pollutants from earlier activity at the facility's site, or pollutants in run-on from neighboring sources that are not naturally occurring.

2. Monitoring instructions.

a. Collection and analysis of samples. Sampling requirements shall be assessed on an outfall by outfall basis. Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with the requirements of Part II A.

b. When and how to sample. A minimum of one grab sample shall be taken from the discharge associated with industrial activity resulting from a storm event that results in an actual <u>a</u> discharge from the site (defined as a "measurable storm event"), providing the interval from the preceding measurable storm event is at least 72 hours. The 72-hour storm interval is waived if the permittee is able to document that less than a 72-hour interval is representative for local storm events during the sampling period. In the case of snowmelt, the monitoring shall be performed at a time when a measurable discharge occurs at the site. For discharges from a stormwater management structure, the monitoring shall be performed at a time when a measurable discharge occurs from the structure.

The grab sample shall be taken during the first 30 minutes of the discharge. If it is not practicable to take the sample during the first 30 minutes, the sample may be taken during the first three hours of the discharge, provided that the permittee explains why a grab sample during the first 30 minutes was impracticable. This information shall be submitted on or with the Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) in the department's electronic discharge monitoring report (e-DMR) system, and maintained with the SWPPP. If the sampled discharge commingles with process or nonprocess water, the permittee shall attempt to sample the stormwater discharge before it mixes with the nonstormwater.

c. Storm event data. For each monitoring event (except snowmelt monitoring), along with the monitoring results, the permittee shall identify the date and duration (in hours) of the storm event(s) events sampled; rainfall total (in inches) of the storm event that generated the sampled runoff; and the duration between the storm event sampled and the end of the previous measurable storm event. For snowmelt monitoring, the permittee shall identify the date of the sampling event.

d. Monitoring periods.

(1) Quarterly visual monitoring. The quarterly visual examinations shall be made at least once in each of the following three-month periods each year of permit coverage: January through March, April through June, July through September, and October through December.

(2) Benchmark monitoring, effluent limitation monitoring, and impaired waters monitoring (for waters both with and without an approved TMDL). Monitoring shall be conducted at least once in each of the following semiannual periods each year of permit coverage: January through June, and July through December.

e. Documentation explaining a facility's inability to obtain a sample (including dates and times the outfalls were viewed or sampling was attempted), of no rain event, or of no <u>deviation from the</u> "measurable" storm event <u>requirements</u> shall be maintained with the SWPPP. Acceptable documentation includes, but is not limited to, National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) weather station data, local weather station data, facility rainfall logs, and other appropriate supporting data.

f. Representative outfalls - substantially identical discharges. If the facility has two or more outfalls that discharge substantially identical effluents, based on similarities of the industrial activities, significant materials, size of drainage areas, and stormwater management practices occurring within the drainage areas of the outfalls, frequency of discharges, and stormwater management practices occurring within the drainage areas of the outfalls, the permittee may conduct monitoring on the effluent of just one of the outfalls and report that the observations also apply to the substantially identical outfall or outfalls. The substantially identical outfall monitoring provisions apply to quarterly visual monitoring, benchmark monitoring, and impaired waters monitoring (both those with and without an approved TMDL). The substantially identical outfall monitoring provisions are not available for numeric effluent limits monitoring.

The permittee shall include the following information in the SWPPP:

(1) The locations of the outfalls;

(2) Why the An evaluation, including available monitoring data, indicating the outfalls are expected to discharge substantially identical effluents, including evaluation of monitoring data where available; and

(3) Estimates <u>An estimate</u> of the size of the drainage area (in square feet) for each of the outfalls <u>of each</u> outfall's drainage area in acres.

3. Adverse climatic conditions waiver. When adverse weather conditions prevent the collection of samples, a substitute sample may be taken during a qualifying storm event in the next monitoring period. Adverse weather

conditions are those that are dangerous or create inaccessibility for personnel, and may include such things as local flooding, high winds, electrical storms, or situations that otherwise make sampling impracticable, such as drought or extended frozen conditions. Unless specifically stated otherwise, this waiver may be applied to any monitoring required under this permit. <u>Narrative documentation of conditions necessitating the use of the waiver shall be kept with the SWPPP.</u>

4. Inactive and unstaffed sites (including temporarily inactive sites).

a. A waiver of the quarterly visual assessments monitoring, routine facility inspections, and monitoring requirements (including benchmark, effluent limitation, and impaired waters monitoring) may be granted by the board at a facility that is both inactive and unstaffed, as long as the facility remains inactive and unstaffed and there are no industrial materials or activities exposed to stormwater. The owner of such a facility is only required to conduct an annual comprehensive routine site inspection in accordance with the requirements in Part III  $\in B \ 5$ .

b. An inactive and unstaffed sites waiver request shall be submitted to the board for approval and shall include: the name of the facility; the facility's VPDES general permit registration number; a contact person, phone number and email address (if available); the reason for the request; and the date the facility became or will become inactive and unstaffed. The waiver request shall be signed and certified in accordance with Part II K. If this waiver is granted, a copy of the request and the board's written approval of the waiver shall be maintained with the SWPPP.

c. If circumstances change and industrial materials or activities become exposed to stormwater, or the facility becomes either active or staffed, the permittee shall notify the department within 30 days, and all quarterly visual assessments monitoring, routine facility inspections, and monitoring requirements shall be resumed immediately.

d. The board retains the right to revoke this waiver when it is determined that the discharge is causing, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to a water quality standards violation.

e. Inactive and unstaffed facilities covered under Sector G (Metal Mining) and Sector H (Coal Mines and Coal Mining-Related Facilities) are not required to meet the "no industrial materials or activities exposed to stormwater" standard to be eligible for this waiver, consistent with the conditional exemption requirements established in Part IV Sector G and Part IV Sector H.

5. Reporting monitoring results.

a. Reporting to the department. The permittee shall follow the reporting requirements and deadlines below for the types of monitoring that apply to the facility:

Semiannual Monitoring	Submit the results [ <del>on a DMR</del> ] by January 10 and by July 10.
Quarterly Visual Monitoring	Retain results with SWPPP - do not submit unless requested to do so by the department.

TABLE 70-4 MONITORING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Permittees shall submit results for each outfall associated with industrial activity according to the requirements of Part II C. For each outfall sampled, one signed discharge monitoring report (DMR) form shall be submitted to the department per storm event sampled. For representative outfalls, the sampled outfall will be reported on the DMR, and the outfalls that are representative of the sampled outfall will be listed in the comment section of the DMR. Signed DMRs are not required for each of the outfalls that are representative of the sampled outfalls.

b. Additional reporting. In addition to submitting copies of discharge monitoring reports in accordance with Part II C, permittees with at least one stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity through a regulated municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) shall submit signed copies of DMRs to the MS4 operator at the same time as the reports are submitted to the department. Permittees not required to report monitoring data and permittees that are not otherwise required to monitor their discharges need not comply with this provision.

e. <u>b.</u> Significant digits. The permittee shall report at least the same number of significant digits as a numeric effluent limitation or TMDL wasteload allocation for a given parameter; otherwise, at least two significant digits shall be reported for a given parameter. Regardless of the rounding convention used by the permittee (i.e., five always rounding up or to the nearest even number), the permittee shall use the convention consistently and shall ensure that consulting laboratories employed by the permittee use the same convention.

6. Corrective actions.

a. Data exceeding [benchmarks benchmark] concentration values.

(1) If the benchmark monitoring result exceeds the benchmark concentration value for that parameter, the permittee shall review the SWPPP and modify it as necessary to address any deficiencies that caused the exceedance. Revisions to the SWPPP shall be completed within 30 60 days after an exceedance is discovered. When control measures need to be modified or added (distinct from regular preventive maintenance of existing control measures described in Part III C), implementation shall be completed before the next anticipated storm event if possible, but no later than 60 days after the exceedance is discovered, or as otherwise provided or approved by the department. In cases where construction is necessary to implement control measures as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than three years after the exceedance is discovered. Where a construction compliance schedule is included in the SWPPP, the plan SWPPP shall include appropriate nonstructural and temporary controls to be implemented in the affected portion(s) portions of the facility prior to completion of the permanent control measure. Any control measure modifications shall be documented and dated, and retained with the SWPPP, along with the amount of time taken to modify the applicable control measures or implement additional control measures.

(2) Natural background pollutant levels. If the concentration of a pollutant exceeds a benchmark concentration value, and the permittee determines that exceedance of the benchmark is attributable solely to the presence of that pollutant in the natural background, corrective action is not required provided that:

(a) The concentration of the benchmark monitoring result is less than or equal to the concentration of that pollutant in the natural background;

(b) The permittee documents and maintains with the SWPPP the supporting rationale for concluding that benchmark exceedances are in fact attributable solely to natural background pollutant levels. The supporting rationale shall include any data previously collected by the facility or others (including literature studies) that describe the levels of natural background pollutants in the facility's stormwater discharges; and

(c) The permittee notifies the department on the benchmark monitoring DMR that the benchmark exceedances are attributable solely to natural background pollutant levels.

Natural background pollutants include those substances that are naturally occurring in soils or groundwater. Natural background pollutants do not include legacy pollutants from earlier activity on the facility's site, or pollutants in run-on from neighboring sources that are not naturally occurring.

b. Corrective actions. The permittee shall take corrective action whenever:

(1) Routine facility inspections, comprehensive site compliance evaluations, inspections by local, state or federal officials, or any other process, observation or event result in a determination that modifications to the stormwater control measures are necessary to meet the permit requirements;

(2) There is any exceedance of an effluent limitation (including coal pile runoff), TMDL wasteload allocation, or a reduction required by a local ordinance established by a municipality to meet Chesapeake Bay TMDL requirements; or

(3) The department determines, or the permittee becomes aware, that the stormwater control measures are not stringent enough for the discharge to meet applicable water quality standards.

The permittee shall review the SWPPP and modify it as necessary to address any deficiencies. Revisions to the SWPPP shall be completed within 30 60 days following the discovery of the deficiency. When control measures need to be modified or added (distinct from regular preventive maintenance of existing control measures described in Part III C), implementation shall be completed before the next anticipated storm event if possible, but no later than 60 days after the deficiency is discovered, or as otherwise provided or approved by the department. In cases where construction is necessary to implement control measures, the permittee

shall include a schedule in the SWPPP that provides for the completion of the control measures as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than three years after the deficiency is discovered. Where a construction compliance schedule is included in the SWPPP, the plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include appropriate nonstructural and temporary controls to be implemented in the affected portion(s) portion of the facility prior to completion of the permanent control measure. The amount of time taken to modify a control measure or implement additional control measures shall be documented in the SWPPP.

Any corrective actions taken shall be documented and retained with the SWPPP. Reports of corrective actions shall be signed in accordance with Part II K.

c. Follow-up reporting. If at any time monitoring results indicate that discharges from the facility exceed an effluent limitation or a TMDL wasteload allocation, or the department determines that discharges from the facility are causing or contributing to an exceedance of a water quality standard, immediate steps shall be taken to eliminate the exceedances in accordance with the above Part I A 6 b (Corrective actions). Within 30 calendar days of implementing the relevant corrective action(s) action, an exceedance report shall be submitted to the department. The following information shall be included in the report: general permit registration number; facility name, address, and location; receiving water; monitoring data from this event; an explanation of the situation; description of what has been done and the intended actions (should the corrective actions not yet be complete) to further reduce pollutants in the discharge; and an appropriate contact name and phone number.

(1) General permit registration number;

(2) Facility name and address;

(3) Receiving water for each outfall exceeding an effluent limitation of TMDL wasteload allocation;

(4) Monitoring data from the event being reported;

(5) A narrative description of the situation;

(6) A description of actions taken since the event was discovered and steps taken to minimize to the extent feasible pollutants in the discharge; and

(7) A local facility contact name, email address, and phone number.

B. Special conditions.

1. <u>Allowable Authorized nonstormwater discharges</u>. Except as provided in this section or in Part IV (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.), all discharges covered by this permit shall be composed entirely of stormwater. The following nonstormwater discharges are authorized by this permit:

a. Discharges from emergency firefighting activities;

b. Fire hydrant flushings, managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

c. Potable water, including water line flushings, managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

d. Uncontaminated condensate from air conditioners, coolers, and other compressors and from the outside storage of refrigerated gases or liquids;

e. Irrigation drainage;

f. Landscape watering provided all pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer have been applied in accordance with the approved labeling;

g. Routine external building washdown that does not use detergents or hazardous cleaning products;

h. Pavement wash waters where no detergents <u>or hazardous cleaning products</u> are used and no spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have occurred (unless all spilled material has been removed). Pavement wash waters shall be managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

i. Uncontaminated ground water or spring water;

j. Foundation or footing drains where flows are not contaminated with process materials; and

k. Incidental windblown mist from cooling towers that collects on rooftops or adjacent portions of the facility, but not intentional discharges from the cooling tower (e.g., "piped" cooling tower blowdown or drains).

All other nonstormwater discharges are not authorized and shall either be eliminated or covered under a separate VPDES permit.

The following nonstormwater discharges are specifically not authorized by this permit:

Sector A - Timber products. Discharges of stormwater from areas where there may be contact with chemical formulations sprayed to provide surface protection.

Sector C – Chemical and allied products manufacturing. Inks, paints, or substances (hazardous, nonhazardous, etc.) resulting from an on-site spill, including materials collected in drip pans; washwaters from material handling and processing areas; or washwaters from drum, tank, or container rinsing and cleaning.

Sector G – Metal mining (ore mining and dressing). Adit drainage or contaminated springs or seeps; and contaminated seeps and springs discharging from waste rock dumps that do not directly result from precipitation events.

Sector H – Coal mines and coal mining related facilities. Discharges from pollutant seeps or underground drainage from inactive coal mines and refuse disposal areas that do not result from precipitation events; and discharges from floor drains in maintenance buildings and other similar drains in mining and preparation plant areas.

Sector I - Oil and gas extraction and refining. Discharges of vehicle and equipment washwater, including tank cleaning operations.

Sector K – Hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities. Leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, contaminated ground water, laboratory derived wastewater and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

Sector L – Landfills, land application sites and open dumps. Leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, contaminated ground water, laboratory wastewater, and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

Sector N - Scrap recycling and waste recycling facilities. Discharges from turnings containment areas in the absence of a storm event.

Sector O - Steam electric generating facilities. Nonstormwater discharges subject to effluent limitation guidelines.

Sector P - Land transportation and warehousing. Vehicle, equipment, or surface washwater, including tank cleaning operations.

Sector Q - Water transportation. Bilge and ballast water, sanitary wastes, pressure wash water, and cooling water originating from vessels.

Sector R - Ship and boat building or repair yards. Bilge and ballast water, pressure wash water, sanitary wastes, and cooling water originating from vessels.

Sector S - Air transportation. Aircraft, ground vehicle, runway and equipment washwaters; and dry weather discharges of deicing and anti-icing chemicals.

Sector T - Treatment works. Sanitary and industrial wastewater; and equipment or vehicle washwaters.

Sector U - Food and kindred products. Boiler blowdown, cooling tower overflow and blowdown, ammonia refrigeration purging, and vehicle washing and clean out operations.

Sector V – Textile mills, apparel, and other fabric products. Discharges of wastewater (e.g., wastewater as a result of wet processing or from any processes relating to the production process); reused or recycled water; and waters used in cooling towers.

2. Releases of hazardous substances or oil in excess of reportable quantities. The discharge of hazardous substances or oil in the stormwater <u>discharge(s)</u> <u>discharges</u> from the facility shall be prevented or minimized in accordance with the stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> for the facility. This permit does not authorize the discharge of hazardous substances or oil resulting from an on-site spill. This permit does not relieve the permittee of the reporting requirements of 40 CFR Part 110, 40 CFR Part 117, and 40 CFR Part 302 or § 62.1-44.34:19 of the Code of Virginia.

Where a release containing a hazardous substance or oil in an amount equal to or in excess of a reportable quantity established under either 40 CFR Part 110, 40 CFR Part 117, or 40 CFR Part 302 occurs during a 24-hour period:

a. The permittee is required to notify the department in accordance with the requirements of Part II G as soon as he has knowledge of the discharge;

b. Where a release enters a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) an MS4, the permittee shall also notify the owner of the MS4; and

c. The stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> required under Part III shall be reviewed to identify measures to prevent the reoccurrence of such releases and to respond to such releases, and the <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall be modified where appropriate.

3. Colocated industrial activity. If the facility has industrial activities occurring on-site which are described by any of the activities in Part IV of the permit (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.), those industrial activities are considered to be colocated industrial activities. Stormwater discharges from colocated industrial activities are authorized by this permit, provided that the permittee complies with any and all additional pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> and monitoring requirements from Part IV applicable to that particular colocated industrial activity. The permittee shall determine which be responsible for additional pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> and monitoring requirements are applicable to the colocated industrial activity by examining the narrative descriptions of each coverage section (Discharges covered under this section) all discharges covered under this section.

4. The stormwater discharges authorized by this permit may be combined with other sources of stormwater which are not required to be covered under a VPDES permit, so long as the combined discharge is in compliance with this permit.

5. There shall be no discharge of waste, garbage, or floating debris in other than trace amounts.

6. Approval for coverage under this general permit does not relieve the permittee of the responsibility to comply with any other applicable federal, state, or local statute, ordinance, or regulation.

7. Discharges to waters subject to TMDL wasteload allocations. a. Owners of facilities that are a source of the specified pollutant of concern to waters for which a total maximum daily load (TMDL) <u>TMDL</u> wasteload allocation has been approved prior to the term of this permit shall incorporate measures and controls into the SWPPP required by Part III that are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. The department will provide written notification to the owner that a facility is subject to the TMDL requirements. The facility's SWPPP shall specifically address any conditions or requirements included in the TMDL that are applicable to discharges from the facility. If the TMDL establishes a specific numeric wasteload allocation that applies to discharges from the facility, the owner shall perform any required monitoring in accordance with Part I A 1 c (3), and implement control measures designed to meet that allocation.

b. Facilities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

8. Discharges to waters subject to the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.

(1) <u>a.</u> Owners of facilities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed shall monitor their discharges for total suspended solids (TSS), total nitrogen (TN), and total phosphorus (TP) to characterize the contributions from their facility's specific industrial sector for these parameters. <u>Total nitrogen is the sum of total Kjeldahl</u> <u>nitrogen (TKN) and nitrite + nitrate and shall be derived from the results of those tests.</u> After the facility is granted coverage under the permit, samples shall be collected during each of the first four monitoring periods (i.e., the first two years of permit coverage). Monitoring periods are specified in Part I A 2. Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with Part I A 2. Monitoring results shall be reported in accordance with Part I A 5 and Part II C, and retained in accordance with Part II B.

(2) <u>b.</u> Facilities that were covered under the 2009 2014 industrial stormwater general permit that sampled for TSS, TN, or TP may use applicable sampling data from the last two monitoring periods of that permit and the first two monitoring periods of this permit to satisfy the four consecutive monitoring periods requirement. shall comply with the following:

(1) Facilities that submitted a Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan that was approved by the board during the 2014 industrial stormwater general permit term shall continue to implement the approved Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan during this permit term. An annual report shall be submitted to the department by June 30 of each year describing the progress in meeting the required reductions unless this reporting requirement is waived by the department in accordance with Part I B 8 g. Monitoring in accordance with Part I B 8 a is not required for these facilities during this permit term.

(2) Facilities that completed four samples for TSS, TN, and TP during the 2014 industrial stormwater general permit term shall utilize the procedures in Part I B 8 c (2) to calculate their facility stormwater loads. The permittee shall submit a copy of the calculations and Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan if required under Part I B 8 f to the department within 60 days of coverage under this general permit.

(3) Facilities that did not complete four samples for TSS, TN, and TP during the 2014 industrial stormwater general permit term shall be subject to completing the monitoring requirements in Part I B 8 a beginning with the first full monitoring period after receiving permit coverage. Calculations and a Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan if required under Part I B 8 f shall be submitted no later than 90 days following the completion of the fourth monitoring period to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located on a form provided by the department and maintained with the facility's SWPPP.

(4) Facilities that monitored for TSS, TN, or TP may use the applicable sampling data collected during the 2014 industrial stormwater general permit term to satisfy all or part of the four monitoring periods requirement in accordance with Part I B 8 a.

(3) c. Chesapeake Bay TMDL wasteload allocations and Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plans.

(a) (1) EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL (December 29, 2010) includes wasteload allocations for VPDES permitted industrial stormwater facilities as part of the regulated stormwater aggregate load. EPA used data submitted by Virginia with the Phase I Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan, including the number of industrial stormwater permits per county and the number of urban acres regulated by industrial stormwater facilities were appropriate because actual facility loading data were not available to develop individual facility wasteload allocations.

Virginia estimated the loadings from industrial stormwater facilities using actual and estimated facility acreage information and TP, TN, and TSS loading values rates from the Northern Virginia Planning District Commission (NVPDC) Guidebook for Screening Urban Nonpoint Pollution Management Strategies (Annandale, VA November 1979), prepared for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. The loading values rates used were as follows:

TP - High (80%) imperviousness industrial; 1.5 lb/ac/yr

TN - High (80%) imperviousness industrial; 12.3 lb/ac/yr

TSS - High (80%) imperviousness industrial; 440 lb/ac/yr

The actual facility area information and the TP, TN, and TSS data collected for this permit will be used by the board to quantify the nutrient and sediment loads from VPDES permitted industrial stormwater facilities and will be submitted to EPA to aid in further refinements to its Chesapeake Bay TMDL model. The loading information will also be used by the board to determine any additional load reductions needed for industrial stormwater facilities for the next reissuance of this permit.

(b) Data analysis and Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plans (2) Calculation of facility loads. The permittee shall analyze the nutrient and sediment data collected in accordance with subdivision 7 b (1) of this subsection Part I B 8 a and 8 b to determine if additional action is needed pollution reductions are required for this permit term. The permittee shall average the data collected at the facility for each of the pollutants of concern (POC) (e.g., TP, TN, and TSS) and compare the results to the loading values rates for TP, TN, and TSS presented in subdivision 7 b (3) (a) of this subsection Part I B 8 c (1). To calculate the facility loadings, the permittee may use either (i) actual annual average rainfall data for the facility location (in inches/year), or the Virginia annual average rainfall of 44.3 inches/year; or (ii) another method approved by the board.

The following formula may be used to determine the loading value rate:

L = (0.2263 x R x C) / A 0.226 x P x Pj x (0.05 + (0.9 x Ia)) x C

where:

L = the POC loading value <u>rate</u> (lb/acre/year)

R = the annual average rainfall (inches/year)

 $\underline{P}$  = the annual rainfall (inches/year) - The permittee may use either actual annual average rainfall data for the facility location (in inches/year), the Virginia annual average rainfall of 44.3 inches/year, or another method approved by the board.

 $\underline{Pj}$  = the fraction of annual events that produce runoff - The permittee shall use 0.9 unless the board approves another rate.

 $\underline{Ia} =$  the impervious fraction of the facility impervious area of industrial activity to the facility industrial activity area

C = the POC average concentration of all facility samples (mg/L) <u>- Facilities with multiple outfalls shall</u> calculate a weighted average concentration for each outfall using the drainage area of each outfall.

A = the facility industrial activity area (acres)

(e) For total phosphorus and total suspended solids, all daily concentration data below the quantitation level (QL) for the analytical method used shall be treated as half the QL. All daily concentration data equal to or above the QL for the analytical method used shall be treated as it is reported.

For total nitrogen, if none of the daily concentration data for the respective species (i.e., TKN, nitrate, or nitrite) are equal to or above the QL for the respective analytical methods used, the daily TN concentration value reported shall equal one half of the largest QL used for the respective species. If one of the data is equal to or above the QL, the daily TN concentration value shall be treated as that data point is reported. If more than one of the data is above the QL, the daily TN concentration value shall equal the sum of the data points as reported.

d. The permittee shall submit a copy of the calculations to the department within 90 days from the end of the last monitoring period that satisfies the monitoring requirement in Part I B 8 a. Calculations shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located[,] on a form provided by the department[,] and maintained with the facility's SWPPP.

e. Any modification to the facility's industrial acreage or impervious industrial acreage [will shall] require the facility to recalculate facility loading rates. This may require the facility to modify the facility's Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan or submit a Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan as appropriate. Any recalculation of facility loading rates or modifications to a Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan shall be submitted to the department within 90 days of the date on which the permittee completes a site modification. If previous monitoring is no longer representative of the modified facility, monitoring in accordance with Part I B 8 a shall commence within 90 days of the modification and the revised calculations and Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan if required under Part I B 8 f shall be submitted no later than 90 days following completion of the fourth monitoring period.

<u>f. Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan Requirements.</u> If the calculated facility loading value rate for TP, TN, or TSS is above the loading values rates for TP, TN, or TSS presented in subdivision 7 b (3) (a) of this subsection Part I B 8 c (1), then the permittee shall develop and submit to the board for review and approval a Chesapeake Bay TMDL Action Plan action plan to the department. The plan shall be submitted within 90 days from the end of the second year's monitoring period (by September 28, 2016). The permittee shall implement the approved plan over the remaining term of this permit to achieve all the necessary reductions by June 30, 2024. The action plan shall include:

(i) The Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan shall be submitted on a form provided by the department to the regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located within 90 days following the completion of the fourth monitoring period. A copy of the current Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan and all facility loading rate calculations shall be maintained with the facility's SWPPP. The Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan shall include:

(1) A determination of the total pollutant load reductions for TP, TN, and TSS (as appropriate) necessary to reduce the annual loads from industrial activities. This shall be determined by <u>calculating multiplying the</u> <u>industrial average times</u> the difference between the <u>TMDL</u> loading <u>values</u> <u>rates</u> listed in <u>subdivision 7 b (3)</u> (a) of this subsection, <u>Part I B 8 c (1)</u> and the <u>average of the sampling data for TP, TN, or TSS (as appropriate)</u> for the entire facility loading rates calculated in accordance with Part I B 8 c (2). The reduction applies to the total difference calculated for each pollutant of concern;

(ii) (2) The means and methods, such as management practices and retrofit programs, that will be utilized to meet the required reductions determined in subdivision 7 b (3) (c) (i) of this subsection, Part I B 8 f (1) and a schedule to achieve those reductions by June 30, 2024. The schedule should include annual benchmarks milestones to demonstrate the ongoing progress in meeting those reductions; and

 $\frac{(iii)}{(3)}$  The permittee may consider utilization of any pollutant trading or offset program in accordance with §§ 62.1-44.19:20 through 62.1-44.19:23 of the Code of Virginia, governing trading and offsetting, to meet the required reductions.

(d) g. A permittee required to develop and implement a Chesapeake Bay TMDL Action Plan shall submit an annual report to the department by June 30 of each year describing the progress in meeting the required reductions.

h. Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan annual reporting waiver. Upon implementation of the facility's Chesapeake Bay TMDL action plan, permittees may submit a waiver for the annual reporting requirements. The waiver request shall be submitted for board approval to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located on a form provided by the department. Annual reporting requirements will be in effect until the permittee receives notice from the department that the waiver has been approved. A copy of the waiver approval shall be maintained with the SWPPP. The waiver may be revoked for cause by the board. A waiver request may be approved by the board once the permittee demonstrates that they have achieved all of the required pollutant reductions calculated under Part I B 8 f (1). Pollutant reductions may be achieved using a combination of the following alternatives:

(1) Reductions provided by one or more of the BMPs from the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse listed in 9VAC25-870-65, approved BMPs found on the Virginia Stormwater Clearinghouse website, or BMPs approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program. Any BMPs implemented to provide the required pollutant reductions shall be incorporated in the SWPPP and be permanently maintained by the permittee;

(2) Implementation of site-specific BMPs followed by a minimum of four stormwater samples collected in accordance with sampling requirements in Part I B 8 a that demonstrate pollutant loadings have been reduced below those calculated under Part I B 8 c. Any BMPs implemented to provide the required pollutant reductions shall be incorporated in the SWPPP and be permanently maintained by the permittee; or

(3) Acquisition of nonpoint source credits certified by the board as perpetual in accordance with § 62.1-44.19:20 of the Code of Virginia.

8. 9. Discharges through a regulated MS4 to waters subject to the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. In addition to the requirements of this permit, any facility with industrial activity [stormwater] discharges through a regulated MS4 that is notified by the MS4 operator that the locality has adopted ordinances to meet the Chesapeake Bay TMDL shall incorporate measures and controls into its SWPPP to comply with applicable local TMDL ordinance requirements.

9. <u>10.</u> Expansion of facilities that discharge to waters subject to the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Virginia's Phase I Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan (November 29, 2010), states that the wasteloads from any expansion of an existing permitted facility discharging stormwater in the Chesapeake Bay watershed cannot exceed the nutrient and sediment loadings that were discharged from the expanded portion of the land prior to the land being developed for the expanded industrial activity.

a. For any industrial activity area expansions (i.e., construction activities, including clearing, grading, and excavation activities) that commence on or after July 1, 2014 2019, (the effective date of this permit), the permittee shall document in the SWPPP the information and calculations used to determine the nutrient and sediment loadings discharged from the expanded land area prior to the land being developed, and the measures and controls that were employed to meet the no net increase of stormwater nutrient and sediment load as a result of the expansion of the industrial activity. Any land disturbance that is exempt from permitting under the VPDES construction stormwater general permit regulation (9VAC25-880) is exempt from this requirement.

b. The permittee may use the VSMP water quality design criteria to meet the requirements of subdivision 9 Part I B 10 a of this subsection. Under this criteria, the total phosphorus load shall not exceed the greater of: (i) the total phosphorus load that was discharged from the expanded portion of the land prior to the land being developed for the industrial activity or (ii) 0.41 pounds per acre per year. Compliance with the water quality design criteria may be determined utilizing the Virginia Runoff Reduction Method or another equivalent methodology approved by the board. Design specifications and pollutant removal efficiencies for specific BMPs can be found on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc.

c. The permittee may consider utilization of any pollutant trading or offset program in accordance with §§ 62.1-44.19:20 through 62.1-44.19:23 of the Code of Virginia, governing trading and offsetting, to meet the no net increase requirement.

10. Water quality protection. The discharges authorized by this permit shall be controlled as necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The board expects that compliance with the conditions in this permit will control discharges as necessary to meet applicable water quality standards.

11. Adding or deleting stormwater outfalls. The permittee may add new or delete existing stormwater outfalls at the facility as necessary and appropriate. The permittee shall update the SWPPP and notify the department of all outfall changes within 30 days of the change. The permittee shall submit a copy of the updated SWPPP site map with this notification.

12. Antidegradation requirements for new or increased discharges to high quality waters. Facilities that add new outfalls, or increase their discharges from existing outfalls that discharge directly to high quality waters designated under Virginia's water quality standards antidegradation policy under 9VAC25-260-30 A 2 may be notified by the department that additional control measures, or other permit conditions are necessary to comply with the applicable antidegradation requirements, or may be notified that an individual permit is required in accordance with 9VAC25-31-170 B 3.

13. If the permittee discharges to surface waters through a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4), the permittee shall, within 30 days of coverage under this general permit, notify the owner of the MS4 in writing of the existence of the discharge and provide the following information: the name of the facility, a contact person and phone number, the location of the discharge, the nature of the discharge, and the facility's VPDES general permit registration number. A copy of such notification shall be provided to the department.

14. 13. Termination of permit coverage.

a. The owner may terminate coverage under this general permit by filing a complete notice of termination <u>with the department</u>. The notice of termination may be filed after one or more of the following conditions have been met:

(1) Operations have ceased at the facility and there are no longer discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activity from the facility;

(2) A new owner has assumed responsibility for the facility (Note: A notice of termination does not have to be submitted if a VPDES Change of Ownership Agreement Form has been submitted;

(3) All stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity have been covered by an individual VPDES permit; or

(4) Termination of coverage is being requested for another reason, provided the board agrees that coverage under this general permit is no longer needed.

b. The notice of termination shall contain the following information:

(1) Owner's name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if available);

(2) Facility name and location;

(3) VPDES industrial stormwater general permit registration number;

(4) The basis for submitting the notice of termination, including:

(a) A statement indicating that a new owner has assumed responsibility for the facility;

(b) A statement indicating that operations have ceased at the facility, and there are no longer discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activity from the facility;

(c) A statement indicating that all stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity have been covered by an individual VPDES permit; or

(d) A statement indicating that termination of coverage is being requested for another reason (state the reason); and a description of the reason; and

(5) The following certification: "I certify under penalty of law that all stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from the identified facility that are authorized by this VPDES general permit have been eliminated, or covered under a VPDES individual permit, or that I am no longer the owner of the industrial activity, or permit coverage should be terminated for another reason listed above. I understand that by submitting this notice of termination, that I am no longer authorized to discharge stormwater associated with industrial activity in accordance with the general permit, and that discharging pollutants in stormwater associated with industrial activity to surface waters is unlawful where the discharge is not authorized by a VPDES permit. I also understand that the submittal of this notice of termination does not release an owner from liability for any violations of this permit or the Clean Water Act."

c. The notice of termination shall be signed in accordance with Part II K.

d. The notice of termination shall be submitted to the DEQ regional office serving the area where the industrial facility is located.

## Part II

## Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits

## A. Monitoring.

1. Samples and measurements taken as required by this permit shall be representative of the monitored activity.

2. Monitoring shall be conducted according to procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or alternative methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, unless other procedures have been specified in this permit.

3. The permittee shall periodically calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring and analytical instrumentation at intervals that will ensure accuracy of measurements.

4. Samples taken as required by this permit shall be analyzed in accordance with 1VAC30-45 (Certification for Noncommercial Environmental Laboratories) or 1VAC30-46 (Accreditation for Commercial Environmental Laboratories).

## B. Records.

- 1. Records of monitoring information shall include:
  - a. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
  - b. The individual(s) individuals who performed the sampling or measurements;
  - c. The date(s) dates and time(s) times analyses were performed;
  - d. The individual(s) individuals who performed the analyses;
  - e. The analytical techniques or methods used; and
  - f. The results of such analyses.

2. The permittee shall retain copies of the SWPPP, including any modifications made during the term of this permit, records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the registration statement for this permit, for a period of at least three years from the date that coverage under this permit expires or is terminated. This period of retention shall be extended automatically during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding the regulated activity or regarding control standards applicable to the permittee, or as requested by the board.

C. Reporting monitoring results.

1. The permittee shall submit the results of the monitoring required by this permit not later than the 10th day of the month after monitoring takes place, unless another reporting schedule is specified elsewhere in this permit. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the department's regional office.

2. Monitoring results shall be reported on a discharge monitoring report (DMR) or on forms provided, approved or specified by the department in the department's electronic discharge monitoring report (e-DMR) system. All reports and forms submitted in compliance with this permit shall be submitted electronically by the permittee in accordance with 9VAC25-31-1020.

3. If the permittee monitors any pollutant specifically addressed by this permit more frequently than required by this permit using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or using other test procedures approved by

the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or using procedures specified in this permit, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted on the DMR in e-DMR or reporting form specified by the department.

4. Calculations for all limitations which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this permit.

D. Duty to provide information. The permittee shall furnish to the department, within a reasonable time, any information which the board may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating coverage under this permit or to determine compliance with this permit. The board may require the permittee to furnish, upon request, such plans, specifications, and other pertinent information as may be necessary to determine the effect of the wastes from the discharge on the quality of state waters, or such other information as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the State Water Control Law. The permittee shall also furnish to the department upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.

E. Compliance schedule reports. Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date.

F. Unauthorized discharges. Except in compliance with this permit, or another permit issued by the board, it shall be unlawful for any person to:

1. Discharge into state waters sewage, industrial wastes, other wastes, or any noxious or deleterious substances; or

2. Otherwise alter the physical, chemical or biological properties of such state waters and make them detrimental to the public health, or to animal or aquatic life, or to the use of such waters for domestic or industrial consumption, or for recreation, or for other uses.

G. Reports of unauthorized discharges. Any permittee who discharges or causes or allows a discharge of sewage, industrial waste, other wastes or any noxious or deleterious substance into or upon state waters in violation of Part II F; or who discharges or causes or allows a discharge that may reasonably be expected to enter state waters in violation of Part II F, shall notify the department of the discharge immediately upon discovery of the discharge, but in no case later than 24 hours after said discovery. A written report of the unauthorized discharge shall be submitted to the department within five days of discovery of the discharge. The written report shall contain:

1. A description of the nature and location of the discharge;

2. The cause of the discharge;

3. The date on which the discharge occurred;

4. The length of time that the discharge continued;

5. The volume of the discharge;

6. If the discharge is continuing, how long it is expected to continue;

7. If the discharge is continuing, what the expected total volume of the discharge will be; and

8. Any steps planned or taken to reduce, eliminate and prevent a recurrence of the present discharge or any future discharges not authorized by this permit.

Discharges reportable to the department under the immediate reporting requirements of other regulations are exempted from this requirement.

H. Reports of unusual or extraordinary discharges. If any unusual or extraordinary discharge including a bypass or upset should occur from a treatment works and the discharge enters or could be expected to enter state waters, the permittee shall promptly notify, in no case later than 24 hours, the department by telephone after the discovery of the discharge. This notification shall provide all available details of the incident, including any adverse effects on aquatic life and the known number of fish killed. The permittee shall reduce the report to writing and shall submit it to the department within five days of discovery of the discharge in accordance with Part II I  $2 \underline{1} \underline{b}$ . Unusual and extraordinary discharges include but are not limited to any discharge resulting from:

1. Unusual spillage of materials resulting directly or indirectly from processing operations;

- 2. Breakdown of processing or accessory equipment;
- 3. Failure or taking out of service some or all of the treatment works; and

4. Flooding or other acts of nature.

I. Reports of noncompliance.

<u>1.</u> The permittee shall report any noncompliance which that may adversely affect state waters or may endanger public health.

1. <u>a.</u> An oral report shall be provided within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The following shall be included as information which that shall be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph Part II I:

a. (1) Any unanticipated bypass; and

b. (2) Any upset which causes a discharge to surface waters.

2. <u>b.</u> A written report shall be submitted within five days and shall contain:

a. (1) A description of the noncompliance and its cause;

b. (2) The period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and

e. (3) Steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.

The board may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports of noncompliance under Part II I if the oral report has been received within 24 hours and no adverse impact on state waters has been reported.

3. 2. The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Part II I 1 or 2, in writing, at the time the next monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Part II I  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

NOTE: 3. The immediate (within 24 hours) reports required in Part II G, H and I may be made to the department's regional office. Reports may be made by telephone, FAX. online or at http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/PollutionResponsePreparedness/MakingaReport.aspx. For reports outside normal working hours, a message may be left and this shall fulfill the immediate reporting requirement. For emergencies, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management maintains a 24-hour telephone service at 1-800-468-8892.

# J. Notice of planned changes.

1. The permittee shall give notice to the department as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required only when:

a. The permittee plans alteration or addition to any building, structure, facility, or installation from which there is or may be a discharge of pollutants, the construction of which commenced:

(1) After promulgation of standards of performance under § 306 of the Clean Water Act which are applicable to such source; or

(2) After proposal of standards of performance in accordance with § 306 of the Clean Water Act which are applicable to such source, but only if the standards are promulgated in accordance with § 306 within 120 days of their proposal;

b. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants which are subject neither to effluent limitations nor to notification requirements specified elsewhere in this permit; or

c. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the permittee's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan.

2. The permittee shall give advance notice to the department of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements.

- K. Signatory requirements.
  - 1. Registration statement. All registration statements shall be signed as follows:

a. For a corporation: by a responsible corporate officer. For the purpose of this section, a responsible corporate officer means: (i) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy-making or decision-making

functions for the corporation; or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities, provided the manager is authorized to make management decisions that govern the operation of the regulated facility including having the explicit or implicit duty of making major capital investment recommendations, and initiating and directing other comprehensive measures to assure long-term environmental compliance with environmental laws and regulations; the manager can ensure that the necessary systems are established or actions taken to gather complete and accurate information for permit registration requirements; and where authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures;

b. For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or

c. For a municipality, state, federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this section, a principal executive officer of a public agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency.

2. Reports, etc. All reports required by permits, and other information requested by the board shall be signed by a person described in Part II K 1 or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Part II K 1;

b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position; and

c. The written authorization is submitted to the department.

3. Changes to authorization. If an authorization under Part II K 2 is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Part II K 2 shall be submitted to the department prior to or together with any reports, or information to be signed by an authorized representative.

4. Certification. Any person signing a document under Part II K 1 or 2 shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

L. Duty to comply. The permittee shall comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the State Water Control Law and the Clean Water Act, except that noncompliance with certain provisions of this permit may constitute a violation of the State Water Control Law but not the Clean Water Act. Permit noncompliance is grounds for enforcement action; for permit <u>coverage</u> termination<del>, revocation and reissuance, or modification;</del> or denial of a permit coverage renewal <del>application</del>.

The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under § 307(a) of the Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under § 405(d) of the Clean Water Act within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions or standards for sewage sludge use or disposal, even if this permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.

M. Duty to reapply. If the permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the permittee shall submit a new registration statement at least 60 days before the expiration date of the existing permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the board. The board shall not grant permission for registration statements to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing permit.

N. Effect of a permit. This permit does not convey any property rights in either real or personal property or any exclusive privileges, nor does it authorize any injury to private property or invasion of personal rights, or any infringement of federal, state or local law or regulations.

O. State law. Nothing in this permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action under, or relieve the permittee from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties established pursuant to any other state law or regulation or under authority preserved by § 510 of the Clean Water Act. Except as provided in permit conditions on "bypassing" (Part II U), and "upset" (Part II V) nothing in this permit shall be construed to relieve the permittee from civil and criminal penalties for noncompliance.

P. Oil and hazardous substance liability. Nothing in this permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action or relieve the permittee from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties to which the permittee is or may be subject under §§ 62.1-44.34:14 through 62.1-44.34:23 of the State Water Control Law.

Q. Proper operation and maintenance. The permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance also includes effective plant performance, adequate funding, adequate staffing, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems which are installed by the permittee only when the operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit.

R. Disposal of solids or sludges. Solids, sludges or other pollutants removed in the course of treatment or management of pollutants shall be disposed of in a manner so as to prevent any pollutant from such materials from entering state waters.

S. Duty to mitigate. The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

T. Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense. It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.

U. Bypass.

1. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. The permittee may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded, but only if it also is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions of Part II U 2 and 3.

2. Notice.

a. Anticipated bypass. If the permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, prior notice shall be submitted, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.

b. Unanticipated bypass. The permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Part II I.

3. Prohibition of bypass.

a. Bypass is prohibited, and the board may take enforcement action against a permittee for bypass, unless:

(1) Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage;

(2) There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass which occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance; and

(3) The permittee submitted notices as required under Part II U 2.

b. The board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed above in Part II U 3 a.

V. Upset.

1. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Part II V 2 are met. A determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is not a final administrative action subject to judicial review.

2. A permittee who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs, or other relevant evidence that:

a. An upset occurred and that the permittee can identify the cause(s) causes of the upset;

b. The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated;

c. The permittee submitted notice of the upset as required in Part II I; and

d. The permittee complied with any remedial measures required under Part II S.

3. In any enforcement proceeding the permittee seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

W. Inspection and entry. The permittee shall allow the director, or an authorized representative, <u>including an</u> <u>authorized contractor acting as a representative of the administrator</u>, upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:

1. Enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of this permit;

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;

3. Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this permit; and

4. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the Clean Water Act and the State Water Control Law, any substances or parameters at any location.

For purposes of this section, the time for inspection shall be deemed reasonable during regular business hours, and whenever the facility is discharging. Nothing contained herein shall make an inspection unreasonable during an emergency.

X. Permit actions. <u>Permits Permit coverages</u> may be <u>modified</u>, <u>revoked and reissued</u>, <u>or</u> terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit <del>modification</del>, <u>revocation and reissuance</u>, <u>or</u> termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit condition.

Y. Transfer of permits.

1. Permits are not transferable to any person except after notice to the department.

2. Coverage under this permit may be automatically transferred to a new permittee if:

1. <u>a.</u> The current permittee notifies the department within 30 days of the <del>proposed</del> transfer of the title to the facility or property, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the board;

2. <u>b.</u> The notice includes a written agreement between the existing and new permittees containing a specific date for transfer of permit responsibility, coverage, and liability between them; and

3. <u>c.</u> The board does not notify the existing permittee and the proposed new permittee of its intent to deny the new permittee coverage under the permit. If this notice is not received, the transfer is effective on the date specified in the agreement mentioned in Part II Y 2 <u>b</u>.

Z. Severability. The provisions of this permit are severable, and if any provision of this permit or the application of any provision of this permit to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of this permit, shall not be affected thereby.

### Part III

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

# 9VAC25-151-80. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans pollution prevention plans.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented for the facility covered by this permit. The SWPPP is intended to document the selection, design, and installation of control measures, including BMPs, to eliminate or reduce minimize the pollutants in all stormwater discharges from the facility, and to meet applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards.

The SWPPP requirements of this general permit may be fulfilled, in part, by incorporating by reference other plans or documents such as a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan developed for the facility under § 311 of the Clean Water Act, or best management practices (BMP) programs otherwise required for the facility, provided that the incorporated plan meets or exceeds the plan requirements of Part III B (Contents of the [Plan SWPPP]). All plans

incorporated by reference into the SWPPP become enforceable under this permit. If a plan incorporated by reference does not contain all of the required elements of the SWPPP of Part III B, the permittee shall develop the missing SWPPP elements and include them in the required plan.

A. Deadlines for plan <u>SWPPP</u> preparation and compliance.

1. Facilities that were covered under the  $\frac{2009}{2014}$  Industrial Stormwater General Permit. Owners of facilities that were covered under the  $\frac{2009}{2014}$  Industrial Stormwater General Permit who are continuing coverage under this general permit shall update and implement any revisions to the SWPPP within 90 days of the board granting coverage under this permit.

2. New facilities, facilities previously covered by an expiring individual permit, and existing facilities not currently covered by a VPDES permit. Owners of new facilities, facilities previously covered by an expiring individual permit, and existing facilities not currently covered by a VPDES permit who elect to be covered under this general permit shall prepare and implement the SWPPP prior to submitting the registration statement.

3. New owners of existing facilities. Where the owner of an existing facility that is covered by this permit changes, the new owner of the facility shall update and implement any revisions to the SWPPP within 60 days of the ownership change.

4. Extensions. Upon a showing of good cause, the director may establish a later date in writing for the preparation and compliance with the SWPPP.

B. Contents of the plan <u>SWPPP</u>. The contents of the SWPPP shall comply with the requirements listed below and those in the appropriate sectors of Part IV (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.). These requirements are cumulative. If a facility has colocated <u>industrial</u> activities that are covered in more than one sector of Part IV, that facility's <del>pollution prevention plan</del> <u>SWPPP</u> shall comply with the requirements listed in all applicable sectors. The following requirements are applicable to all SWPPPs developed under this general permit. The <del>plan</del> <u>SWPPP</u> shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Pollution prevention team. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall identify the staff individuals by name or title who comprise the facility's stormwater pollution prevention team. The pollution prevention team is responsible for assisting the facility or plant manager in developing, implementing, maintaining, revising and ensuring compliance with the facility's SWPPP. Specific responsibilities of each staff individual on the team shall be identified and listed.

2. Site description. The SWPPP shall include the following:

a. Activities at the facility. A description of the nature of the industrial activities at the facility.

b. General location map. A general location map (e.g., USGS quadrangle or other map) with enough detail to identify the location of the facility and the receiving waters within one mile of the facility.

c. Site map. b. A site map identifying the following:

(1) The boundaries of the property and the size of the property (in acres) in acres;

(2) The location and extent of significant structures and impervious surfaces (roofs, paved areas and other impervious areas);

(3) Locations of all stormwater conveyances, including ditches, pipes, swales, and inlets, and the directions of stormwater flow (use arrows to show which ways stormwater will flow) using arrows to indicate which direction stormwater will flow;

(4) Locations of all existing structural and source stormwater control measures, including BMPs;

(5) Locations of all surface water bodies, including wetlands;

(6) Locations of potential pollutant sources identified under Part III B 3;

(7) Locations where significant spills or leaks identified under Part III B 3 c have occurred;

(8) Locations of the following activities where such activities are exposed to precipitation: fueling stations; vehicle and equipment maintenance and cleaning areas; loading and unloading areas; locations used for the treatment, storage or disposal of wastes; liquid storage tanks; processing and storage areas; access roads, rail cars and tracks; transfer areas for substances in bulk; and machinery;

(9) (8) Locations of stormwater outfalls and an approximate outline of the area draining to each outfall, and location of municipal storm sewer systems, if the stormwater from the facility discharges to them. Outfalls shall be numbered using a unique numerical identification code for each outfall (e.g., Outfall No. 001, No. 002, etc.);.

(10) (a) An approximate outline of the area draining to each outfall;

(b) The drainage area of each outfall in acres;

(c) The longitude and latitude of each outfall;

(d) The location of any MS4 conveyance receiving discharge from the facility; and

(e) Each outfall shall be identified with a unique numerical identification code. For example: Outfall Number 001, Outfall Number 002, etc.;

(9) Location and description of all nonstormwater discharges;

(11) (10) Location of any storage piles containing salt used for deicing or other commercial or industrial purposes;

(12) (11) Locations and sources of <u>suspected</u> runon <u>run-on</u> to the site from <u>an</u> adjacent property, where <u>if</u> the runon contains <u>run-on</u> is <u>suspected</u> of <u>containing</u> significant quantities of pollutants; and

(13) (12) Locations of all stormwater monitoring points.

 $[\underline{d} \underline{c}]$ . Receiving waters and wetlands. The name of all surface waters receiving discharges from the site, including intermittent streams, dry sloughs, and arroyos. Provide a description of wetland sites that may receive discharges from the facility. If the facility discharges through a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) an MS4, identify the MS4 operator, and the receiving water to which the MS4 discharges.

3. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall identify each separate area at the facility where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater. Industrial materials or activities include, but are not limited to: material handling equipment or activities, industrial machinery, raw materials, industrial production and processes, intermediate products, byproducts, final products, and waste products. Material handling activities include, but are not limited to: the storage, loading and unloading, transportation, disposal, or conveyance of any raw material, intermediate product, final product or waste product. For each separate area identified, the description shall include:

a. Activities in the area. A list of the industrial activities exposed to stormwater (e.g., material storage, equipment fueling and cleaning, cutting steel beams).

b. Pollutants. A list of the pollutant(s) or pollutants, pollutant constituents (e.g., crankcase oil, zinc, sulfurie acid, cleaning solvents, etc.), or industrial chemicals associated with each industrial activity that could potentially be exposed to stormwater. The pollutant list shall include all significant materials handled, treated, stored or disposed that have been exposed to stormwater in the three years prior to the date this SWPPP was prepared or amended. The list shall include any hazardous substances or oil at the facility.

c. Spills and leaks. The SWPPP shall clearly identify areas where potential spills and leaks that can contribute pollutants to stormwater discharges can occur and their corresponding outfalls. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include a list of significant spills and leaks of toxic or hazardous pollutants that actually occurred at exposed areas, or that drained to a stormwater conveyance during the three-year period prior to the date this SWPPP was prepared or amended. The list shall be updated <u>within 60 days of the incident</u> if significant spills or leaks occur in exposed areas of the facility during the term of the permit. Significant spills and leaks include, but are not limited to, releases of oil or hazardous substances in excess of reportable quantities.

d. Sampling data. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include a <u>summary of existing</u> stormwater discharge sampling data taken at the facility. The summary shall include, at a minimum, any data collected during the previous permit term three years.

4. Stormwater controls.

a. Control measures shall be implemented for all the areas identified in Part III B 3 (summary of potential pollutant sources) to prevent or control pollutants in stormwater discharges from the facility. Regulated stormwater discharges from the facility include stormwater runon run-on that commingles with stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity at the facility. The SWPPP shall describe the type, location and implementation of all control measures for each area where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater.

Selection of control measures shall take into consideration:

(1) That preventing stormwater from coming into contact with polluting materials is generally more effective, and less costly, than trying to remove pollutants from stormwater;

(2) Control measures generally shall be used in combination with each other for most effective water quality protection;

(3) Assessing the type and quantity of pollutants, including their potential to impact receiving water quality, is critical to designing effective control measures;

(4) That minimizing impervious areas at the facility can reduce runoff and improve groundwater recharge and stream base flows in local streams (however, care must be taken to avoid ground water groundwater contamination);

(5) Flow attenuation by use of open vegetated swales and natural depressions can reduce in-stream impacts of erosive flows;

(6) Conservation or restoration of riparian buffers will help protect streams from stormwater runoff and improve water quality; and

(7) Treatment interceptors (e.g., swirl separators and sand filters) may be appropriate in some instances to minimize the discharge of pollutants.

b. Nonnumeric technology-based effluent limits. The permittee shall implement the following types of control measures to prevent and control pollutants in the stormwater discharges from the facility, unless it can be demonstrated and documented that such controls are not relevant to the discharges (e.g., there are no storage piles containing salt).

(1) Good housekeeping. The permittee shall keep clean all exposed areas of the facility that are potential sources of pollutants to stormwater discharges. Typical problem areas include areas around trash containers, storage areas, loading docks, and vehicle fueling and maintenance areas. The plan shall include a schedule for regular pickup and disposal of waste materials, along with routine inspections for leaks and conditions of drums, tanks and containers. The permittee shall perform the following good housekeeping measures to minimize pollutant discharges:

(a) The SWPPP shall include a schedule for regular pickup and disposal of waste materials, along with routine inspections for leaks and conditions of drums, tanks, and containers;

(b) As feasible, the facility shall sweep or vacuum;

(c) Store materials in containers constructed of appropriate materials;

(d) Manage all waste containers to prevent a discharge of pollutants;

(e) Minimize the potential for waste, garbage, and floatable debris to be discharged by keeping areas exposed to stormwater free of such materials or by intercepting such materials prior to discharge; and

(f) Facilities that handle pre-production plastic or plastic waste shall implement BMPs to eliminate stormwater discharges of plastics.

(2) Eliminating and minimizing exposure. To the extent practicable, manufacturing, processing, and material storage areas (including loading and unloading, storage, disposal, cleaning, maintenance, and fueling operations) shall be located inside, or protected by a storm-resistant covering to prevent exposure to rain, snow, snowmelt, and runoff. Note: Eliminating exposure at all industrial areas may make the facility eligible for the "Conditional Exclusion for No Exposure" provision of 9VAC25-31-120 E, thereby eliminating the need to have a permit. Unless infeasible, facilities shall implement the following:

(a) Use grading, berming, or curbing to prevent runoff of contaminated flows and divert run-on away from potential sources of pollutants;

(b) Locate materials, equipment, and activities so that potential leaks and spills are contained, or able to be contained, or diverted before discharge;

(c) Clean up spills and leaks immediately, upon discovery of the spills or leaks, using dry methods (e.g., absorbents) to prevent the discharge of pollutants;

(d) Store leaking vehicles and equipment indoors or, if stored outdoors, use drip pans and adsorbents;

(e) Utilize appropriate spill or overflow protections equipment;

(f) Perform all vehicle maintenance or equipment cleaning operations indoors, under cover, or in bermed areas that prevent runoff and run-on and also capture any overspray; and

(g) Drain fluids from equipment and vehicles that will be decommissioned, and for any equipment and vehicles that remain unused for extended periods of time, inspect at least monthly for leaks.

(3) Preventive maintenance. The permittee shall have a preventive maintenance program that includes regular inspection, testing, maintenance and repairing of all industrial equipment and systems to avoid situations that could result in leaks, spills and other releases of pollutants in stormwater discharged from the facility. This program is in addition to the specific control measure maintenance required under Part III C (Maintenance of control measures) (Maintenance).

(4) Spill prevention and response procedures. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe the procedures that will be followed for preventing and responding to spills and leaks, including:

(a) Preventive measures, such as barriers between material storage and traffic areas, secondary containment provisions, and procedures for material storage and handling;

(b) Response procedures, including notification of appropriate facility personnel, emergency agencies, and regulatory agencies, and procedures for stopping, containing and cleaning up spills. Measures for cleaning up hazardous material spills or leaks shall be consistent with applicable RCRA regulations at 40 CFR Part 264 and 40 CFR Part 265. Employees who may cause, detect or respond to a spill or leak shall be trained in these procedures and have necessary spill response equipment available. If possible, one of these individuals shall be a member of the Pollution Prevention Team;

(c) Procedures for plainly labeling containers (e.g., "used oil," "spent solvents," "fertilizers and pesticides," etc.) that could be susceptible to spillage or leakage to encourage proper handling and facilitate rapid response if spills or leaks occur; and

(d) Contact information for individuals and agencies that must be notified in the event of a spill shall be included in the SWPPP, and in other locations where it will be readily available.

(5) Salt storage piles or piles containing salt. Storage piles of salt or piles containing salt used for deicing or other commercial or industrial purposes shall be enclosed or covered to prevent exposure to precipitation. The permittee shall implement appropriate measures (e.g., good housekeeping, diversions, containment) to minimize exposure resulting from adding to or removing materials from the pile. All salt storage piles shall be located on an impervious surface. All runoff from the pile, and runoff that comes in contact with salt, including under drain systems, shall be collected and contained within a bermed basin lined with concrete or other impermeable materials, or within an underground storage tank or tanks, or within an above ground storage tank or tanks, or disposed of through a sanitary sewer (with the permission of the owner of the treatment facility). A combination of any or all of these methods may be used. In no case shall salt contaminated stormwater be allowed to discharge directly to the ground or to surface waters.

(6) Employee training. The permittee shall implement a stormwater employee training program for the facility. The SWPPP shall include a schedule for all types of necessary training, and shall document all training sessions and the employees who received the training. Training shall be provided <u>at least annually</u> for all employees who work in areas where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater, and for employees who are responsible for implementing activities identified in the SWPPP (e.g., inspectors, maintenance personnel, etc.). The training shall cover the components and goals of the SWPPP, and include such topics as spill response, good housekeeping, material management practices, control measure operation and maintenance, etc. The SWPPP shall include a summary of any training performed.

(7) Sediment and erosion control. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall identify areas at the facility that, due to topography, land disturbance (e.g., construction, landscaping, site grading), or other factors, have a potential for soil erosion. The permittee shall identify and implement structural, vegetative, and stabilization control measures to prevent or control on-site and off-site erosion and sedimentation. Flow velocity dissipation devices shall be placed at discharge locations and along the length of any outfall channel if the flows would otherwise create erosive conditions.

(8) Management of runoff. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe the stormwater runoff management practices (i.e., permanent structural control measures) for the facility. These types of control measures are typically shall be used to divert, infiltrate, reuse, or otherwise reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges from the site.

Structural control measures may require a separate permit under § 404 of the CWA and the Virginia Water Protection Permit Program Regulation (9VAC25-210) before installation begins.

(9) Dust suppression and vehicle tracking of industrial materials. The permittee shall implement control measures to minimize the generation of dust and off-site tracking of raw, final, or waste materials. Stormwater collected on-site may be used for the purposes of dust suppression or for spraying stockpiles. Potable water, well water, and uncontaminated reuse water may also be used for this purpose. There shall be no direct discharge to surface waters from dust suppression activities or as a result of spraying stockpiles.

5. Routine facility inspections. Facility personnel Personnel who possess the knowledge and skills to assess conditions and activities that could impact stormwater quality at the facility and who can also evaluate the effectiveness of control measures shall regularly inspect all areas of the facility where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater, areas where spills or leaks have occurred in the past three years, discharge points, and control measures. These inspections are in addition to, or as part of, the comprehensive site evaluation required under Part III E. At least one member of the pollution prevention team shall participate in the routine facility inspections.

The inspection frequency shall be specified in the plan <u>SWPPP</u> based upon a consideration of the level of industrial activity at the facility, but shall be at a minimum <u>quarterly of once per calendar quarter</u> unless more frequent intervals are specified elsewhere in the permit or written approval is received from the department for less frequent intervals. Inspections shall be performed during <u>periods when the facility is in operation operating hours</u>. At least once each calendar year, the routine facility inspection shall be conducted during a period when a stormwater discharge is occurring.

The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status. Note: Certain sectors in Part IV have additional inspection requirements. If the VEEP E3/E4 waiver language is not included for the sector specific inspections, these additional inspection requirements may not be waived.

Any deficiencies in the implementation of the SWPPP that are found shall be corrected as soon as practicable, but not later than within  $\frac{30}{60}$  days of the inspection, unless permission for a later date is granted in writing by the director. The results of the inspections shall be documented in the SWPPP and shall include at a minimum:

- a. The inspection date and time;
- b. The name(s) and signature(s) names of the inspector(s) inspectors;
- c. Weather information and a description of any discharges occurring at the time of the inspection;
- d. Any previously unidentified discharges of pollutants from the site;
- e. Any control measures needing maintenance or repairs;
- f. Any failed control measures that need replacement;
- g. Any incidents of noncompliance observed; and
- h. Any additional control measures needed to comply with the permit requirements.

C. Maintenance. The SWPPP shall include a description of procedures and a regular schedule for preventive maintenance of all control measures, and shall include a description of the back-up practices that are in place should a runoff event occur while a control measure is off-line. The effectiveness of nonstructural control measures shall also be maintained by appropriate means (e.g., spill response supplies available and personnel trained, etc.).

All control measures identified in the SWPPP shall be maintained in effective operating condition and shall be observed at least annually during active operation (i.e., during a stormwater runoff event) when a stormwater discharge is occurring to ensure that they are functioning correctly. Where discharge locations are inaccessible, nearby downstream locations shall be observed. The observations shall be documented in the SWPPP.

If site routine facility inspections required by Part III B 5 (Routine facility inspections) or Part III E (Comprehensive site compliance evaluation) identify control measures that are not operating effectively, repairs or maintenance shall be performed before the next anticipated storm event. If maintenance prior to the next anticipated storm event is not possible, maintenance shall be scheduled and accomplished as soon as practicable. In the interim, back-up measures shall be employed and documented in the SWPPP until repairs or maintenance is complete. Documentation shall be kept with the SWPPP of maintenance and repairs of control measures, including the date(s) dates of regular maintenance, date(s) dates of discovery of areas in need of repair or replacement, date(s) dates for repairs, date(s) dates that the control measure(s) measures returned to full function, and the justification for any extended maintenance or repair schedules.

D. Nonstormwater discharges.

1. Discharges of certain sources of nonstormwater <u>listed in Part I B 1</u> are allowable discharges under this permit (see Part I B, Special Condition No. 1 – Allowable nonstormwater discharges). All other nonstormwater discharges are not authorized and shall be either eliminated or covered under a separate VPDES permit.

2. Annual outfall evaluation for unauthorized discharges.

a. The SWPPP shall include documentation that all stormwater outfalls associated with industrial activity have been evaluated annually for the presence of unauthorized discharges (i.e., discharges other than stormwater; the authorized nonstormwater discharges described in Part I B, Special Condition No. 1; or discharges covered under a separate VPDES permit, other than this permit). The documentation shall include:

(1) The date of the evaluation;

(2) A description of the evaluation criteria used;

(3) A list of the outfalls or on-site drainage points that were directly observed during the evaluation;

(4) A description of the results of the evaluation for the presence of unauthorized discharges; and

(5) The actions taken to eliminate unauthorized discharges if any were identified (i.e., a floor drain was sealed, a sink drain was rerouted to sanitary, or a VPDES permit application was submitted for a cooling water discharge).

b. The permittee may request in writing to the department that the facility be allowed to conduct annual outfall evaluations at 20% of the outfalls. If approved, the permittee shall evaluate at least 20% of the facility outfalls each year on a rotating basis such that all facility outfalls will be evaluated during the period of coverage under this permit.

E. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. The permittee shall conduct comprehensive site compliance evaluations at least once each calendar year after coverage under the permit begins. The evaluations shall be done by qualified personnel who possess the knowledge and skills to assess conditions and activities that could impact stormwater quality at the facility, and who can also evaluate the effectiveness of control measures. The personnel conducting the evaluations may be either facility employees or outside personnel hired by the facility.

1. Scope of the compliance evaluation. Evaluations shall include all areas where industrial materials or activities are exposed to stormwater, as identified in Part III B 3. The personnel shall evaluate:

a. Industrial materials, residue or trash that may have or could come into contact with stormwater;

b. Leaks or spills from industrial equipment, drums, barrels, tanks or other containers that have occurred within the past three years;

c. Off-site tracking of industrial or waste materials or sediment where vehicles enter or exit the site;

d. Tracking or blowing of raw, final, or waste materials from areas of no exposure to exposed areas;

e. Evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system;

f. Evidence of pollutants discharging to surface waters at all facility outfalls, and the condition of and around the outfall, including flow dissipation measures to prevent scouring;

g. Review of stormwater related training performed, inspections completed, maintenance performed, quarterly visual examinations, and effective operation of control measures, including BMPs;

h. A summary of the annual outfall evaluation for unauthorized discharges required by subdivision D 2 of this section.

i. Results of both visual and any analytical monitoring done during the past year shall be taken into consideration during the evaluation.

2. Based on the results of the evaluation, the SWPPP shall be modified as necessary (e.g., show additional controls on the map required by Part III B 2 c; revise the description of controls required by Part III B 4 to include additional or modified control measures designed to correct problems identified). Revisions to the SWPPP shall be completed within 30 days following the evaluation, unless permission for a later date is granted in writing by the director. If existing control measures need to be modified or if additional control measures are necessary, implementation shall be completed before the next anticipated storm event, if practicable, but not more than 60 days after completion of the comprehensive site evaluation, unless permission for a later date is granted in writing by the department.

3. Compliance evaluation report. A report shall be written summarizing the scope of the evaluation, name(s) of personnel making the evaluation, the date of the evaluation, and all observations relating to the implementation of the SWPPP, including elements stipulated in Part III E 1 (a) through (i) above. Observations shall include such things as: the location(s) of discharges of pollutants from the site; location(s) of previously unidentified sources of pollutants; location(s) of control measures that need to be maintained or repaired; location(s) of failed control measures that need replacement; and location(s) where additional control measures are needed. The report shall identify any incidents of noncompliance that were observed. Where a report does not identify any incidents of noncompliance that were observed. Where a report does not identify any incidents of noncompliance with the SWPPP and this permit. The report shall be signed in accordance with Part II K and maintained with the SWPPP.

4. Where compliance evaluation schedules overlap with routine inspections required under Part III B 5 the annual compliance evaluation may be used as one of the routine inspections.

F. E. Signature and plan SWPPP review.

1. Signature and location. The SWPPP, including revisions to the SWPPP to document any corrective actions taken as required by Part I A 6, shall be signed in accordance with Part II K, dated, and retained on-site at the facility covered by this permit in accordance with Part II B 2. All other changes to the SWPPP, and other permit compliance documentation, shall be signed and dated by the person preparing the change or documentation. For inactive <u>and unstaffed</u> facilities, the plan may be kept at the nearest office of the permittee.

2. Availability. The permittee shall retain a copy of the current SWPPP required by this permit at the facility, and it shall be immediately available to the department, EPA, or the operator of an MS4 receiving discharges from the site at the time of an on-site inspection or upon request.

3. Required modifications. The permittee shall modify the SWPPP whenever necessary to address all corrective actions required by Part I A 6 a (Data exceeding benchmark concentration values) or Part I A 6 b (Corrective actions). Changes to the SWPPP shall be made in accordance with the corrective action deadlines in Part I A 6 a and Part I A 6 b, and shall be signed and dated in accordance with Part III F+E1.

The director may notify the permittee at any time that the SWPPP, control measures, or other components of the facility's stormwater program do not meet one or more of the requirements of this permit. The notification shall identify specific provisions of the permit that are not being met, and may include required modifications to the stormwater program, additional monitoring requirements, and special reporting requirements. The permittee shall make any required changes to the SWPPP within 60 days of receipt of such notification, unless permission for a later date is granted in writing by the director, and shall submit a written certification to the director that the requested changes have been made.

G. F. Maintaining an updated SWPPP.

1. The permittee shall review and amend the SWPPP as appropriate whenever:

a. There is construction or a change in design, operation, or maintenance at the facility that has a significant effect on the discharge, or the potential for the discharge, of pollutants from the facility;

b. Routine inspections or compliance evaluations determine that there are deficiencies in the control measures, including BMPs;

c. Inspections by local, state, or federal officials determine that modifications to the SWPPP are necessary;

d. There is a <u>significant</u> spill, leak, or other release at the facility;

e. There is an unauthorized discharge from the facility; or

f. The department notifies the permittee that a TMDL has been developed and applies to the permitted facility, consistent with Part I B, special condition 7 (Discharges to waters subject to TMDL wasteload allocations).

2. SWPPP modifications shall be made within 30 60 calendar days after discovery, observation or event requiring a SWPPP modification. Implementation of new or modified control measures (distinct from regular preventive maintenance of existing control measures described in Part III C) shall be initiated before the next storm event if possible, but no later than 60 days after discovery, or as otherwise provided or approved by the director. The amount of time taken to modify a control measure or implement additional control measures shall be documented in the SWPPP.

3. If the SWPPP modification is based on a <u>significant spill, leak</u>, release, or unauthorized discharge, include a description and date of the <u>release incident</u>, the circumstances leading to the <u>release incident</u>, actions taken in response to the <u>release incident</u>, and measures to prevent the recurrence of such releases. Unauthorized <del>releases</del> and discharges are subject to the reporting requirements of Part II G of this permit.

## Part IV

### Sector Specific Permit Requirements

The permittee must only comply with the additional requirements of Part IV (9VAC25-151-90 et seq.) that apply to the sector(s) sectors of industrial activity located at the facility. These sector specific requirements are in addition to the "basic" requirements specified in Parts I, II and III of this permit. All numeric effluent limitations and benchmark monitoring concentration values reflect two significant digits, unless otherwise noted.

# 9VAC25-151-90. Sector A - Timber products facilities (including mulch, wood, and bark facilities and mulch dyeing facilities).

A. Discharges covered under this section. <del>1.</del> The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities generally classified under Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Major Group 24 SIC Codes 2491 and 2499 that are engaged in the following activities: [cutting timber and pulpwood (those that have log storage or handling areas), mills, including merchant, lath, shingle, cooperage stock, planing, plywood and veneer, and producing lumber and wood materials;] wood preserving[, manufacturing wood buildings or mobile homes; and manufacturing finished articles made entirely of wood or related materials, except for wood kitchen cabinet manufacturers (SIC Code 2434),] which are addressed under Sector W (9VAC25-151-300). and mulch, wood, and bark facilities, including mulch dyeing operations (SIC Code 24991303).

2. The requirements listed under this section also apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from mulch, wood, and bark facilities, including mulch dyeing operations (SIC Code 24991303).

B. Special conditions.

1. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. Discharges of stormwater from areas where there may be contact with chemical formulations [sprayed applied ]to provide surface protection are not authorized by this permit. [Surface protection includes chemical application to control sap stain, mold, mildew, and insects.] These discharges must be covered under a separate VPDES permit. Discharge of wet dye drippings from mulch dyeing operations are also prohibited.

2. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the discharges described in Part I B 1, the following nonstormwater discharges may be authorized by this permit provided the nonstormwater component of the discharge is in compliance with 9VAC25-151-90 C and the effluent limitations described in 9VAC25-151-90 D: discharges from the spray down of lumber and wood product storage yards where no chemical additives are used in the spray down waters and no chemicals are applied to the wood during storage.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: processing areas; treatment chemical storage areas; treated wood and residue storage areas; wet decking areas; dry decking areas; untreated wood and residue storage areas; and treatment equipment storage areas.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. Where information is available, facilities that have used chlorophenolic, creosote, or chromium copper arsenic formulations for wood surface protection or wood preserving activities on site in the past shall identify in the inventory the following: areas where contaminated soils, treatment equipment, and stored materials still remain, and the management practices employed to minimize the contact of these materials with stormwater runoff.

2. <u>C.</u> Stormwater controls. The description of stormwater management controls shall address the following areas of the site: log, lumber and wood product storage areas; residue storage areas; loading and unloading areas; material handling areas; chemical storage areas; and equipment and vehicle maintenance, storage and repair areas. Facilities that surface protect or preserve wood products shall address specific control measures, including any BMPs, for wood surface protection and preserving activities. Facilities that dye mulch shall address specific control measures to prevent the discharge of wet dye drippings and to prevent seepage of pollutants to groundwater.

The SWPPP shall address the following minimum components:

a. <u>1.</u> Good housekeeping. Good housekeeping measures in storage areas, loading and unloading areas, and material handling areas shall be designed to:

(1) <u>a.</u> Limit the discharge of wood debris;

(2) b. Minimize the leachate generated from decaying wood materials; and

(3) <u>c.</u> Minimize the generation of dust.

b. 2. Routine facility inspections. Inspections at processing areas, transport areas, and treated wood storage areas of facilities performing wood surface protection and preservation activities shall be performed monthly to assess the usefulness of practices in minimizing the deposit of treatment chemicals on unprotected soils and in areas that will come in contact with stormwater discharges. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

D. Numeric effluent limitations.

[In addition to the numeric effluent limitations described in Part I A 1 c, the <u>The</u>] following [<u>numeric effluent</u>] limitations shall be met by existing and new facilities.

Wet deck storage area runoff. Nonstormwater discharges from areas used for the storage of logs where water, without chemical additives, is intentionally sprayed or deposited on logs to deter decay or infestation by insects are required to meet the following effluent limitations: pH shall be within the range of 6.0-9.0, and there will be no discharge of debris. Chemicals are not allowed to be applied to the stored logs. The term "debris" is defined as woody material such as bark, twigs, branches, heartwood or sapwood that will not pass through a 2.54 cm (1 in.) diameter round opening and is present in the discharge from a wet deck storage area. Permittees subject to these numeric limitations shall be in compliance with these limitations through the duration of permit coverage.

Table 90-1		
Sector A - Numeric Effluent Limitations		

Parameter	Effluent Limitations	
Wet Decking Discharges at Log Storage and Handling Areas (SIC Code 2411)		
pH	6.0 - 9.0 s.u.	
Debris (woody material such as bark, twigs, branches, heartwood, or sapwood)	No discharge of debris that will not pass through a 2.54 cm (1") diameter round opening.	

E. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. <u>Timber product Wood preserving</u> facilities; mulch, wood, and bark facilities; and mulch dyeing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in the appropriate section of Table 90-2.

Table 90-2
Sector A - Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration
[General Sawmills and Planing Mills (SIC Code 2421)]	
[Total Suspended Solids (TSS)]	[100 mg/L]
Wood Preserving Facilities (SIC <u>Code</u> 2491)	
Total Recoverable Arsenic <sup>1</sup>	50 µg/L
Total Recoverable Chromium <sup>1</sup>	16 µg/L
Total Recoverable Copper <sup>1</sup>	18 µg/L
[Log Storage and Handling Facilities (SIC Code 2411)]	
[Total Suspended Solids (TSS)]	[100 mg/L]

[Hardwood Dimension and Flooring Mills; Special Products Sawmills, not elsewhere classified; Millwork, Veneer, Plywood and Structural Wood; Wood Containers; Wood Buildings and Mobile Homes; Reconstituted Wood Products; and Wood Products Facilities not elsewhere classified (SIC Codes 2426, 2429, 2431-2439 (except 2434), 2441, 2448, 2449, 2451, 2452, 2493, and 2499).]

[Total Suspended Solids (TSS)]	[100 mg/L]
Mulch, Wood, and Bark Facilities (SIC Code 24991303)	•
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> ) Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	<del>30</del> <u>120</u> mg/L
Facilities with Mulch Dyeing/Coloring Operations (SIC Code 2499130 outfalls from the facility that collect runoff from areas where mulch dye occur, including but not limited to areas where loading, transporting, ar mulch occurs. <sup>2</sup>	eing/coloring activities
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD5)	30 mg/L
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	120 mg/L
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 µg/L
Total Recoverable Arsenic	[ <del>150</del> <u>50]</u> μg/L
Total Recoverable Cadmium	2.1 μg/L
Total Recoverable Chromium	16 µg/L
Total Recoverable Copper	18 μg/L
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L
Total Recoverable Lead	<del>120 μg/L</del>
Total Recoverable Manganese	<del>64 μg/L</del>
Total Recoverable Mercury	<del>1.4 μg/L</del>
Total Recoverable Nickel	<del>470 μg/L</del>
Total Recoverable Selenium	5.0 µg/L
Total Recoverable Silver	3.8 μg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L
Total Phosphorus	2.0 mg/L

<sup>1</sup>Monitoring for metals (arsenic, chromium and copper) is not required for wood preserving facilities using only oil-based preservatives.

<sup>2</sup>Benchmark monitoring waivers are available to facilities utilizing mulch dye or colorant products that do not contain the specified parameters provided that: (i) monitoring from samples collected during one monitoring period demonstrates that the specific parameter in question is below the quantitation level; (ii) a waiver request with attached laboratory certificate of analysis is submitted to and approved by the board (The laboratory certificate of analysis must be submitted with the request. If approved, documentation of this shall be kept with the SWPPP.);

and (iii) a certification statement is submitted to the department annually that the facility does not use mulch dyeing products that contain any of the specifically waived parameters. <u>Approved</u> <u>benchmark monitoring waivers shall be kept with the SWPPP.</u>

# 9VAC25-151-100. Sector B - Paper and allied products manufacturing.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to storm water stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities generally classified under as paperboard mills, SIC Major Group 26 that are engaged in the following activities: the manufacture of pulps from wood and other cellulose fibers and from rags; the manufacture of paper and paperboard into converted products, such as paper coated off the paper machine, paper bags, paper boxes and envelopes; and the manufacture of bags of plastic film and sheet Code 2631.

B. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Paperboard mills are required to monitor their storm water stormwater discharges for the pollutants pollutant of concern listed in Table 100.

Table 100.
Sector B – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements.

Pollutants of Concern Benchmark Concentration	
Paperboard Mills (SIC Code 2631)	
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	30 mg/L

# 9VAC25-151-110. Sector C - Chemical and allied products manufacturing.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities engaged in manufacturing the following products and generally described by the SIC code shown:

1. Basic industrial Industrial inorganic chemicals (including SIC Code 281) Codes 2812-2819);

2. Plastic materials and synthetic resins, synthetic rubbers, and cellulosic and other humanmade synthetic fibers, except glass (including SIC Code 282) Codes 2821-2824);

3. Medicinal chemicals and pharmaceutical products, including the grading, grinding and milling of botanicals (including SIC Code 283);

4. <u>3.</u> Soap and other detergents, including facilities producing glycerin from vegetable and animal fats and oils; specialty cleaning, polishing, and sanitation preparations; surface active preparations used as emulsifiers, wetting agents, and finishing agents, including sulfonated oils; and perfumes, cosmetics, and other toilet preparations (including SIC Code 284) Codes 2841-2844); and

5. Paints (in paste and ready mixed form); varnishes; lacquers; enamels and shellac; putties, wood fillers, and sealers; paint and varnish removers; paint brush cleaners; and allied paint products (including SIC Code 285);

6. Industrial organic chemicals (including SIC Code 286);

7. <u>4.</u> Nitrogenous and phosphatic basic fertilizers, mixed fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural chemicals (including SIC Code 287) (SIC Codes 2873-2879). Note: SIC Code 287 includes Composting Facilities (SIC Code 2875) are included.

8. Industrial and household adhesives, glues, caulking compounds, sealants, and linoleum, tile, and rubber cements from vegetable, animal, or synthetic plastics materials; explosives; printing ink, including gravure ink, screen process and lithographic inks; miscellaneous chemical preparations, such as fatty acids, essential oils, gelatin (except vegetable), sizes, bluing, laundry sours, and writing and stamp pad ink; industrial compounds, such as boiler and heat insulating compounds; and chemical supplies for foundries (including SIC Code 289); and

9. Ink and paints, including china painting enamels, India ink, drawing ink, platinum paints for burnt wood or leather work, paints for china painting, artists' paints and artists' water colors (SIC Code 3952, limited to those listed; for others in SIC Code 3952 not listed above, see Sector Y (9VAC25-151-320)).

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general prohibition of nonstormwater discharges in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: inks, paints, or substances (hazardous, nonhazardous, etc.) resulting from an on site spill, including materials collected in drip pans;

washwaters from material handling and processing areas; or washwaters from drum, tank, or container rinsing and cleaning.

C. <u>B.</u> Numeric effluent limitations. [In addition to the numeric effluent limitations described in Part I A 1 c, the <u>The</u>] following [<u>numeric</u>] effluent limitations shall be met by existing and new discharges with phosphate fertilizer manufacturing runoff. The provisions of this paragraph are applicable to stormwater discharges from the phosphate subcategory of the fertilizer manufacturing point source category (40 CFR 418.10). The term contaminated stormwater runoff shall mean precipitation runoff, that during manufacturing or processing, comes into contact with any raw materials, intermediate product, finished product, by-products or waste product. The concentration of pollutants in stormwater discharges shall not exceed the effluent limitations in Table 110-1.

Table 110-1
Sector C – Numeric Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Effluent Limitations	
ratameter	Daily Maximum	30-day Average
Phosphate Subcategory of the Fertilizer Manufacturing Point Source Category (40 CFR 418.10) - applies to precipitation runoff that, during manufacturing or processing, comes into contact with any raw materials, intermediate product, finished product, by-products or waste product (SIC <u>Code</u> 2874)		

Total Phosphorus (as P)	105 mg/L	35 mg/L
Fluoride	75 mg/L	25 mg/L

D. C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Agricultural chemical manufacturing facilities; industrial inorganic chemical facilities; soaps, detergents, cosmetics, and perfume manufacturing facilities; and plastics, synthetics, and resin manufacturing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 110-2 below.

	Benchmark
Pollutants of Concern	Concentration
Agricultural Chemicals (SIC Codes 2873-2879)	
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L
Total Phosphorus	2.0 mg/L
Industrial Inorganic Chemicals (SIC Codes 2812-2819)	-
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L
Soaps, Detergents, Cosmetics, and Perfumes (SIC Codes 2841-2844	)
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L
Plastics, Synthetics, and Resins (SIC Codes 2821-2824)	
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L
Composting Facilities (SIC Code 2875)	

 Table 110-2

 Sector C – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	30 mg/L
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	120 mg/L
Ammonia	2.14 mg/L
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L
Total Phosphorus	2.0 mg/L

## 9VAC25-151-130. Sector E - Glass, clay Clay, cement, concrete, and gypsum products.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities generally classified under SIC Major Group 32 Codes 3251-3259, 3261-3269, 3274, and 3275 that are engaged in either manufacturing the following products or performing the following activities: flat, pressed, or blown glass or glass containers; hydraulic cement; structural clay products including tile and brick; pottery and porcelain electrical supplies; and concrete, plaster, and gypsum products; nonclay refractories; minerals and earths, ground or otherwise treated; lime manufacturing; cut stone and stone products; asbestos products; and mineral wool and mineral wool insulation products.

Concrete block and brick facilities (SIC Code 3271), concrete products facilities, except block and brick (SIC Code 3272), and ready-mixed concrete facilities (SIC Code 3273) are not covered by this permit.

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the plan shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Site description and site map. The site map shall identify the locations of the following, if applicable: bag house or other dust control device; recycle or sedimentation pond, clarifier or other device used for the treatment of process wastewater and the areas that drain to the treatment device.

2. Stormwater controls. Good housekeeping.

a. B. Stormwater controls. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

<u>1.</u> Facilities shall prevent or minimize the discharge of: spilled cement; aggregate (including sand or gravel); kiln dust; fly ash; settled dust; and other significant materials in stormwater from paved portions of the site that are exposed to stormwater. Measures used to minimize the presence of these materials may include regular sweeping, or other equivalent measures. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall indicate the frequency of sweeping or equivalent measures. The frequency shall be determined based upon consideration of the amount of industrial activity occurring in the area and frequency of precipitation, but shall not be less than once per week if cement, aggregate, kiln dust[ $\frac{1}{2}$ ] fly ash, or settled dust are being handled or processed.

b. 2. Facilities shall prevent the exposure of fine granular solids (such as cement, fly ash, kiln dust, etc.) to stormwater. Where practicable, these materials shall be stored in enclosed silos or hoppers, buildings, or under other covering.

C. Numeric effluent limitations. [In addition to the numeric effluent limitations described by Part I A 1 c, the <u>The</u>] following [<u>numeric effluent</u>] limitations shall be met by existing and new facilities: <u>with</u> cement manufacturing facility, and material storage runoff. Any discharge composed of runoff that derives from the storage of materials, including raw materials, intermediate products, finished products, and waste materials that are used in or derived from the manufacture of cement, shall not exceed the limitations in Table 130-1. Runoff from the storage piles shall not be diluted with other stormwater runoff or flows to meet these limitations. Any untreated overflow from facilities designed, constructed and operated to treat the volume of material storage pile runoff that is associated with a 10-year, 24-hour rainfall event shall not be subject to the TSS or pH limitations. Facilities subject to these numeric effluent limitations shall be in compliance with these limits upon commencement of coverage and for the entire term of this permit.

Daramatar	Effluent Limitations		
Parameter	Daily Maximum	30-day Average	

 Table 130-1

 Sector E – Numeric Effluent Limitations

Cement Manufacturing Facility, Material Storage Runoff: Any discharge composed of runoff that derives from the storage of materials including raw materials, intermediate products, finished products, and waste materials that are used in or derived from the manufacture of cement.

Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	50 mg/L	
pH	6.0 - 9.0 s.u.	

D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Clay product manufacturers (SIC <u>Codes</u> 3251-3259, SIC <u>Codes</u> 3261-3269) and lime and gypsum product manufacturers (SIC <u>Codes</u> 3274, 3275) are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 130-2.

 Table 130-2

 Sector E – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration		
Clay Product Manufacturers (SIC Codes 3251-3259, 3261-3269)			
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 ug/L		
Lime and Gypsum Product Manufacturers (SIC Codes 3274, 3275)			
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) 100 mg/L			
pH	6.0 - 9.0 s.u.		
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L		

## 9VAC25-151-140. Sector F - Primary metals.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from the following types of facilities in the primary metal industry, and generally described by the SIC <u>code codes</u> shown:

1. Steel works, blast furnaces, and rolling and finishing mills, including: steel wire drawing and steel nails and spikes; cold-rolled steel sheet, strip, and bars; and steel pipes and tubes (SIC Code 331) Codes 3312-3317).

2. Iron and steel foundries, including: gray and ductile iron, malleable iron, steel investment, and steel foundries not elsewhere classified (SIC Code 332) Codes 3321-3325).

3. Primary smelting and refining of nonferrous metals, including: primary smelting and refining of copper, and primary production of aluminum (SIC Code 333).

4. Secondary smelting and refining of nonferrous metals (SIC Code 334).

5. <u>3.</u> Rolling, drawing, and extruding of nonferrous metals, including: rolling, drawing, and extruding of copper; rolling, drawing and extruding of nonferrous metals except copper and aluminum; and drawing and insulating of nonferrous wire (SIC Code 335) Codes 3351-3357).

6. <u>4.</u> Nonferrous foundries (castings), including: aluminum die-castings, nonferrous die-castings, except aluminum, aluminum foundries, copper foundries, and nonferrous foundries, except copper and aluminum (SIC Code 336) Codes 3363-3369).

7. Miscellaneous primary metal products, not elsewhere classified, including: metal heat treating, and primary metal products, not elsewhere classified (SIC Code 339).

Activities covered include, but are not limited to, stormwater discharges associated with coking operations, sintering plants, blast furnaces, smelting operations, rolling mills, casting operations, heat treating, extruding, drawing, or forging of all types of ferrous and nonferrous metals, scrap, and ore.

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the plan shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following activities may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: storage or disposal of wastes such as spent solvents and baths, sand, slag and dross; liquid storage tanks and drums; processing areas including pollution control equipment (e.g., baghouses); and

storage areas of raw materials such as coal, coke, scrap, sand, fluxes, refractories, or metal in any form. In addition, indicate sources where an accumulation of significant amounts of particulate matter could occur from such sources as furnace or oven emissions, losses from coal and coke handling operations, etc., and that could result in a discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The inventory of materials handled at the site that potentially may be exposed to precipitation or runoff shall include areas where deposition of particulate matter from process air emissions or losses during material handling activities are possible.

#### 2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping. The permittee shall implement the following measures, or equivalent measures, where applicable.

(1) Establishment of a cleaning and maintenance program for all impervious areas of the facility where particulate matter, dust, or debris may accumulate, especially areas where material loading and unloading, storage, handling, and processing occur.

(2) The paving of areas, where practicable, where vehicle traffic or material storage occur, but where vegetative or other stabilization methods are not practicable. Sweeping programs shall be instituted in these areas as well.

(3) For unstabilized areas of the facility where sweeping is not practical, the permittee shall consider using stormwater management devices such as sediment traps, vegetative buffer strips, filter fabric fence, sediment filtering boom, gravel outlet protection, or other equivalent measures, that effectively trap or remove sediment.

b. Routine facility inspections. Inspections shall be conducted quarterly. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status. Inspections shall address all potential sources of pollutants, including (if applicable):

(1) Air pollution control equipment (e.g., baghouses, electrostatic precipitators, scrubbers, and cyclones) shall be inspected for any signs of degradation (e.g., leaks, corrosion, or improper operation) that could limit their efficiency and lead to excessive emissions. The permittee shall consider monitoring air flow at inlets and outlets, or equivalent measures, to check for leaks (e.g., particulate deposition) or blockage in ducts;

(2) All process or material handling equipment (e.g., conveyors, cranes, and vehicles) shall be inspected for leaks, drips, or the potential loss of materials; and

(3) Material storage areas (e.g., piles, bins or hoppers for storing coke, coal, scrap, or slag, as well as chemicals stored in tanks and drums) shall be examined for signs of material losses due to wind or stormwater runoff.

C. <u>B.</u> Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Primary metals facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 140 below.

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Steel Works, Blast Furnaces, and Rolling and Finishing Mills (SIC Codes 3312-3317)		
Total Recoverable Aluminum 750 µg/L		
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L	
Iron and Steel Foundries (SIC Codes 3321-3325)		
Total Recoverable Aluminum 750 µg/L		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L	

 Table 140

 Sector F – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L		
Rolling, Drawing, and Extruding of Nonferrous Metals (SIC Codes 3351-3357)			
Total Recoverable Copper 18 µg/L			
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L		
Nonferrous Foundries (SIC Codes 3363-3369)			
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L		
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L		

# 9VAC25-151-150. Sector G - Metal mining (ore mining and dressing).

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from active, temporarily inactive and inactive metal mining and ore dressing facilities including mines abandoned on federal lands, as classified under SIC Major Group 10. Coverage is required for facilities that discharge stormwater that has come into contact with, or is contaminated by, any overburden, raw material, intermediate product, finished product, byproduct, or waste product located on the site of the operation. SIC Major Group 10 includes establishments primarily engaged in mining of ores, developing mines, or exploring for metallic minerals (ores) and also includes ore dressing and beneficiating operations, whether performed at colocated, dedicated mills or at separate mills, such as custom mills. For the purposes of this section, the term "metal mining" includes any of the separate activities listed <del>above</del> in this subsection. Covered discharges include:

1. All stormwater discharges from inactive facilities;

2. Stormwater discharges from the following areas of active and temporarily inactive metal mining facilities: waste rock and overburden piles if composed entirely of stormwater and not combining with mine drainage; topsoil piles; off-site haul and access roads; on-site haul and access roads constructed of waste rock and overburden if composed entirely of stormwater and not combining with mine drainage; on-site haul and access roads not constructed of waste rock, overburden, or spent ore except if mine drainage is used for dust control; runoff from tailings dams and dikes when not constructed of waste rock or tailings and no process fluids are present; runoff from tailings dams or dikes when constructed of waste rock or tailings and no process fluids are present if composed entirely of stormwater and not combining with mine drainage; concentration building if no contact with material piles; mill site if no contact with material piles; office or administrative building and housing if mixed with stormwater from industrial area; chemical storage area; docking facility if no excessive contact with waste product that would otherwise constitute mine drainage; unreclaimed, disturbed areas outside of active mining area; reclaimed areas released from reclamation bonds prior to December 17, 1990; and partially or inadequately reclaimed areas or areas not released from reclamation bonds;

3. Stormwater discharges from exploration and development of metal mining and ore dressing facilities; and

4. Stormwater discharges from facilities at mining sites undergoing reclamation.

B. Limitations on coverage. Stormwater discharges from active metal mining facilities that are subject to the effluent limitation guidelines for the Ore Mining and Dressing Point Source Category (40 CFR Part 440) are not authorized by this permit.

Note: Discharges that come in contact with overburden and waste rock are subject to 40 CFR Part 440, providing: the discharges drain to a point source (either naturally or as a result of intentional diversion), and they combine with mine drainage that is otherwise regulated under 40 CFR Part 440. Discharges from overburden and waste rock can be covered under this permit if they are composed entirely of stormwater and do not combine with sources of mine drainage that are subject to 40 CFR Part 440.

C. Special Conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general prohibition of nonstormwater discharges in Part I B 1, the following discharge is not covered by this permit: adit drainage. Contaminated seeps and springs discharging from waste rock dumps that do not directly result from precipitation events are also not authorized by this permit.

D. Special definitions. The following definitions are not intended to supersede the definitions of active and inactive mining facilities established by 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(iii), and are only for this section of the general permit:

"Active metal mining facility" means a place where work or other related activity to the extraction, removal, or recovery of metal ore is being conducted. For surface mines, this definition does not include any land where grading has returned the earth to a desired contour and reclamation has begun.

"Active phase" means activities including the extraction, removal, or recovery of metal ore. For surface mines, this definition does not include any land where grading has returned the earth to a desired contour and reclamation has begun.

"Construction phase" means the building of site access roads and removal of overburden and waste rock to expose mineable minerals. The construction phase is not considered part of "mining operations."

"Exploration phase" entails means exploration and land disturbance activities to determine the financial viability of a site. The exploration phase is not considered part of "mining operations."

"Final stabilization"- <u>means</u> a site or portion of a site is "finally stabilized" when <u>where</u> all applicable federal and state reclamation requirements have been implemented.

"Inactive metal mining facility" means a site or portion of a site where metal mining or milling occurred in the past but is not an active facility as defined in this permit, and where the inactive portion is not covered by an active mining permit issued by the applicable federal or state agency. An inactive metal mining facility has an identifiable owner or operator. Sites where mining claims are being maintained prior to disturbances associated with the extraction, beneficiation, or processing of mined materials and sites where minimal activities are undertaken for the sole purpose of maintaining a mining claim are not considered either active or inactive mining facilities and do not require a VPDES industrial stormwater permit.

"Mining operation" consists of means the active and temporarily inactive phases and the reclamation phase, but excludes the exploration and construction phases.

"Reclamation phase" means activities undertaken, in compliance with applicable mined land reclamation requirements, following the cessation of the "active phase," intended to return the land to an appropriate post-mining land use in order to meet applicable federal and state reclamation requirements. The reclamation phase is considered part of "mining operations."

"Temporarily inactive metal mining facility" means a site or portion of a site where metal mining or milling occurred in the past but currently are not being actively undertaken, and the facility is covered by an active mining permit issued by the applicable federal or state agency.

E. Clearing, grading, and excavation activities. Clearing, grading, and excavation activities being conducted as part of the exploration and construction phase of mining activities are covered under this permit.

1. Management practices for clearing, grading, and excavation activities.

a. Selecting and installing control measures. A combination of erosion and sedimentation control measures are required to achieve maximum pollutant prevention and removal. All control measures shall be properly selected, installed, and maintained in accordance with any relevant manufacturer specifications and good engineering practices.

b. Good housekeeping. Litter, debris, and chemicals shall be prevented from becoming a pollutant source in stormwater discharges.

c. Retention and detention of stormwater runoff. For drainage locations serving more than one acre, sediment basins or temporary sediment traps should be used. At a minimum, silt fences, vegetative buffer strips, or equivalent sediment controls are required for all down slope boundaries (and for those side slope boundaries deemed appropriate as dictated by individual site conditions) of the development area unless a sediment basin providing storage for a calculated volume of runoff from a two-year, 24-hour storm or 3,600 cubic feet of storage per acre drained is provided. Sediment shall be removed from sediment traps or sedimentation ponds when the design capacity has been reduced by 50%.

d. Temporary stabilization of disturbed areas. Stabilization measures shall be initiated immediately in portions of the site where development activities have temporarily ceased, but in no case more than 14 days after the clearing, grading, and excavation activities in that portion of the site have temporarily ceased. In arid, semi-arid, and drought-stricken areas, or in areas subject to snow or freezing conditions, where initiating perennial vegetative stabilization measures is not possible within 14 days after mining, exploration, or construction activity has temporarily ceased, final temporary vegetative stabilization measures shall be

initiated as soon as practicable. Until temporary vegetative stabilization is achieved, interim measures such as erosion control blankets with an appropriate seed base and tackifiers shall be employed. In areas of the site where exploration or construction has permanently ceased prior to active mining, temporary stabilization measures shall be implemented to minimize mobilization of sediment or other pollutants until such time as the active mining phase commences.

2. Requirements for inspection of clearing, grading, and excavation activities.

a. Inspection frequency. Inspections shall be conducted at least once every seven calendar days or at least once every 14 calendar days and within 24 hours of the end of a storm event of 0.5 inches or greater. Inspection frequency may be reduced to at least once every month if the entire site is temporarily stabilized, if runoff is unlikely due to winter (e.g., site is covered with snow or ice) or frozen conditions, or construction is occurring during seasonal dry periods in arid areas and semi-arid areas.

b. Location of inspections. Inspections shall include all areas of the site disturbed by clearing, grading, and excavation activities and areas used for storage of materials that are exposed to precipitation. Sedimentation and erosion control measures identified in the SWPPP shall be observed to ensure proper operation. Discharge locations shall be inspected to ascertain whether erosion control measures are effective in preventing significant impacts to surface waters, where accessible. Where discharge locations are inaccessible, nearby downstream locations shall be inspected to the extent that such inspections are practicable. Locations where vehicles enter or exit the site shall be inspected for evidence of off-site sediment tracking.

c. Inspection reports. For each inspection required above in this subsection, an inspection report shall be completed. At a minimum, the inspection report shall include:

(1) The inspection date;

(2) Names, titles, and qualifications of personnel making the inspection;

(3) Weather information for the period since the last inspection (or note if it is the first inspection) including a best estimate of the beginning of each storm event, duration of each storm event, approximate amount of rainfall for each storm event (in inches), and whether any discharges occurred;

(4) Weather information and a description of any discharges occurring at the time of the inspection;

(5) Location(s) Locations of discharges of sediment or other pollutants from the site;

(6) Location(s) Locations of control measures that need to be maintained;

(7) <u>Location(s)</u> <u>Locations</u> of control measures that failed to operate as designed or proved inadequate for a particular location;

(8) Location(s) Locations where additional control measures are needed that did not exist at the time of inspection; and

(9) Corrective action(s) actions required, including any changes to the SWPPP necessary and implementation dates.

A record of each inspection and of any actions taken in accordance with this section shall be retained as part of the SWPPP for at least three years from the date that permit coverage expires or is terminated. The inspection reports shall identify any incidents of noncompliance with the permit conditions. Where a report does not identify any incidents of noncompliance, the report shall contain a certification that the clearing, grading, and excavation activities are in compliance with the SWPPP and this permit. The report shall be signed in accordance with Part II K of the permit.

3. Requirements for cessation of clearing, grading, and excavation activities.

a. Inspections and maintenance. Inspections and maintenance of control measures, including BMPs, associated with clearing, grading, and excavation activities being conducted as part of the exploration and construction phase of a mining operation shall continue until final stabilization has been achieved on all portions of the disturbed area, or until the commencement of the active mining phase for those areas that have been temporarily stabilized as a precursor to mining.

b. Final stabilization. Stabilization measures shall be initiated immediately in portions of the site where exploration or construction activities have permanently ceased, but in no case more than 14 days after the exploration or construction activity in that portion of the site has permanently ceased. In arid, semi-arid, and

drought-stricken areas, or in areas subject to snow or freezing conditions, where initiating perennial vegetative stabilization measures is not possible within 14 days after exploration or construction activity has permanently ceased, final vegetative stabilization measures shall be initiated as soon as possible. Until final stabilization is achieved temporary stabilization measures, such as erosion control blankets with an appropriate seed base and tackifiers, shall be used.

F. Stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements for active, inactive, and temporarily inactive metal mining facilities and sites undergoing reclamation. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Activities at the facility. A description of the mining and associated activities taking place at the site that can potentially affect stormwater discharges covered by this permit. The description shall include a general description of the location of the site relative to major transportation routes and communities.

b. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations of the following, as appropriate: mining and milling site boundaries; access and haul roads; an outline of the drainage areas of each stormwater outfall within the facility, and an indication of the types of discharges from the drainage areas; <del>location(s)</del> <u>locations</u> of all permitted discharges covered under an individual VPDES permit; outdoor equipment storage, fueling and maintenance areas; materials handling areas; outdoor manufacturing, storage or material disposal areas; outdoor storage areas for chemicals and explosives; areas used for storage of overburden, materials, soils or wastes; location of mine drainage (where water leaves mine) or any other process water; tailings piles and ponds, both proposed and existing; heap leach pads; points of discharge from the property for mine drainage and process water; surface waters; boundary of tributary areas that are subject to effluent limitations guidelines; and <del>location(s)</del> <u>locations</u> of reclaimed areas.

2. Summary of potential pollutant sources. For each area of the mine or mill site where stormwater discharges associated with industrial activities occur, the plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall identify the types of pollutants likely to be present in significant amounts (e.g., heavy metals, sediment). The following factors shall be considered: the mineralogy of the ore and waste rock (e.g., acid forming); toxicity and quantity of chemicals used, produced or discharged; the likelihood of contact with stormwater; vegetation of site, if any; and history of significant leaks and spills of toxic or hazardous pollutants. A summary of any existing ore or waste rock and overburden characterization data and test results for potential generation of acid rock shall also be included. If the ore or waste rock and overburden characterization data are updated due to a change in the ore type being mined, the SWPPP shall be updated with the new data.

3. Stormwater controls.

a. Routine facility inspections. Except for areas subject to clearing, grading, and excavation activities subject to subdivision E 2 of this section, sites shall be inspected at least quarterly unless adverse weather conditions make the site inaccessible. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

b. Employee training. Employee training shall be conducted at least annually at active mining and temporarily inactive sites. All employee training shall be documented in the SWPPP.

c. Structural control measures. In addition to the control measures required by Part III B 4, each of the following control measures shall be considered documented in the SWPPP. The potential pollutants identified in subdivision 1 + b 2 of this subsection shall determine the priority and appropriateness of the control measures selected. If control measures are implemented or planned but are not listed here (e.g., substituting a less toxic chemical for a more toxic one), descriptions of them shall be included in the SWPPP.

(1) Stormwater diversion. A description of how and where stormwater will be diverted away from potential pollutant sources to prevent stormwater contamination. Control measure options may measures shall include one or more of the following: interceptor dikes and swales; diversion dikes, curbs and berms; pipe slope drains; subsurface drains; drainage and stormwater conveyance systems (channels or gutters, open top box culverts and waterbars; rolling dips and road sloping; roadway surface water deflector and culverts) or equivalent measures.

(a) Interceptor dikes and swales;

(b) Diversion dikes, curbs, and berms;

(c) Pipe slope drains;

(d) Subsurface drains;

(e) Drainage and stormwater conveyance systems; or

(f) Equivalent measures.

(2) Capping. When capping of a contaminant source is necessary, the source being capped and materials and procedures used to cap the contaminant source shall be identified.

(3) Treatment. If treatment of a stormwater discharge is necessary to protect water quality, include a description of the type and location of stormwater treatment that will be used. Stormwater treatments include the following: chemical or physical systems; oil and water separators; artificial wetlands; etc. The permittee is encouraged to use both passive and active treatment of stormwater runoff. Treated runoff may be discharged as a stormwater source regulated under this permit provided the discharge is not combined with discharges subject to effluent limitation guidelines for the Ore Mining and Dressing Point Source Category (40 CFR Part 440).

(4) Certification of discharge testing. The permittee shall test or evaluate all outfalls covered under this permit for the presence of specific mining-related nonstormwater discharges such as seeps or adit discharges or discharges subject to effluent limitations guidelines (e.g., 40 CFR Part 440), such as mine drainage or process water. Alternatively (if applicable), the <u>The</u> permittee may certify in the SWPPP that a particular discharge composed of commingled stormwater and nonstormwater is covered under a separate VPDES permit; and that permit subjects the nonstormwater portion to effluent limitations prior to any commingling. This certification shall identify the nonstormwater discharge by the <u>permit(s) permits</u>, and the points at which the limitations are applied.

G. Termination of permit coverage.

1. Termination of permit coverage for sites reclaimed after December 17, 1990. A site or a portion of a site that has been released from applicable state or federal reclamation requirements after December 17, 1990, is no longer required to maintain coverage under this permit. If the site or portion of a site reclaimed after December 17, 1990, was not subject to reclamation requirements, the site or portion of the site is no longer required to maintain coverage under this permit of the site has been reclaimed as defined in subdivision 2 of this subsection.

2. Termination of permit coverage for sites reclaimed before December 17, 1990. A site or portion of a site that was released from applicable state or federal reclamation requirements before December 17, 1990, or that was otherwise reclaimed before December 17, 1990, is no longer required to maintain coverage under this permit if the site or portion of the site has been reclaimed. A site or portion of a site is considered to have been reclaimed if: (i) stormwater runoff that comes into contact with raw materials, intermediate byproducts, finished products, and waste products does not have the potential to cause or contribute to violations of state water quality standards, (ii) soil-disturbing activities related to minimize soil erosion, and (iv) as appropriate depending on location, size, and the potential to contribute pollutants to stormwater discharges, the site or portion of the site has been revegetated, will be amenable to natural revegetation, or will be left in a condition consistent with the post-mining land use.

H. Inactive and unstaffed sites. Permittees in Sector G seeking to exercise a waiver from the quarterly visual assessment monitoring and routine facility inspection requirements for inactive and unstaffed sites (including temporarily inactive sites) are conditionally exempt from the requirement to certify that "there are no industrial materials or activities exposed to stormwater" in Part I A 4.

This exemption is conditioned on the following:

1. If circumstances change and the facility becomes active or staffed, this exception no longer applies and the permittee shall immediately begin complying with the quarterly visual assessment and routine facility inspection requirements; and

2. The board retains the authority to revoke this exemption and the monitoring waiver when it is determined that the discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an instream excursion above an applicable water quality standard, including designated uses.

Subject to the two conditions in subdivisions 1 and 2 of this subsection, if a facility is inactive and unstaffed, the permittee is waived from the requirement to conduct quarterly visual assessments monitoring and routine facility inspections. The permittee is not waived from conducting the Part III E comprehensive site inspection at least one routine facility inspection per calendar year. The board encourages the permittee to inspect the site more frequently when there is reason to believe that severe weather or natural disasters may have damaged control measures.

I. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Note: There are no benchmark monitoring requirements for inactive and unstaffed sites that have received a waiver in accordance with Part I A 4 (Inactive and unstaffed sites).

1. Copper ore mining and dressing facilities. Active copper ore mining and dressing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 150-1 below.

2. Discharges from waste rock and overburden piles at active sites. Discharges from waste rock and overburden piles at active sites shall be analyzed for the parameters listed in Table 150-2. Facilities shall also monitor for the parameters listed in Table 150-3. The director may also notify the facility that additional monitoring must be performed to accurately characterize the quality and quantity of pollutants discharged from the waste rock or overburden piles.

#### Table 150-1

Sector G – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements - Copper Ore Mining and Dressing Facilities

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration		
Active Copper Ore Mining and Dressing Facilities (SIC Code 1021)			
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L		

### Table 150-2

Sector G – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements - Discharges from Waste Rock and Overburden Piles from Active Ore Mining or Dressing Facilities

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Iron Ores; Copper Ores; Lead and Zinc Ores; Gold and Silver Ores; Ferroalloy Ores Except Vanadium; Miscellaneous Metal Ores (SIC Codes 1011, 1021, 1031, 1041, 1044, 1061, 1081, 1094, 1099)		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Turbidity (NTUs)	50 NTU	
pH	6.0 - 9.0 s.u.	
Hardness (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	no benchmark value	
Total Recoverable Antimony	640 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Arsenic	50 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Beryllium	130 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Cadmium	2.1 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Lead	120 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Mercury	1.4 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Nickel	470 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Selenium	5.0 µg/L	

Total Recoverable Silver	3.8 μg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L

 Table 150-3

 Sector G – Additional Monitoring Requirements for Discharges from Waste Rock and Overburden Piles from Active Ore Mining or Dressing Facilities

Type of Ore Mined	Pollutants of Concern		
Type of Ore Mined	TSS (mg/L)	pН	Metals, Total Recoverable
Tungsten Ore	X	Х	Arsenic, Cadmium (H), Copper (H), Lead (H), Zinc (H).
Nickel Ore	X	Х	Arsenic, Cadmium (H), Copper (H), Lead (H), Zinc (H).
Aluminum Ore	Х	Х	Iron.
Mercury Ore	X	Х	Nickel (H).
Iron Ore	Х	Х	Iron (Dissolved).
Platinum Ore			Cadmium (H), Copper (H), Mercury, Lead (H), Zinc (H).
Titanium Ore	X	Х	Iron, Nickel (H), Zinc (H).
Vanadium Ore	X	Х	Arsenic, Cadmium (H), Copper (H), Lead (H), Zinc (H).
Copper, Lead, Zinc, Gold, Silver and Molybdenum	X	Х	Arsenic, Cadmium (H), Copper (H), Lead (H), Mercury, Zinc (H).
Uranium, Radium and Vanadium	X	Х	Chemical Oxygen Demand, Arsenic, Radium (Dissolved and Total Recoverable), Uranium, Zinc (H).
Note: (H) indicates that hardness shall also be measured when this pollutant is measured.			

Note: (H) indicates that hardness shall also be measured when this pollutant is measured.

# 9VAC25-151-160. Sector H - Coal mines and coal mining-related facilities.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from coal mining-related areas (SIC Major Group 12) if (i) they are not subject to effluent limitations guidelines under 40 CFR Part 434 or (ii) they are not subject to the standards of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) (30 USC § 1201 et seq.) and the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy's individual permit requirements.

The requirements of this section shall apply to stormwater discharges from coal mining-related activities exempt from SMCRA, including the public financed exemption, the 16-2/3% exemption, the private use exemption, the under 250 tons exemption, the nonincidental tipple exemption, and the exemption for coal piles and preparation plants associated with the end user. Stormwater discharges from the following portions of eligible coal mines and coal mining related facilities may be eligible for this permit: haul roads (nonpublic roads on which coal or coal refuse is conveyed), access roads (nonpublic roads providing light vehicular traffic within the facility property and to public roadways), railroad spurs, sidings, and internal haulage lines (rail lines used for hauling coal within the facility property and to offsite commercial railroad lines or loading areas); conveyor belts, chutes, and aerial tramway haulage areas (areas under and around coal or refuse conveyor areas, including transfer stations); and equipment storage and maintenance yards, coal handling buildings and structures, coal tipples, coal loading facilities and inactive coal mines and related areas (abandoned and other inactive mines, refuse disposal sites and other mining-related areas). B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general prohibition of nonstormwater discharges in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: discharges from pollutant seeps or underground drainage from inactive coal mines and refuse disposal areas that do not result from precipitation events and discharges from floor drains in maintenance buildings and other similar drains in mining and preparation plant areas.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff:

- (1) Haul and access roads;
- (2) Railroad spurs, sliding, and internal hauling lines;
- (3) Conveyor belts, chutes, and aerial tramways;
- (4) Equipment storage and maintenance yards;
- (5) Coal handling buildings and structures;
- (6) Inactive mines and related areas;
- (7) Acidic spoil, refuse or unreclaimed disturbed areas; and
- (8) Liquid storage tanks containing pollutants such as caustics, hydraulic fluids and lubricants.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. A description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities: truck traffic on haul roads and resulting generation of sediment subject to runoff and dust generation; fuel or other liquid storage; pressure lines containing slurry, hydraulic fluid or other potential harmful liquids; and loading or temporary storage of acidic refuse or spoil.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping. As part of the facility's good housekeeping program required by Part III B 4 b (1), the permittee shall consider the following: using sweepers, covered storage, and watering of haul roads to minimize dust generation; and conservation of vegetation (where possible) to minimize erosion.

b. Preventive maintenance. The permittee shall also perform inspections of storage tanks and pressure lines for fuels, lubricants, hydraulic fluid or slurry to prevent leaks due to deterioration or faulty connections; or other equivalent measures.

c. Routine facility inspections. Sites shall be inspected at least quarterly unless adverse weather conditions make the site inaccessible. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

3. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. The evaluation program shall also include inspections for pollutants entering the drainage system from activities located on or near coal mining related areas. Among the areas to be inspected: haul and access roads; railroad spurs, sliding and internal hauling lines; conveyor belts, chutes and aerial tramways; equipment storage and maintenance yards; coal handling buildings and structures; and inactive mines and related areas.

D. Inactive and unstaffed sites. Permittees in Sector H seeking to exercise a waiver from the quarterly visual assessment monitoring and routine facility inspection requirements for inactive and unstaffed sites (including temporarily inactive sites) are conditionally exempt from the requirement to certify that "there are no industrial materials or activities exposed to stormwater" in Part I A 4.

This exemption is conditioned on the following:

1. If circumstances change and the facility becomes active or staffed, this exception no longer applies and the permittee shall immediately begin complying with the quarterly visual assessment monitoring requirements and routine facility inspection requirements; and

2. The board retains the authority to revoke this exemption and the monitoring waiver when it is determined that the discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an instream excursion above an applicable water quality standard, including designated uses.

Subject to the two conditions in subdivisions 1 and 2 of this subsection, if a facility is inactive and unstaffed, the permittee is waived from the requirement to conduct quarterly visual assessments monitoring and routine facility inspections. The permittee is not waived from conducting the Part III E comprehensive a minimum of one annual site inspection. The board encourages the permittee to inspect the site more frequently when there is reason to believe that severe weather or natural disasters may have damaged control measures.

E. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Coal mining facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 160. Note: There are no benchmark monitoring requirements for inactive and unstaffed sites that have received a waiver in accordance with Part I A 4 (Inactive and unstaffed sites).

Sector H - Benchmark Monitoring Requirements			
Pollutants of Concern Benchmark Concentration			
Coal Mines and Related Areas (SIC Codes 1221-1241)			
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L		
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L		

Table 160	
Sector H - Benchmark Monitoring Requirer	nents

#### 9VAC25-151-170. Sector I - Oil and gas extraction and refining. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from oil and gas extraction and refining facilities listed under SIC Major Group 13 which have had a discharge of a reportable quantity (RQ) of oil or a hazardous substance for which notification is required under 40 CFR 110.6, 40 CFR 117.21 or 40 CFR 302.6. These include oil and gas exploration, production, processing, or treatment operations, or transmission facilities that discharge stormwater contaminated by contact with or that has come into contact with any overburden raw material, intermediate products, finished products, by products or waste products located on the site of such operations. Industries in SIC Major Group 13 include the extraction and production of crude oil, natural gas, oil sands and shale; the production of hydrocarbon liquids and natural gas from coal; and associated oilfield service, supply and repair industries. This section also covers petroleum refineries listed under SIC Code 2911.

Contaminated stormwater discharges from petroleum refining or drilling operations that are subject to nationally established BAT or BPT guidelines found at 40 CFR Part 419 and 40 CFR Part 435 respectively are not authorized by this permit.

Note: most contaminated discharges from petroleum refining and drilling facilities are subject to these effluent guidelines and are not eligible for coverage under this permit.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general prohibition of nonstormwater discharges in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: discharges of vehicle and equipment washwater, including tank cleaning operations. Alternatively, washwater discharges must be authorized under a separate VPDES permit, or be discharged to a sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable industrial pretreatment requirements.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: reportable quantity (RQ) releases; locations used for the treatment, storage or disposal of wastes; processing areas and storage areas; chemical mixing areas; construction and drilling areas; all areas subject to the effluent guidelines requirement of "No Discharge" in accordance with 40 CFR 435.32 and the structural controls to achieve compliance with the "No Discharge" requirement.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources.

(1) The plan shall also include a description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities: chemical, cement, mud or gel mixing activities; drilling or mining activities; and equipment cleaning and rehabilitation activities.

(2) The plan shall include information about the RQ release which triggered the permit application requirements, including: the nature of the release (e.g., spill of oil from a drum storage area); the amount of oil or hazardous substance released; amount of substance recovered; date of the release; cause of the release (e.g., poor handling techniques and lack of containment in the area); areas affected by the release, including land and waters; procedure to cleanup release; actions or procedures implemented to prevent or improve response to a release; and remaining potential contamination of stormwater from release (taking into account human health risks, the control of drinking water intakes, and the designated uses of the receiving water).

2. Stormwater controls: Sediment and erosion control. The sediment and erosion control additional documentation requirements for well drillings and sand or shale mining areas are as follows:

a. Site description. Each plan shall provide a description of the following:

(1) A description of the nature of the exploration activity;

(2) Estimates of the total area of the site and the area of the site that is expected to be disturbed due to the exploration activity;

(3) An estimate of the runoff coefficient of the site;

(4) A site map indicating drainage patterns and approximate slopes; and

(5) The name of all receiving water(s).

b. Vegetative controls. The SWPPP shall include a description of vegetative practices designed to preserve existing vegetation where attainable and revegetate open areas as soon as practicable after grade drilling. Such practices may include: temporary or permanent seeding, mulching, sod stabilization, vegetative buffer strips, tree protection practices. The permittee shall initiate appropriate vegetative practices on all disturbed areas within 14 calendar days of the last activity at that area.

c. Procedures in the plan shall provide that all erosion and sedimentation controls on the site are inspected at least once every seven calendar days.

Sector J — Mineral Mining and Dressing (SIC 1411–1499). Facilities described by this sector are not covered by this general permit. Facilities with stormwater discharges that fall under this sector should apply for coverage under the VPDES Nonmetallic Mineral Mining General Permit (VAG 84).

#### 9VAC25-151-180. Sector K - Hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous wastes, including those that are operating under interim status or a permit under subtitle C of RCRA the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (Industrial Activity Code "HZ"). Disposal facilities that have been properly closed and capped, or clean closed, and have no significant materials exposed to stormwater, do not require this permit.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general prohibition of nonstormwater discharges in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, contaminated ground water, laboratory-derived wastewater and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

# C. Definitions.

"Contaminated stormwater" means stormwater that comes in direct contact with landfill wastes, the waste handling and treatment areas, or landfill wastewater as defined in this section. Some specific areas of a landfill that may produce contaminated stormwater include<del>, but are not limited to:</del> the open face of an active landfill with exposed waste (no cover added); the areas around wastewater treatment operations; trucks, equipment or machinery that has been in direct contact with the waste; and waste dumping areas.

"Drained free liquids" means aqueous wastes drained from waste containers (e.g., drums, etc.) prior to landfilling.

"Landfill" means an area of land or an excavation in which wastes are placed for permanent disposal, that is not a land application or land treatment unit, surface impoundment, underground injection well, waste pile, salt dome formation, a salt bed formation, an underground mine or a cave as these terms are defined in 40 CFR 257.2, 40 CFR 258.2 and 40 CFR 260.10.

"Landfill wastewater," as defined in 40 CFR Part 445 (Landfills Point Source Category), means all wastewater associated with, or produced by, landfilling activities except for sanitary wastewater, noncontaminated stormwater,

contaminated ground water, and wastewater from recovery pumping wells. Landfill wastewater includes, but is not limited to, leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, laboratory derived wastewater, contaminated stormwater and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

"Leachate" means liquid that has passed through or emerged from solid waste and contains soluble, suspended, or miscible materials removed from such waste.

"Noncontaminated stormwater" means stormwater that does not come into direct contact with landfill wastes, the waste handling and treatment areas, or landfill wastewater as defined above. Noncontaminated stormwater includes stormwater that flows off the cap, cover, intermediate cover, daily cover, or final cover of the landfill.

D. Numeric effluent limitations. As set forth at 40 CFR Part 445 Subpart A, the numeric limitations in Table 180-1 apply to contaminated stormwater discharges from hazardous waste landfills subject to the provisions of RCRA Subtitle C at 40 CFR Parts 264 (Subpart N) and 265 (Subpart N) except for any of the following facilities:

1. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill only receives wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation directly associated with the landfill;

2. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill receives wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation directly associated with the landfill and also receives other wastes provided the other wastes received for disposal are generated by a facility that is subject to the same provisions in 40 CFR Subchapter N as the industrial or commercial operation or the other wastes received are of similar nature to the wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation;

3. Landfills operated in conjunction with Centralized Waste Treatment centralized waste treatment (CWT) facilities subject to 40 CFR Part 437 so long as the CWT facility commingles the landfill wastewater with other nonlandfill wastewater for discharge. A landfill directly associated with a CWT facility is subject to this part if the CWT facility discharges landfill wastewater separately from other CWT wastewater or commingles the wastewater from its landfill only with wastewater from other landfills; or

4. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill receives wastes from public service activities so long as the company owning the landfill does not receive a fee or other remuneration for the disposal service.

	Effluent Limitations		
Parameter	Maximum Daily	Maximum Monthly Average	
Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities (Industrial Activity Code "HZ") Subject to the Provisions of 40 CFR Part 445 Subpart A.			
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	220 mg/L	56 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	88 mg/L	27 mg/L	
Ammonia	10 mg/L	4.9 mg/L	
Alpha Terpineol	0.042 mg/L	0.019 mg/L	
Aniline	0.024 mg/L	0.015 mg/L	
Benzoic Acid	0.119 mg/L*	0.073 mg/L	
Naphthalene	0.059 mg/L	0.022 mg/L	
p-Cresol	0.024 mg/L	0.015 mg/L	
Phenol	0.048 mg/L	0.029 mg/L	
Pyridine	0.072 mg/L	0.025 mg/L	

Table 180-1 Sector K – Numeric Effluent Limitations

Arsenic (Total)	1.1 mg/L	0.54 mg/L
Chromium (Total)	1.1 mg/L	0.46 mg/L
Zinc (Total)	0.535 mg/L*	0.296 mg/L*
pH	Within the range of 6.0 - 9.0 s.u.	
*These effluent limitations are three significant digits for reporting purposes.		

E. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Permittees with hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities (TSDFs) are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 180-2. These benchmark monitoring eutoff concentrations apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity other than contaminated stormwater discharges from landfills subject to the numeric effluent limitations set forth in Table 180-1.

Table 180-2Sector K – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities (Industrial Activity Code "HZ")		
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	1.5 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	110 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Arsenic	50 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Cadmium	2.1 μg/L	
Total Cyanide	22 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Lead	120 µg/L	
Total Magnesium	64 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Mercury	1.4 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Selenium	5.0 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Silver	3.8 μg/L	

### 9VAC25-151-190. Sector L - Landfills, land application sites and open dumps.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from waste disposal at landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that receive or have received industrial wastes (Industrial Activity Code "LF"), including sites subject to regulation under Subtitle D of RCRA the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Landfills, land application sites, and open dumps that have stormwater discharges from other types of industrial activities such as vehicle maintenance, truck washing, and recycling may be subject to additional requirements specified elsewhere in this permit. This permit does not cover discharges from landfills that receive only municipal wastes. Landfills (including landfills in "post-closure care") that have been properly closed and capped in accordance with 9VAC20-81-160 and 9VAC20-81-170 and have no significant materials exposed to stormwater do not require this permit. Landfills closed in accordance with regulations or permits in effect prior to December 21, 1988, do not require this permit, unless significant materials are exposed to stormwater.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, contaminated ground water, laboratory wastewater, and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

C. Definitions.

"Contaminated stormwater" means stormwater that comes in direct contact with landfill wastes, the waste handling and treatment areas, or landfill wastewater. Some areas of a landfill that may produce contaminated stormwater include, but are not limited to, the working face of an active landfill; the areas around wastewater treatment operations; trucks, equipment, or machinery that has been in direct contact with the waste; and waste dumping areas.

"Drained free liquids" means aqueous wastes drained from waste containers (e.g., drums, etc.) prior to landfilling.

"Landfill wastewater," as defined in 40 CFR Part 445 (Landfills Point Source Category), means all wastewater associated with, or produced by, landfilling activities except for sanitary wastewater, noncontaminated stormwater, contaminated groundwater, and wastewater from recovery pumping wells. Landfill wastewater includes, but is not limited to, leachate, gas collection condensate, drained free liquids, laboratory derived wastewater, contaminated stormwater and contact washwater from washing truck, equipment, and railcar exteriors and surface areas that have come in direct contact with solid waste at the landfill facility.

"Leachate" means liquid that has passed through or emerged from solid waste and contains soluble, suspended, or miscible materials removed from such waste.

"Noncontaminated stormwater" means stormwater that does not come into direct contact with landfill wastes, the waste handling and treatment areas, or landfill wastewater as defined above. Noncontaminated stormwater includes stormwater that flows off the cap, intermediate cover, or final cover of the landfill.

"Open dump" means a site on which any solid waste is placed, discharged, deposited, injected, dumped, or spilled so as to present a threat of a release of harmful substances into the environment or present a hazard to human health. Such a site is subject to the open dump criteria in 9VAC20-81-45.

D. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements in Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

#### 1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: active and closed landfill cells or trenches; active and closed land application areas; locations where open dumping is occurring or has occurred; locations of any known leachate springs or other areas where uncontrolled leachate may commingle with runoff; and leachate collection and handling systems.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The SWPPP shall also include a description of potential pollutant sources associated with any of the following: fertilizer, herbicide, and pesticide application; earth and soil moving; waste hauling and loading and unloading; outdoor storage of significant materials including daily, interim and final cover material stockpiles as well as temporary waste storage areas; exposure of active and inactive landfill and land application areas; uncontrolled leachate flows; and failure or leaks from leachate collection and treatment systems.

## 2. Stormwater controls.

D. Stormwater controls. In addition to the requirements in Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

 $\frac{1}{2}$  a. <u>1</u>. Preventive maintenance program. As part of the preventive maintenance program, the permittee shall maintain: all elements of leachate collection and treatment systems to prevent commingling of leachate with stormwater and the integrity and effectiveness of any intermediate or final cover (including making repairs to the cover as necessary), to minimize the effects of settlement, sinking, and erosion.

b. 2. Routine facility inspections.

(1) <u>a.</u> Inspections of active sites. Operating landfills, open dumps, and land application sites shall be inspected at least once every seven days. Qualified personnel shall inspect areas of landfills that have not yet been finally stabilized, active land application areas, areas used for storage of materials or wastes that are exposed to precipitation, stabilization and structural control measures, leachate collection and treatment systems, and locations where equipment and waste trucks enter and exit the site. Erosion and sediment control measures shall be observed to ensure they are operating correctly. For stabilized sites and areas where land application has been completed, or where the climate is seasonally arid (annual rainfall averages from 0 to 10 inches) or semi-arid (annual rainfall averages from 10 to 20 inches), inspections shall be conducted at least once every month.

(2) <u>b.</u> Inspections of inactive sites. Inactive landfills, open dumps, and land application sites shall be inspected at least quarterly. Qualified personnel shall inspect landfill (or open dump) stabilization and

structural erosion control measures and leachate collection and treatment systems, and all closed land application areas.

e. <u>3.</u> Recordkeeping and internal reporting procedures. Landfill and open dump owners shall provide for a tracking system for the types of wastes disposed of in each cell or trench of a landfill or open dump. Land application site owners shall track the types and quantities of wastes applied in specific areas.

d. <u>4.</u> Annual outfall evaluation for unauthorized discharges. The evaluation shall also be conducted for the presence of leachate and vehicle washwater.

e. <u>5.</u> Sediment and erosion control plan. Landfill and open dump owners shall provide for temporary stabilization of materials stockpiled for daily, intermediate, and final cover. Stabilization practices to consider include, but are not limited to, temporary seeding, mulching, and placing geotextiles on the inactive portions of the stockpiles. Landfill and open dump owners shall provide for temporary stabilization of inactive areas of the landfill or open dump which have an intermediate cover but no final cover. Landfill and open dump owners shall provide for temporary stabilization of any landfill or open dumping areas which have received a final cover until vegetation has established itself. Land application site owners shall also stabilize areas where waste application has been completed until vegetation has been established.

f. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. Areas contributing to a stormwater discharge associated with industrial activities at landfills, open dumps and land application sites shall be evaluated for evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system.

E. Numeric effluent limitations. As set forth at 40 CFR Part 445 Subpart B, the numeric limitations in Table 190-1 apply to contaminated stormwater discharges from municipal solid waste landfills (MSWLFs) that have not been closed in accordance with 40 CFR 258.60, and contaminated stormwater discharges from those landfills that are subject to the provisions of 40 CFR Part 257 (these include CDD landfills (also known as C&D landfills), construction and debris landfills and industrial landfills) except for discharges from any of the following facilities:

1. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill only receives wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation directly associated with the landfill;

2. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill receives wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation directly associated with the landfill and also receives other wastes provided the other wastes received for disposal are generated by a facility that is subject to the same provisions in 40 CFR Subchapter N as the industrial or commercial operation or the other wastes received are of similar nature to the wastes generated by the industrial or commercial operation;

3. Landfills operated in conjunction with centralized waste treatment (CWT) facilities subject to 40 CFR Part 437 so long as the CWT facility commingles the landfill wastewater with other nonlandfill wastewater for discharge. A landfill directly associated with a CWT facility is subject to this part if the CWT facility discharges landfill wastewater separately from other CWT wastewater or commingles the wastewater from its landfill only with wastewater from other landfills; or

4. Landfills operated in conjunction with other industrial or commercial operations when the landfill receives wastes from public service activities so long as the company owning the landfill does not receive a fee or other remuneration for the disposal service.

Table 190-1 Sector L – Numeric Effluent Limitations		
Effluent Limitations		Limitations
Parameter	Maximum Daily	Maximum Monthly Average
Landfills (Industrial Activity Code "LF") that are Subject to the Requirements of 40 CFR Part 445 Subpart B.		
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	140 mg/L	37 mg/L
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	88 mg/L	27 mg/L
Ammonia	10 mg/L	4.9 mg/L

Alpha Terpineol	0.033 mg/L	0.016 mg/L
Benzoic Acid	0.12 mg/L	0.071 mg/L
p-Cresol	0.025 mg/L	0.014 mg/L
Phenol	0.026 mg/L 0.015 mg/L	
Zinc (Total)	0.20 mg/L	0.11 mg/L
pН	Within the range of 6.0 - 9.0 s.u.	

F. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. [Landfill Landfills], land application, and open dump sites are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 190-2. These benchmark monitoring eutoff concentrations apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity other than contaminated stormwater discharges from landfills subject to the numeric effluent limitations set forth in Table 190-1.

 Table 190-2

 Sector L – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Landfills, Land Application Sites and Open Dumps (Industrial Activity Code "LF").		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	

# 9VAC25-151-200. Sector M - Automobile salvage yards.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities engaged in dismantling or wrecking used motor vehicles for parts recycling or resale, and for scrap (SIC Code 5015).

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The map shall include the location of each monitoring point, and an estimation (in acres) of the total area used for industrial activity including, but not limited to, dismantling, storage, and maintenance of used motor vehicle parts. The site map shall also identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: vehicle storage areas; dismantling areas; parts storage areas (e.g., engine blocks, tires, hub caps, batteries, hoods, mufflers); and liquid storage tanks and drums for fuel and other fluids.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The permittee shall assess the potential for the following activities to contribute pollutants to stormwater discharges: vehicle storage areas; dismantling areas; parts storage areas (e.g., engine blocks, tires, hub caps, batteries, and hoods); fueling stations.

2. <u>B.</u> Stormwater controls. <u>In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:</u>

 $\frac{1}{2}$  Spill and leak prevention procedures. All vehicles that are intended to be dismantled shall be properly drained of all fluids prior to being dismantled or crushed, or other equivalent means shall be taken to prevent leaks or spills of fluids upon arrival at the site, or as soon thereafter as feasible. All drained fluids shall be managed to minimize leaks or spills.

b. 2. Inspections. Upon arrival at the site, or as soon thereafter as feasible, vehicles shall be inspected for leaks. Any equipment containing oily parts, hydraulic fluids, any other types of fluids, or mercury switches shall be inspected at least quarterly (four times per year) for signs of leaks. All <u>vessels</u>, <u>containers</u>, <u>or tanks</u> and areas where hazardous materials and general automotive fluids are stored, including, <u>but not limited to</u>, mercury switches, brake fluid, transmission fluid, radiator water, and antifreeze, shall be inspected at least quarterly for leaks. <u>Quarterly inspection records shall be maintained with the SWPPP</u>.

e. <u>3.</u> Employee training. Employee training shall, at a minimum, address the following areas when applicable to a facility: proper handling (collection, storage, and disposal) of oil, used mineral spirits, anti-freeze antifreeze, mercury switches, and solvents.

d. <u>4.</u> Management of runoff. The permittee shall implement control measures to divert, infiltrate, reuse, contain, or otherwise reduce stormwater runoff to minimize pollutants in discharges from the facility. The following management practices shall be <del>considered</del> <u>used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters</u>: [berms or drainage ditches on the property line, to help prevent runon <u>run on</u> from neighboring properties; berms for uncovered outdoor storage of oily parts, engine blocks, and aboveground liquid storage; and the installation of detention ponds, filtering devices, and oil/water separators.]

a. Berms or drainage ditches on the property line used to help prevent run-on from neighboring properties;

b. Berms for uncovered outdoor storage of oily parts and engine blocks;

c. Aboveground liquid storage;

d. The installation of detention ponds, filtering devices, or oil/water separators; and

e. Another control measure used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Automobile salvage yards are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 200.

Sector M – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Automobile Salvage Yards (SIC Code 5015)		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Lead	120 µg/L	

 Table 200

 Sector M – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

## 9VAC25-151-210. Sector N - Scrap recycling and waste recycling facilities and material recovery facilities (MRF).

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities that are engaged in the processing, reclaiming and wholesale distribution of scrap and waste materials such as ferrous and nonferrous metals, paper, plastic, cardboard, glass, animal hides (these types of activities are typically identified as SIC Code 5093), and facilities that are engaged in reclaiming and recycling liquid wastes such as used oil, antifreeze, mineral spirits, and industrial solvents (also identified as SIC Code 5093). Separate permit requirements have been established for recycling facilities that only receive source-separated recyclable materials primarily from nonindustrial and residential sources (also identified as SIC Code 5093) (e.g., common consumer products including paper, newspaper, glass, cardboard, plastic containers, aluminum and tin cans).

Separate permit requirements have also been established for facilities that are engaged in dismantling ships, marine salvaging, and marine wrecking - ships for scrap (SIC <u>Code</u> 4499, limited to those listed; for others in SIC <u>Code</u> 4499 not listed above in this subsection, see Sector Q (9VAC25-151-240)).

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, nonstormwater discharges from turnings containment areas are not covered by this permit (see also subdivision C 2 c of this section). Discharges from containment areas in the absence of a storm event are prohibited unless covered by a separate VPDES permit.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, <del>all</del> facilities are required to comply with the general SWPPP requirement in subdivision 1 of this subsection. <u>the following</u> items are applicable:

Subdivisions 2 through 5 of this subsection have SWPPP requirements for specific types of recycling facilities. The permittee shall implement and describe in the SWPPP a program to address those items that apply. Included are lists of control measure options that, along with any functional equivalents, shall be considered for implementation.

1. Site description. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations where any of the following activities or sources may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: scrap and waste material storage, outdoor scrap and waste processing equipment, and containment areas for turnings exposed to cutting fluids.

2. <u>1.</u> Scrap recycling and waste recycling facilities (nonsource-separated, nonliquid recyclable materials). The following SWPPP special conditions have been established for facilities that receive, process and do wholesale distribution of nonliquid recyclable wastes (e.g., ferrous and nonferrous metals, plastics, glass, cardboard and paper). These facilities may receive both nonrecyclable and recyclable materials. This section is not intended for those facilities that only accept recyclable materials primarily from nonindustrial and residential sources.

a. Inbound recyclable and waste material control program. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include a recyclable and waste material inspection program to minimize the likelihood of receiving materials that may be significant pollutant sources to stormwater discharges. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures shall include one or more of the following</u>:

(1) Provide information and education flyers, brochures and pamphlets to suppliers of scrap and recyclable waste materials on draining and properly disposing of residual fluids prior to delivery to the facility (e.g., from vehicles and equipment engines, radiators, and transmissions, oil-filled transformers, and individual containers or drums), and on removal of mercury switches prior to delivery to the facility;

(2) Establish procedures to minimize the potential of any residual fluids from coming in contact with precipitation or runoff;

(3) Establish procedures for accepting scrap lead-acid batteries. Additional requirements for the handling, storage and disposal or recycling of batteries are contained in the scrap lead-acid battery program provisions in subdivision 2 f of this subsection;

(4) Provide training targeted for those personnel engaged in the inspection and acceptance of inbound recyclable materials; and  $\underline{or}$ 

(5) Establish procedures to ensure that liquid wastes, including used oil, are stored in materially compatible and nonleaking containers and disposed or recycled in accordance with all requirements under the Resource Recovery and Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and other state or local requirements.

b. Scrap and waste material stockpiles and storage (outdoor). The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe measures and controls to minimize contact of stormwater runoff with stockpiled materials, processed materials and nonrecyclable wastes. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Permanent or semipermanent covers;

(2) The use of sediment traps, vegetated swales and strips, catch basin filters, and sand filters to facilitate settling or filtering of pollutants;

(3) Diversion of runoff away from storage areas via dikes, berms, containment trenches, culverts, and surface grading;

(4) Silt fencing; and

(5) Oil/water separators, sumps, and dry adsorbents for areas where potential sources of residual fluids are stockpiled (e.g., automotive engine storage areas); or

(6) Another control measure used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

c. Stockpiling of turnings exposed to cutting fluids (outdoor storage). The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall implement measures necessary to minimize contact of surface runoff with residual cutting fluids. Control measure options (use singularly or in combination) measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Storage of all turnings exposed to cutting fluids under some form of permanent or semipermanent cover. Stormwater discharges from these areas are permitted provided the runoff is first treated by an oil/water separator or its equivalent. Procedures to collect, handle, and dispose or recycle residual fluids that may be present shall be identified in the plan <u>SWPPP</u>; or

(2) Establish dedicated containment areas for all turnings that have been exposed to cutting fluids. Stormwater runoff from these areas can be discharged provided:

(a) The containment areas are constructed of either concrete, asphalt or other equivalent type of impermeable material;

(b) There is a barrier around the perimeter of the containment areas to prevent contact with stormwater <del>runon</del> <u>run-on</u> (e.g., berms, curbing, elevated pads, etc.);

(c) There is a drainage collection system for runoff generated from containment areas;

(d) There is a schedule to maintain the oil/water separator (or its equivalent); and

(e) Procedures are identified for the proper disposal or recycling of collected residual fluids.

d. Scrap and waste material stockpiles and storage (covered or indoor storage). The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall address measures and controls to minimize contact of residual liquids and particulate matter from materials stored indoors or under cover from coming in contact with surface runoff. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures</u> <u>shall include one or more of the following</u>:

(1) Good housekeeping measures, including the use of dry absorbent or wet vacuum cleanup methods, to contain, dispose, or recycle residual liquids originating from recyclable containers, or mercury spill kits from storage of mercury switches;

(2) Prohibiting the practice of allowing washwater from tipping floors or other processing areas from discharging to the storm sewer system; and

(3) Disconnecting or sealing off all floor drains <del>connected to the storm sewer system.</del> <u>if necessary to prevent</u> <u>a discharge; or</u>

(4) Another control measure used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

e. Scrap and recyclable waste processing areas. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include measures and controls to minimize surface runoff from coming in contact with scrap processing equipment. In the case of processing equipment that generate visible amounts of particulate residue (e.g., shredding facilities), the plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe measures to minimize the contact of residual fluids and accumulated particulate matter with runoff (i.e., through good housekeeping, preventive maintenance, etc.). Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) A schedule of regular inspections of equipment for leaks, spills, malfunctioning, worn or corroded parts or equipment;

(2) A preventive maintenance program for processing equipment;

(3) Removal of mercury switches from the hood and trunk lighting units, and removal of anti-lock brake system units containing mercury switches;

(4) Use of dry-absorbents or other cleanup practices to collect and to dispose of or recycle spilled or leaking fluids, or use of mercury spill kits for spills from storage of mercury switches;

(5) Installation of low-level alarms or other equivalent protection devices on unattended hydraulic reservoirs over 150 gallons in capacity. Alternatively, provide secondary containment with sufficient volume to contain the entire volume of the reservoir;

(6) Containment or diversion structures such as dikes, berms, culverts, trenches, elevated concrete pads, and grading to minimize contact of stormwater runoff with outdoor processing equipment or stored materials;

(7) Oil/water separators or sumps;

(8) Permanent or semipermanent covers in processing areas where there are residual fluids and grease;

(9) Retention and detention basins or ponds, sediment traps, vegetated swales or strips, to facilitate pollutant settling and filtration; and

(10) Catch basin filters or sand filters; or

(11) Another control measure used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

f. Scrap lead-acid battery program. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall address measures and controls for the proper handling, storage and disposal of scrap lead-acid batteries. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures shall include</u> <u>one or more of the following</u>:

(1) Segregate scrap lead-acid batteries from other scrap materials and store under cover;

(2) A description of procedures and measures for the proper handling, storage and disposal of cracked or broken batteries;

(3) A description of measures to collect and dispose of leaking lead-acid battery fluid;

(4) A description of measures to minimize and, whenever possible, eliminate exposure of scrap lead-acid batteries to precipitation or runoff; and  $\underline{or}$ 

(5) A description of employee training for the management of scrap batteries.

g. Spill prevention and response procedures. The SWPPP shall include measures to minimize stormwater contamination at loading and unloading areas, and from equipment or container failures. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Description of spill prevention and response measures to address areas that are potential sources of fluid leaks or spills;

(2) Immediate containment and clean up of spills and leaks. If malfunctioning equipment is responsible for the spill or leak, repairs shall also be conducted as soon as possible;

(3) Cleanup procedures shall be identified in the plan <u>SWPPP</u>, including the use of dry absorbents. Where dry absorbent cleanup methods are used, an adequate supply of dry absorbent material shall be maintained on-site. Used absorbent material shall be disposed of properly;

(4) Drums containing liquids, especially oil and lubricants, shall be stored: indoors; in a bermed area; in overpack containers or spill pallets; or in similar containment devices;

(5) Overfill prevention devices shall be installed on all fuel pumps or tanks;

(6) Drip pans or equivalent measures shall be placed under any leaking piece of stationary equipment until the leak is repaired. The drip pans shall be inspected for leaks and potential overflow and all liquids properly disposed of in accordance with RCRA requirements; and or

(7) An alarm or pump shut off system shall be installed on outdoor equipment with hydraulic reservoirs exceeding 150 gallons in order to prevent draining the tank contents in the event of a line break. Alternatively, the equipment may have a secondary containment system capable of containing the contents of the hydraulic reservoir plus adequate freeboard for precipitation. A mercury spill kit shall be used for any release of mercury from switches, anti-lock brake systems, and switch storage areas.

h. Inspection program. All designated areas of the facility and equipment identified in the plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall be inspected at least quarterly. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

i. Supplier notification program. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include a program to notify major suppliers which scrap materials will not be accepted at the facility or are only accepted under certain conditions.

3. 2. Waste recycling facilities (liquid recyclable materials).

a. Waste material storage (indoor). The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include measures and controls to minimize or eliminate contact between residual liquids from waste materials stored indoors and surface runoff. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> may refer to applicable portions of other existing plans such as SPCC plans required under 40 CFR Part 112. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Procedures for material handling (including labeling and marking);

(2) A sufficient supply of dry-absorbent materials or a wet vacuum system to collect spilled or leaked materials (note: (spilled or leaking mercury should never be vacuumed);

(3) An appropriate containment structure, such as trenches, curbing, gutters or other equivalent measures; and  $\underline{or}$ 

(4) A drainage system, including appurtenances (e.g., pumps or ejectors, or manually operated valves), to handle discharges from diked or bermed areas. Drainage shall be discharged to an appropriate treatment facility, sanitary sewer system, or otherwise disposed of properly. Discharges from these areas may require coverage under a separate VPDES permit or industrial user permit under the pretreatment program.

b. Waste material storage (outdoor). The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe measures and controls to minimize contact between stored residual liquids and precipitation or runoff. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> may refer to applicable portions of other existing plans such as SPCC plans required under 40 CFR Part 112. Discharges of precipitation from containment areas containing used oil shall also be in accordance with applicable sections of 40 CFR Part 112. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Appropriate containment structures (e.g., dikes, berms, curbing, pits) to store the volume of the largest single tank, with sufficient extra capacity for precipitation;

(2) Drainage control and other diversionary structures;

(3) For storage tanks, provide corrosion protection or leak detection systems; and or

(4) Dry-absorbent materials or a wet vacuum system to collect spills.

c. Truck and rail car waste transfer areas. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall describe measures and controls to minimize pollutants in discharges from truck and rail car loading and unloading areas. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall also address measures to clean up minor spills and leaks resulting from the transfer of liquid wastes. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Containment and diversionary structures to minimize contact with precipitation or runoff; and

(2) Use of dry cleanup methods, wet vacuuming, roof coverings, or runoff controls: or

(3) Another control measure used to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to surface waters.

d. Inspections. Inspections shall be made quarterly and shall also include all areas where waste is generated, received, stored, treated or disposed that are exposed to either precipitation or stormwater runoff. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

4. <u>3.</u> Recycling facilities (source separated materials). The following SWPPP special conditions have been established for facilities that receive only source-separated recyclable materials primarily from nonindustrial and residential sources.

a. Inbound recyclable material control. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include an inbound materials inspection program to minimize the likelihood of receiving nonrecyclable materials (e.g., hazardous materials) that may be a significant source of pollutants in surface runoff. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures shall include</u> <u>one or more of the following</u>:

(1) Provide information and education measures to inform suppliers of recyclable materials on the types of materials that are acceptable and those that are not acceptable;

(2) A description of training measures for drivers responsible for pickup of recyclable materials;

(3) Clearly mark public drop-off containers regarding which materials can be accepted;

(4) Rejecting nonrecyclable wastes or household hazardous wastes at the source; and or

(5) Establish procedures for the handling and disposal of nonrecyclable materials.

b. Outdoor storage. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include procedures to minimize the exposure of recyclable materials to surface runoff and precipitation. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include good housekeeping measures to prevent the accumulation of particulate matter and fluids, particularly in high traffic areas. Control measure options measures shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Provide totally-enclosed drop-off containers for the public;

(2) Install a sump and pump with each containment pit, and treat or discharge collected fluids to a sanitary sewer system;

(3) Provide dikes and curbs for secondary containment (e.g., around bales of recyclable waste paper);

(4) Divert surface runoff away from outside material storage areas;

(5) Provide covers over containment bins, dumpsters, roll-off boxes; and or

(6) Store the equivalent one day's volume of recyclable materials indoors.

c. Indoor storage and material processing. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall include measures to minimize the release of pollutants from indoor storage and processing areas. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures shall include one</u> <u>or more of the following</u>:

(1) Schedule routine good housekeeping measures for all storage and processing areas;

(2) Prohibit a practice of allowing tipping floor washwaters from draining to any portion of the storm sewer system; and or

(3) Provide employee training on pollution prevention practices.

d. Vehicle and equipment maintenance. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall also provide for control measures in those areas where vehicle and equipment maintenance is occurring outdoors. Control <u>measure options</u> <u>measures</u> <u>shall include one or more of the following</u>:

(1) Prohibit vehicle and equipment washwater from discharging to the storm sewer system discharges;

(2) Minimize or eliminate outdoor maintenance areas, wherever possible;

(3) Establish spill prevention and clean-up procedures in fueling areas;

(4) Avoid topping off fuel tanks;

(5) Divert runoff from fueling areas;

- (6) Store lubricants and hydraulic fluids indoors; and or
- (7) Provide employee training on proper, handling, storage of hydraulic fluids and lubricants.

5. <u>4.</u> Facilities engaged in dismantling ships, marine salvaging, and marine wrecking - ships for scrap. The following SWPPP special conditions have been established for facilities that are engaged in dismantling ships, marine salvaging, and marine wrecking - ships for scrap.

Vessel breaking and scrapping activities. Scrapping of vessels shall be accomplished ashore beyond the range of mean high tide, whenever practicable. If this activity must be conducted while a vessel is afloat or grounded in state waters, then the permittee shall employ control measures to reduce the amount of pollutants released. The following control measures shall be implemented during those periods when vessels (ships, barges, yachts, etc.) are brought to the facility's site for recycling, scrapping and storage prior to scrapping.

a. Fixed or floating platforms sufficiently sized and constructed to catch and prevent scrap materials and pollutants from entering surface waters (or equivalent measures approved by the board) shall be used as work surfaces when working on or near the water surface. These platforms shall be cleaned as required to prevent pollutants from entering surface waters and at the end of each work shift. All scrap metals and pollutants shall be collected in a manner to prevent releases (containerization is recommended).

b. There shall be no discharge of oil or oily wastewater at the facility. Drip pans and other protective devices shall be required for all oil and oily waste transfer operations to catch incidental spillage and drips from hose nozzles, hose racks, drums or barrels. Drip pans and other protective devices shall be inspected and maintained to prevent releases. Oil and oily waste shall be disposed at a permitted facility and adequate documentation of off-site disposition shall be retained for review by the board upon request.

c. During the storage, breaking, and scrapping period, oil containment boom(s) booms shall be deployed either around the vessel being scrapped, or across the mouth of the facility's wetslip, to contain pollutants in the event of a spill. Booms shall be inspected, maintained, and repaired as needed. Oil, grease and fuel spills shall be prevented from reaching surface waters. Cleanup shall be carried out promptly immediately after an oil, grease, or fuel spill is detected.

d. Paint and solvent spills shall be immediately, upon discovery of the spills, cleaned up to prevent pollutants from reaching storm drains, deck drains, and surface waters.

e. Contaminated bilge and ballast water shall not be discharged to surface waters. If it becomes necessary to dispose of contaminated bilge and ballast waters during a vessel breaking activity, the wastewater shall be disposed at a permitted facility and adequate documentation of off-site disposition shall be retained for review by the board upon request.

D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Scrap recycling and waste recycling facilities (both sourceseparated and nonsource-separated facilities), and facilities engaged in dismantling ships, marine salvaging, and marine wrecking - ships for scrap are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 210.

Sector N – Benefiniark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities (nonsource-separated facilities only) (SIC Code 5093)		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Cadmium	2.1 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Chromium	16 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L	

Table 210Sector N – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L
Total Recoverable Lead	120 µg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L
Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities (source-s	separated facilities) (SIC Code 5093)
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L
Total Recoverable Aluminum <sup>1</sup>	750 µg/L
Total Recoverable Cadmium <sup>1</sup>	2.1 μg/L
Total Recoverable Chromium <sup>1</sup>	16 μg/L
Total Recoverable Copper <sup>1</sup>	18 µg/L
Total Recoverable Iron <sup>1</sup>	1.0 mg/L
Total Recoverable Lead <sup>1</sup>	120 µg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc <sup>1</sup>	120 µg/L
<sup>1</sup> Metals monitoring is only required at source-separated fa are received at the facility.	acilities for the specific metals listed above that
Facilities Engaged in Dismantling Ships, Marine Salvagin (SIC Code 4499, limited to list)	ng, and Marine Wrecking - Ships for Scrap
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L
Total Recoverable Cadmium	2.1 µg/L
Total Recoverable Chromium	16 μg/L
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L
Total Recoverable Lead	120 µg/L
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L

## 9VAC25-151-220. Sector O - Steam electric generating facilities.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from steam electric power generating facilities using coal, natural gas, oil, nuclear energy, etc. to produce a steam source, including coal handling areas (Industrial Activity Code "SE").

Stormwater discharges from coal pile runoff subject to numeric effluent limitations are eligible for coverage under this permit, but are subject to the limitations established by Part I A 1 c (2).

Stormwater discharges from ancillary facilities (e.g., fleet centers, gas turbine stations, and substations) that are not contiguous to a steam electric power generating facility are not covered by this permit. Heat capture and heat recovery combined cycle generation facilities are also not covered by this permit; however, dual fuel co-generation facilities that generate electric power are included.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, nonstormwater discharges subject to effluent limitation guidelines are also not covered by this permit.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the plan shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations of any of the following activities or sources that may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: storage tanks, scrap yards, general refuse areas; short and

long term storage of general materials (including, but not limited to: supplies, construction materials, paint equipment, oils, fuels, used and unused solvents, cleaning materials, paint, water treatment chemicals, fertilizer, and pesticides); landfills; construction sites; and stock pile areas (such as coal or limestone piles).

## 2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping measures.

B. Stormwater controls. Good housekeeping measures.

(1) <u>1.</u> Fugitive dust emissions. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize fugitive dust emissions from coal and ash handling areas. The permittee shall minimize off-site tracking of coal dust and ash. Control measures to consider include installing specially designed tires, or washing vehicles in a designated area before they leave the site, and controlling the wash water.

(2) <u>2.</u> Delivery vehicles. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall describe measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from delivery vehicles arriving on the plant site. At a minimum the permittee shall consider the following:

(a) <u>a.</u> Develop procedures for the inspection of delivery vehicles arriving on the plant site, and ensure overall integrity of the body or container; and

(b) b. Develop procedures to deal with leakage and spillage from vehicles or containers.

(3) <u>3.</u> Fuel oil unloading areas. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall describe measures that prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from fuel oil unloading areas. At a minimum the permittee shall consider using the following measures, or an equivalent:

(a) a. Use of containment curbs in unloading areas;

(b) <u>b.</u> During deliveries, having station personnel familiar with spill prevention and response procedures present to ensure that any leaks and spills are immediately contained and cleaned up; and

(c) <u>c.</u> Use of spill and overflow protection (e.g., drip. Drip pans, drip diapers, or other containment devices <u>may be</u> placed beneath fuel oil connectors to contain potential spillage during deliveries or from leaks at the <u>connectors</u>) <u>connectors</u>.

(4) <u>4.</u> Chemical loading and unloading areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize the contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from chemical loading and unloading areas. At a minimum the permittee shall consider using the following measures (or their equivalents):

(a) a. Use of containment curbs at chemical loading and unloading areas to contain spills;

(b) <u>b.</u> During deliveries, having station personnel familiar with spill prevention and response procedures present to ensure that any leaks or spills are immediately contained and cleaned up; and

(c) c. Covering chemical loading and unloading areas, and storing chemicals indoors.

(5) <u>5.</u> Miscellaneous loading and unloading areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize the contamination of stormwater runoff from loading and unloading areas. The permittee shall consider the following, at a minimum (or their equivalents):

(a) a. Covering the loading area;

(b) b. Grading, berming, or curbing around the loading area to divert runon run-on; or

(c) <u>c.</u> Locating the loading and unloading equipment and vehicles so that leaks are contained in existing containment and flow diversion systems.

(6) <u>6.</u> Liquid storage tanks. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from aboveground liquid storage tanks. At a minimum the permittee shall consider employing the following measures (or their equivalents):

(a) <u>a.</u> Use of protective guards around tanks;

(b) <u>b.</u> Use of containment curbs;

(c) c. Use of spill and overflow protection; and

(d) d. Use of dry cleanup methods.

(7) <u>7.</u> Large bulk fuel storage tanks. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from large bulk fuel storage tanks. At a minimum the permittee

shall consider employing containment berms (or its equivalent). The permittee shall also comply with applicable state and federal laws, including Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC).

(8) 8. Spill reduction measures. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to reduce the potential for an oil or chemical spill, or reference the appropriate section of their SPCC plan. The structural integrity of all aboveground tanks, pipelines, pumps and other related equipment shall be visually inspected as part of the routine facility inspection. All repairs deemed necessary based on the findings of the inspections shall be completed immediately to reduce the incidence of spills and leaks occurring from such faulty equipment.

(9) 9. Oil bearing equipment in switchyards. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of surface runoff from oil bearing equipment in switchyard areas. The permittee shall consider the use of level grades and gravel surfaces to retard flows and limit the spread of spills, and the collection of stormwater runoff in perimeter ditches.

(10) <u>10</u>. Residue hauling vehicles. All residue hauling vehicles shall be inspected for proper covering over the load, adequate gate sealing and overall integrity of the container body. Vehicles without load coverings or adequate gate sealing, or with leaking containers or beds shall be repaired as soon as practicable.

(11) <u>11.</u> Ash loading areas. The permittee shall describe and implement procedures to reduce or control the tracking of ash and residue from ash loading areas. Where practicable, clear the ash building floor and immediately adjacent roadways of spillage, debris and excess water before departure of each loaded vehicle.

(12) <u>12</u>. Areas adjacent to disposal ponds or landfills. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from areas adjacent to disposal ponds or landfills. The permittee shall develop procedures to:

(a) <u>a.</u> Reduce ash residue which may be tracked on to access roads traveled by residue trucks or residue handling vehicles; and

(b) b. Reduce ash residue on exit roads leading into and out of residue handling areas.

(13) <u>13.</u> Landfills, scrapyards, surface impoundments, open dumps, general refuse sites. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall address and include appropriate control measures to minimize the potential for contamination of runoff from landfills, scrapyards, surface impoundments, open dumps and general refuse sites.

b. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. As part of the evaluation, qualified facility personnel shall inspect the following areas on a monthly basis: coal handling areas, loading and unloading areas, switchyards, fueling areas, bulk storage areas, ash handling areas, areas adjacent to disposal ponds and landfills, maintenance areas, liquid storage tanks, and long term and short term material storage areas.

D. <u>C.</u> Numeric effluent limitations. Permittees with point sources of coal pile runoff associated with steam electric power generation shall monitor these stormwater discharges for the presence of TSS and for pH at least annually (one time per year) in accordance with Part I A 1 c (2).

E. D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Steam electric power generating facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 220.

Sector O – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern Benchmark Concentration		
Steam Electric Generating Facilities (Industrial Activity Code "SE")		
Total Recoverable Iron   1.0 mg/L		

 Table 220

 Sector O – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

9VAC25-151-230. Sector P - Land transportation and warehousing. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from ground transportation facilities and rail transportation facilities (generally identified by SIC Codes 40, 41, 42, 43, and 5171), that have vehicle and equipment maintenance shops (vehicle and equipment rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling and lubrication) or equipment cleaning operations. Also covered under this section are facilities found under SIC Codes 4221 through 4225 (public warehousing and storage) that do not have vehicle and equipment maintenance shops or equipment cleaning operations.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. This permit does not authorize the discharge of vehicle, equipment, or surface washwater, including tank-cleaning operations. Such discharges must be authorized under a separate VPDES permit, discharged to a sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable industrial pretreatment requirements, or recycled on-site.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations of any of the following activities and indicate whether the activities may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: fueling stations; vehicle and equipment maintenance or cleaning areas; storage areas for vehicle and equipment with actual or potential fluid leaks; loading and unloading areas; areas where treatment, storage or disposal of wastes occur; liquid storage tanks; processing areas; and storage areas.

2. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall describe and assess the potential for the following to contribute pollutants to stormwater discharges: on-site waste storage or disposal; dirt or gravel parking areas for vehicles awaiting maintenance; plumbing connections between shop floor drains and the stormwater conveyance system; and fueling areas.

3. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping.

(1) Vehicle and equipment storage areas. The storage of vehicles and equipment awaiting maintenance with actual or potential fluid leaks shall be confined to designated areas (delineated on the site map). The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): the use of drip pans under vehicles and equipment; indoor storage of vehicles and equipment; installation of berms or dikes; use of absorbents; roofing or covering storage areas; and cleaning pavement surface to remove oil and grease.

(2) Fueling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from fueling areas. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): covering the fueling area; using spill and overflow protection and cleanup equipment; minimizing stormwater runon and runoff to the fueling area; using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling collected stormwater runoff.

(3) Material storage areas. Storage vessels of all materials (e.g., for used oil or oil filters, spent solvents, paint wastes, hydraulic fluids) shall be maintained in good condition, so as to prevent contamination of stormwater, and plainly labeled (e.g., "used oil," "spent solvents," etc.). The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): indoor storage of the materials; installation of berms and dikes around the areas, minimizing runoff of stormwater to the areas; using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling the collected stormwater runoff.

(4) Vehicle and equipment cleaning areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from all areas used for vehicle and equipment cleaning. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): performing all cleaning operations indoors; covering the cleaning operation; ensuring that all washwaters drain to a proper collection system (i.e., not the stormwater drainage system unless VPDES permitted); and treating or recycling the collected stormwater runoff.

(5) Vehicle and equipment maintenance areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from all areas used for vehicle and equipment maintenance. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): performing maintenance activities indoors; using drip pans; keeping an organized inventory of materials used in the shop; draining all parts of fluids prior to disposal; prohibiting wet clean up practices where the practices would result in the discharge of pollutants to stormwater drainage systems; using dry cleanup methods; treating or recycling collected stormwater runoff; and minimizing runon and runoff of stormwater to maintenance areas.

(6) Locomotive sanding (loading sand for traction) areas. The plan shall describe measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from areas used for locomotive sanding. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): covering sanding areas; minimizing stormwater runon and runoff; or appropriate sediment removal practices to minimize the off site transport of sanding material by stormwater.

b. Routine facility inspections. The following areas and activities shall be included in all inspections: storage area for vehicles and equipment awaiting maintenance; fueling areas; indoor and outdoor vehicle and equipment maintenance areas; material storage areas; vehicle and equipment cleaning areas; and loading and unloading areas.

c. Employee training. Employee training shall take place, at a minimum, annually (once per calendar year). Employee training shall address the following as applicable: used oil and spent solvent management; fueling procedures; general good housekeeping practices; proper painting procedures; and used battery management.

D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Land transportation and warehousing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 230.

Table 230			
Sector P - Benchmark Monitoring Required	nents	5	

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Land Transportation and Warehousing Facilities (SIC 4011, 4013, 4111-4173, 4212-4231, 4311, and 5171)		
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) *	<del>15.0 mg/L</del>	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	<del>100 mg/L</del>	

\*Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) is the sum of individual gasoline range organics and diesel range organics (TPH-GRO and TPH-DRO) to be measured by EPA SW 846 Method 8015 for gasoline and diesel range organics, or by EPA SW 846 Methods 8260 Extended and 8270 Extended.

# 9VAC25-151-240. Sector Q - Water transportation and ship and boat building or repairing yards.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with <u>the following</u> industrial activity from water transportation facilities (generally identified by SIC Major Group 44), that have vehicle (vessel) maintenance shops or equipment cleaning operations. The water transportation industry includes facilities engaged in foreign or domestic transport of freight or passengers in deep sea or inland waters; marine cargo handling operations; ferry operations; towing and tugboat services; and marinas. <u>activities:</u>

1. Water transportation facilities identified by SIC Codes 4412-4499 (except SIC Code 4499 facilities as specified in Sector N - 9VAC25-151-210). The water transportation industry includes facilities engaged in foreign or domestic transport of freight or passengers in deep sea or inland waters, marine cargo handling operations, ferry operations, towing and tugboat services, and marinas.

2. Ship building and repairing and boat building and repairing facilities identified by SIC Codes 3731 and 3732. The U.S. Coast Guard refers to a vessel 65 feet or greater in length as a "ship" and a vessel smaller than 65 feet as a "boat."

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: bilge and ballast water, sanitary wastes, pressure wash water, and cooling water originating from vessels.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations where any of the following activities may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: fueling; engine maintenance or repair; vessel maintenance or repair; pressure washing; painting; sanding; blasting; welding; metal fabrication; loading and unloading areas; locations used for the treatment, storage or disposal of wastes; liquid storage tanks; liquid storage areas (e.g., paint, solvents, resins); and material storage areas (e.g., blasting media, aluminum, steel, scrap iron).

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall describe the following additional sources and activities that have potential pollutants associated with them: outdoor manufacturing or processing activities (i.e., welding, metal fabricating); and significant dust or particulate generating processes (e.g., abrasive blasting, sanding, painting).

# 2. C. Stormwater controls.

a. 1. Good housekeeping.

(1) <u>a.</u> Pressure washing area. As defined by this permit, process wastewater related to hull work at <del>water transportation</del> facilities shall be any water used on a vessel's hull for any purpose, regardless of application pressure, including <del>but not limited to</del> the activities of removing marine salts, sediments, marine growth and paint, or other hull, weather deck, or superstructure cleaning activities using water, such as preparing those areas for inspection or work (cutting, welding, grinding, coating, etc.). The discharge water shall be permitted as a process wastewater by a separate VPDES permit.

(2) <u>b.</u> Blasting and painting areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent spent abrasives, paint chips, and overspray from discharging into the receiving water or the storm sewer system. The permittee <u>may consider containing shall contain</u> all blasting or painting activities, or the use of other measures to prevent or minimize the discharge of contaminants (e.g., hanging plastic barriers or tarpaulins during blasting or painting operations to contain debris). Stormwater conveyances shall be regularly cleaned to remove deposits of abrasive blasting and paint chips. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include any standard operating practices with regard to blasting and painting activities, such as the prohibition of uncontained blasting or painting over open water, or the prohibition of blasting or painting during windy conditions which can render containment ineffective.

(3) <u>c.</u> Material storage areas. All containerized materials (e.g., fuels, paints, solvents, waste oil, antifreeze, batteries) shall be plainly labeled and stored in a protected, secure location away from drains. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize the contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from the storage areas. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall specify which materials are stored indoors and consider containment or enclosure for materials that are stored outdoors. The permittee shall consider implementing an inventory control plan to limit the presence of potentially hazardous materials on-site. Where abrasive blasting is performed, the plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall specifically include a discussion on the storage and disposal of spent abrasive materials generated at the facility.

(4) <u>d.</u> Engine maintenance and repair areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from all areas used for engine maintenance and repair. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalent): performing all maintenance activities indoors; maintaining an organized inventory of materials used in the shop; draining all parts of fluids prior to disposal; prohibiting the practice of hosing down the shop floor using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling stormwater runoff collected from the maintenance area.

(5) <u>e.</u> Material handling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from material handling operations and areas (e.g., fueling, paint and solvent mixing, disposal of process wastewater streams from vessels). The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): covering fueling areas; using spill and overflow protection; mixing paints and solvents in a designated area (preferably indoors or under a shed); and minimizing <del>runon</del> run-on of stormwater to material handling areas.

(6) <u>f.</u> Drydock activities. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall address the routine maintenance and cleaning of the drydock to minimize the potential for pollutants in the stormwater runoff. The <u>plan SWPPP</u> shall describe the procedures for cleaning the accessible areas of the drydock prior to flooding and final cleanup after the vessel is removed and the dock is raised. Cleanup procedures for oil, grease, or fuel spills occurring on the drydock shall also be included within the <u>plan SWPPP</u>. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): sweeping rather than hosing off debris and spent blasting material from the accessible areas of the drydock prior to flooding; and having absorbent materials and oil containment booms readily available to contain or cleanup any spills.

(7) g. General yard area. The plan <u>SWPPP</u> shall include a schedule for routine yard maintenance and cleanup. Scrap metal, wood, plastic, miscellaneous trash, paper, glass, industrial scrap, insulation, welding rods, packaging, etc., shall be routinely removed from the general yard area.

b. (1) Preventative Maintenance maintenance. As part of the facility's preventive maintenance program, stormwater management devices shall be inspected and maintained in a timely manner (e.g., oil/water separators and sediment traps cleaned to ensure that spent abrasives, paint chips and solids are intercepted and retained prior to entering the storm drainage system). Facility equipment and systems shall also be

inspected and tested to uncover conditions that could cause breakdowns or failures resulting in discharges of pollutants to surface waters.

e. (2) Routine facility inspections. The following areas shall be included in all quarterly inspections: pressure washing area; blasting, sanding, and painting areas; material storage areas; engine maintenance and repair areas; material handling areas; drydock area; and general yard area. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

 $\frac{d.}{2}$  Employee training. Training shall address, at a minimum, the following activities (as applicable): used oil management; spent solvent management; disposal of spent abrasives; disposal of vessel wastewaters; spill prevention and control; fueling procedures; general good housekeeping practices; painting and blasting procedures; and used battery management.

D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Water transportation <u>These</u> facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 240.

Table 240
Sector Q – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Water Transportation Facilities (SIC 4412-4499 [except 4499 as specified in Sector N]) and Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards (SIC Codes 3731 and 3732)		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L	

#### 9VAC25-151-250. Sector R - Ship and boat building or repair yards. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities engaged in ship building and repairing and boat building and repairing (SIC Code 373). (According to the U.S. Coast Guard, a vessel 65 feet or greater in length is referred to as a ship and a vessel smaller than 65 feet is a boat.)

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: bilge and ballast water, pressure wash water, sanitary wastes, and cooling water originating from vessels.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations where any of the following activities may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: fueling; engine maintenance or repair; vessel maintenance or repair; pressure washing; painting; sanding; blasting; welding; metal fabrication; loading and unloading areas; locations used for the treatment, storage or disposal of wastes; liquid storage tanks; liquid storage areas (e.g., paint, solvents, resins); and material storage areas (e.g., blasting media, aluminum, steel, scrap iron).

b. Potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a description of the following additional sources and activities that have potential pollutants associated with them (if applicable): outdoor manufacturing and processing activities (e.g., welding, metal fabricating); and significant dust and particulate generating processes (e.g., abrasive blasting, sanding, painting).

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping measures.

(1) Pressure washing area. As defined by this permit, process wastewater related to hull work at ship and boat building or repair yard facilities shall be any water used on a vessel's hull for any purpose, regardless of application pressure, including but not limited to the activities of removing marine salts, sediments, marine growth and paint, or other hull, weather deck, or superstructure cleaning activities using water, such as preparing those areas for inspection or work (cutting, welding, grinding, coating, etc.). The discharge water shall be permitted as a process wastewater by a separate VPDES permit.

(2) Blasting and painting areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent spent abrasives, paint chips and overspray from discharging into the receiving waterbody or the storm sewer system. To prevent the discharge of contaminants, the permittee shall consider containing all blasting and painting activities or using other methods, such as hanging plastic barriers or tarpaulins during blasting or painting operations to contain debris. The plan shall include a schedule for regularly cleaning storm systems to remove deposits of abrasive blasting debris and paint chips. The plan shall include any standard operating practices with regard to blasting and painting activities, such as the prohibition of uncontained blasting or painting over open water or the prohibition of blasting or painting during windy conditions that can render containment ineffective.

(3) Material storage areas. All containerized materials (fuels, paints, solvents, waste oil, antifreeze, batteries) shall be plainly labeled and stored in a protected, secure location away from drains. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from the storage areas. The permittee shall consider implementing an inventory control plan to limit the presence of potentially hazardous materials on site. Where abrasive blasting is performed, the plan shall specifically include a discussion on the storage and disposal of spent abrasive materials generated at the facility.

(4) Engine maintenance and repair areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from all areas used for engine maintenance and repair. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalent): performing all maintenance activities indoors; maintaining an organized inventory of materials used in the shop; draining all parts of fluids prior to disposal; prohibiting the practice of hosing down the shop floor; using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling stormwater runoff collected from the maintenance area.

(5) Material handling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or surface runoff from material handling operations and areas (e.g., fueling, paint and solvent mixing, disposal of process wastewater streams from vessels). The permittee shall consider the following methods (or their equivalents): covering fueling areas; using spill and overflow protection; mixing paints and solvents in a designated area (preferably indoors or under a shed); and minimizing runon of stormwater to material handling areas.

(6) Drydock activities. The plan shall address the routine maintenance and cleaning of the drydock to minimize the potential for pollutants in the stormwater runoff. The plan shall describe the procedures for cleaning the accessible areas of the drydock prior to flooding and final cleanup after the vessel is removed and the dock is raised. Cleanup procedures for oil, grease, or fuel spills occurring on the drydock shall also be included within the plan. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): sweeping rather than hosing off debris and spent blasting material from the accessible areas of the drydock prior to flooding and prior to flooding and having absorbent materials and oil containment booms readily available to contain or cleanup any spills.

(7) General yard area. The plan shall include a schedule for routine yard maintenance and cleanup. Scrap metal, wood, plastic, miscellaneous trash, paper, glass, industrial scrap, insulation, welding rods, packaging, etc., shall be routinely removed from the general yard area.

b. Preventative maintenance. As part of the facility's preventive maintenance program, stormwater management devices shall be inspected and maintained in a timely manner (e.g., oil/water separators and sediment traps cleaned to ensure that spent abrasives, paint chips and solids are intercepted and retained prior to entering the storm drainage system). Facility equipment and systems shall also be inspected and tested to uncover conditions that could cause breakdowns or failures resulting in discharges of pollutants to surface waters.

c. Routine facility inspections. The following areas shall be included in all quarterly routine facility inspections: pressure washing area; blasting, sanding, and painting areas; material storage areas; engine maintenance or repair areas; material handling areas; drydock area; and general yard area. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

d. Employee training. Training shall address, at a minimum, the following activities (as applicable): used oil management; spent solvent management; proper disposal of spent abrasives; proper disposal of vessel

wastewaters, spill prevention and control; fueling procedures; general good housekeeping practices; painting and blasting procedures; and used battery management.

D. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Ship and boat building or repairing yards are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 250.

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Ship and Boat Building or Repairing Yards (SIC 3731, 3732)		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	<del>100 mg/L</del>	
Total Recoverable Copper	<del>18 μg/L</del>	
Total Recoverable Zinc	<del>120 μg/L</del>	

Table 250 Sector R – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

# 9VAC25-151-260. Sector S - Air transportation. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from air transportation facilities including airports, airport terminal services, air transportation (scheduled and nonscheduled), flying fields, air courier services, and establishments engaged in operating and maintaining airports, and servicing, repairing or maintaining aircraft (generally classified under SIC Code 45), which have vehicle maintenance shops, material handling facilities, equipment cleaning operations, or airport or aircraft deicing or anti-icing operations. For the purpose of this section, the term "deicing" is defined as the process to remove frost, snow, or ice and "anti-icing" is the process which prevents the accumulation of frost, snow, or ice. Only those portions of the facility that are either involved in vehicle maintenance (including vehicle rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling, and lubrication), equipment cleaning operations, or deicing or anti-icing operations are addressed under this section.

B. Special definitions. The following definitions are only for this section of the general permit:

"Aircraft deicing fluid" or "ADF" means a fluid (other than hot water) applied to aircraft to remove or prevent any accumulation of snow or ice on the aircraft. This includes deicing and anti-icing fluids.

"Airfield pavement" means all paved surfaces on the airside of an airport.

"Airside" means the part of an airport directly involved in the arrival and departure of aircraft, including runways, taxiways, aprons, and ramps.

"Annual non-propeller aircraft departures" means the average number of commercial turbine-engine aircraft that are propelled by jet (i.e., turbojet or turbofan) that take off from an airport on an annual basis, as tabulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

"Available ADF" means 75% of the normalized Type I aircraft deicing fluid and 10% of the normalized Type IV aircraft deicing fluid, excluding aircraft deicing fluids used for defrosting or deicing for safe taxiing.

"Collection requirement" means, for new sources, the requirement for permittee to collect available ADF.

"Defrosting" means the removal of frost contamination from an aircraft when there has been no active precipitation.

"Deicing" mean procedures and practices to remove or prevent any accumulation of snow or ice on:

1. An aircraft; or

2. Airfield pavement.

"Normalized Type I or Type IV aircraft deicing fluid" means ADF less any water added by the manufacturer or customer before ADF application.

"Primary airport" means an airport defined at 49 USC § 47102 (15).

C. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: aircraft, ground vehicle, runway and equipment washwaters, and dry weather discharges of deicing or anti-icing chemicals. These discharges must be covered by a separate VPDES permit. Note: Discharge resulting from snowmelt is not a dry weather discharge. D. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. SWPPPs developed for areas of the facility occupied by tenants of the airport shall be integrated with the plan for the entire airport. For the purposes of this permit, tenants of the airport facility include airline passenger or cargo companies, fixed based operators and other parties who have contracts with the airport authority to conduct business operations on airport property and whose operations result in stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

#### 1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify the location of the following activities and indicate any of the activities that may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: aircraft and runway deicing or anti-icing operations; fueling stations; aircraft, ground vehicle and equipment maintenance and cleaning areas; and storage areas for aircraft, ground vehicles and equipment awaiting maintenance.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a narrative description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities: aircraft, runway, ground vehicle and equipment maintenance and cleaning; aircraft and runway deicing or anti-icing operations (including apron and centralized aircraft deicing or anti-icing stations, runways, taxiways, and ramps). Facilities which conduct deicing or anti-icing operations shall maintain a record of the types (including the safety data sheets (SDS)) and monthly quantities of deicing or anti-icing chemicals used, either as measured amounts, or in the absence of metering, as estimated amounts. This includes all deicing or anti-icing chemicals, not just glycols and urea (e.g., potassium acetate). Tenants and fixed base operators who conduct deicing or anti-icing operations shall provide the above information to the airport authority for inclusion in the stormwater pollution prevention plan for the entire facility.

c. Deicing season. The SWPPP shall define the average seasonal timeframe (e.g., December February, October March, etc.) during which deicing activities typically occur at the facility. Implementation of control measures, including any BMPs, facility inspections, and effluent limitation monitoring shall be conducted with particular emphasis throughout the defined deicing season.

#### 2. Stormwater controls.

#### a. Good housekeeping.

(1) Aircraft, ground vehicle and equipment maintenance areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize the contamination of stormwater runoff from all areas used for aircraft, ground vehicle and equipment maintenance (including the maintenance conducted on the terminal apron and in dedicated hangars). Appropriate control measures (or their equivalents) shall be implemented, such as the following practices: performing maintenance activities indoors; maintaining an organized inventory of materials used in the maintenance areas; draining all parts of fluids prior to disposal; preventing the practice of hosing down the apron or hangar floor; using dry cleanup methods; and collecting the stormwater runoff from the maintenance area and providing treatment or recycling.

(2) Aircraft, ground vehicle and equipment cleaning areas. Permittees shall ensure that cleaning of equipment is conducted in designated areas only and clearly identify these areas on the ground and delineate them on the site map. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize the contamination of the stormwater runoff from cleaning areas.

(3) Aircraft, ground vehicle and equipment storage areas. The storage of aircraft, ground vehicles and equipment awaiting maintenance shall be confined to designated areas (delineated on the site map). Appropriate control measures, including any BMPs (or their equivalents) shall be implemented, such as the following practices: indoor storage of aircraft and ground vehicles; the use of drip pans for the collection of fluid leaks; and perimeter drains, dikes or berms surrounding storage areas.

(4) Material storage areas. Storage vessels of all materials (e.g., used oils, hydraulic fluids, spent solvents, and waste aircraft fuel) shall be maintained in good condition, so as to prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater, and plainly labeled (e.g., "used oil," "Contaminated Jet A," etc.). The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of precipitation or runoff from storage areas. Appropriate control measures (or their equivalents) shall be implemented, such as the following practices: indoor storage of materials; centralized storage areas for waste materials; and installation of berms and dikes around storage areas.

(5) Airport fuel system and fueling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize the discharge of fuels to the storm sewer or surface waters resulting from fuel servicing activities or other operations conducted in support of the airport fuel system. Appropriate control measures (or their equivalents) shall be implemented, such as the following practices: implementing spill and overflow practices (e.g., placing absorptive materials beneath aircraft during fueling operations); using dry cleanup methods; and collecting the stormwater runoff.

b. Source reduction. The permittee shall minimize, and where practicable eliminate, the use of urea and glycol-based deicing or anti-icing chemicals in order to reduce the aggregate amount of deicing or anti-icing chemicals used and lessen the environmental impact. Chemical options to replace ethylene glycol, propylene glycol and urea include: potassium acetate; magnesium acetate; calcium acetate; anhydrous sodium acetate.

(1) Runway deicing operations. The permittee shall minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from runways as a result of deicing operations. The permittee shall evaluate present application rates to ensure against excessive over application by analyzing application rates and adjusting as necessary, consistent with considerations of flight safety. Appropriate control measures, (or their equivalents) shall be implemented, such as the following practices: metered application of chemicals; prewetting dry chemical constituents prior to application; installation of runway ice detection systems; implementing anti-icing operations as a preventive measure against ice buildup.

(2) Aircraft deicing operations. The permittee shall minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from aircraft deicing operations. The permittee shall determine whether excessive application of deicing chemicals occurs, and adjust as necessary, consistent with considerations of flight safety. This evaluation shall be carried out by the personnel most familiar with the particular aircraft and flight operations in question (versus an outside entity such as the airport authority). The use of alternative deicing or anti-icing agents as well as containment measures for all applied chemicals shall be considered. Appropriate control measures (or their equivalents) shall be implemented for reducing deicing fluid use, such as the following practices: forced air deicing systems; computer controlled fixed gantry systems; infrared technology; hot water; varying glycol content to air temperature; enclosed basket deicing trucks; mechanical methods; solar radiation; hangar storage; aircraft covers; and thermal blankets for MD-80s and DC-9s. The use of ice detection systems and airport traffic flow strategies and departure slot allocation systems shall also be considered where practicable.

c. Management of runoff. Where deicing operations occur, the permittee shall implement a program to control or manage contaminated runoff to minimize the amount of pollutants being discharged from the site. The plan shall describe the controls used for collecting or containing contaminated melt water from collection areas used for disposal of contaminated snow. The following control measure options (or their equivalents) shall be considered: establishing a dedicated deicing facility with a runoff collection and recovery system; using vacuum or collection trucks; storing contaminated stormwater water or deicing fluids in tanks and releasing controlled amounts to a publicly owned treatment works; collecting contaminated runoff in a wet pond for biochemical decomposition (be aware of attracting wildlife that may prove hazardous to flight operations); and directing runoff into vegetative swales or other infiltration measures. The plan shall consider the recovery of deicing and anti-icing materials when these materials are applied during nonprecipitation events (e.g., covering storm sewer inlets, using booms, installing absorptive interceptors in the drains, etc.) to prevent these materials from later becoming a source of stormwater contamination. Used deicing fluid shall be recycled whenever possible.

d. Routine facility inspections. The inspection frequency shall be specified in the plan. At a minimum, inspections shall be conducted once per month during deicing and anti-icing season (e.g., October through April for most airports). If deicing occurs before or after this period, the inspections shall be expanded to include all months during which deicing chemicals may be used.

e. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. The annual site compliance evaluations shall be conducted by qualified facility personnel during periods of actual deicing operations, if possible. If not practicable during active deicing or if the weather is too inclement, the evaluations shall be conducted when deicing operations are likely to occur and the materials and equipment for deicing are in place.

E. Numeric effluent limitations. The average deicing season identified in the SWPPP is the time frame during which any effluent limitation monitoring samples shall be obtained.

1. Airfield pavement deicing. Existing primary airports and primary airports meeting the definition of a new source (new primary airports ) with at least 1,000 annual jet departures (non-propeller aircraft) that discharge wastewater associated with airport pavement deicing comingled with stormwater shall either use deicing products that do not contain urea or alternatively, airfield pavement discharges at every discharge point shall achieve the numeric limitations for ammonia in Table 260-1, prior to any dilution or commingling with any non-deicing discharge. Primary airports that only use deicing products that do not contain urea shall certify this fact annually to the board. The certification shall be signed in accordance with Part II K, and a copy of the certification shall be kept with the SWPPP.

 Table 260-1

 Sector S Numeric Effluent Limitations, Existing and New Primary Airports

Airfield Pavement Deicing	
Parameter	Effluent Limitations - Daily Maximum
Ammonia as Nitrogen	<del>14.7 mg/L</del>

2. Aircraft deicing. Airports meeting the definition of a new source (new airports) with 10,000 annual departures, and located in cold climate zones, shall collect at least 60% of available ADF after deicing. New airports shall achieve the performance standards in Table 260-2 for available ADF collected. The limitation shall be met at the location where the effluent leaves the on-site treatment system utilized for meeting these requirements and before commingling with any non-deicing discharge.

Tah	le '	260	_2
1 au		200	_

Sector S Numeric Effluent Limitations, New Primary Airports

Aircraft Deicing			
Doromotor	Effluent Limitations		
Parameter	Daily Maximum	Weekly Average	
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	<del>271 mg/L</del>	<del>154 mg/L</del>	

3. Monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements.

a. Demonstrating compliance with the ADF collection requirement for dischargers subject to the requirements in subdivision 2 of this subsection.

(1) The permittee shall maintain records with the SWPPP to demonstrate that the airport is operating and maintaining one or more centralized deicing pads and shall certify this annually to the board. The certification shall be signed in accordance with Part II K, and a copy of the certification shall be kept with the SWPPP.

The centralized deicing pad technology shall be operated and maintained according to the technical specifications set forth in subdivisions 3 a (1) (a) through (d) of this subsection. The demonstration and valid certification are sufficient to meet the applicable collection requirement without the permittee having to determine the numeric percentage of available ADF collected.

(a) Each centralized deicing pad shall be sized and sited in accordance with all applicable Federal Aviation Administration advisory circulars.

(b) Drainage valves associated with the centralized deicing pad shall be activated before deicing activities commence to collect available ADF.

(c) The centralized deicing pad and associated collection equipment shall be installed and maintained per any applicable manufacturers' instructions and shall be inspected, at a minimum, at the beginning of each deicing season to ensure that the pad and associated equipment are in working condition.

(d) All aircraft deicing shall take place on a centralized deicing pad, with the exception of defrosting and deicing for safe taxiing.

(2) The permittee shall maintain records with the SWPPP on the volume of ADF sprayed and the amount of available ADF collected in order to determine compliance with the collection requirement and shall report this information annually to the department.

b. Monitoring requirements.

(1) COD limitation. Permittees subject to the ADF collection and discharge requirements specified in subdivision 2 of this subsection shall conduct effluent monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the COD limitation for all ADF that is collected.

Compliance shall be demonstrated at the location where the effluent leaves the on-site treatment system utilized for meeting these requirements and before commingling with any non-deicing discharge. Effluent samples shall be collected following the grab sample protocol in 40 CFR 449, Appendix A.

(2) Ammonia limitation. If a permittee chooses to comply with the compliance alternative specified in subdivision 1 of this subsection, the permittee shall conduct effluent monitoring at all locations where pavement deicing with a product that contains urea is occurring, prior to any dilution or commingling with any non-deicing discharge.

c. Recordkeeping.

(1) The permittee shall maintain records with the SWPPP documenting compliance with subdivisions 3 a and 3 b of this subsection. These records include, but are not limited to, documentation of wastewater samples collected and analyzed, certifications, and equipment maintenance schedules and agreements.

(2) The permittee shall collect and maintain data with the SWPPP on the annual volume of ADF used.

F. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Stormwater discharges from those portions of air transportation facilities where vehicle maintenance (including vehicle rehabilitation, mechanical repairs, painting, fueling, and lubrication) and equipment cleaning is performed shall be sampled for the parameters listed in Table 260-3. Note: The benchmark monitoring requirements apply year round and are not limited to the deicing season.

	Table 260-3
Sector S	Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Air Transportation Facilities (SIC 45).		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	<del>100 mg/L</del>	
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)*     15.0 mg/L		
*Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) is the sum of individual gasoline range organics and diesel range organics (TPH-GRO and TPH-DRO) to be measured by EPA SW 846 Method 8015 for gasoline and		

diesel range organics, or by EPA SW 846 Methods 8260 Extended and 8270 Extended.

## 9VAC25-151-270. Sector T - Treatment works. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from treatment works treating domestic sewage or any other sewage sludge or wastewater treatment device or system, used in the storage, treatment, recycling, and reclamation of municipal or domestic sewage, including lands dedicated to the disposal of sewage sludge that are located within the confines of the facility with a design flow of 1.0 MGD or more, or required to have an approved pretreatment program under 9VAC25-31-730 (Industrial Activity Code "TW"). Farm lands, domestic gardens or lands used for sludge management where sludge is beneficially reused and that are not physically located within the facility, or areas that are in compliance with § 405 of the CWA are not required to have permit coverage.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: sanitary and industrial wastewater; and equipment and vehicle washwaters.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

## 1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: grit, screenings, and other solids handling, storage, or disposal areas; sludge drying beds; dried sludge piles; compost piles; septage or hauled waste receiving station; and storage areas for process chemicals, petroleum products, solvents, fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities, as applicable: grit, screenings, and other solids handling, storage, or disposal areas; sludge drying beds; dried sludge piles; compost piles; septage or hauled waste receiving station; and access roads and rail lines.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Control measures. In addition to the other control measures required by Part III B 4, the following measures shall be considered: routing stormwater to the treatment works; or covering exposed materials (i.e., from the following areas: grit, screenings, and other solids handling, storage, or disposal areas; sludge drying beds; dried sludge piles; compost piles; septage or hauled waste receiving station).

b. Inspections. The following areas shall be included in all inspections: access roads and rail lines, grit, screenings, and other solids handling, storage, or disposal areas; sludge drying beds; dried sludge piles; compost piles; septage or hauled waste receiving station areas.

c. Employee training. Employee training shall, at a minimum, address the following areas when applicable to a facility: petroleum product management; process chemical management; spill prevention and control; fueling procedures; general good housekeeping practices; proper procedures for using fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides.

## 9VAC25-151-280. Sector U - Food and kindred products.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from food and kindred products processing facilities (commonly identified by SIC Code 20), including: meat products; dairy products <u>SIC Codes 2021-2026</u>; canned, frozen and preserved fruits, vegetables, and food specialties; grain mill products <u>SIC Codes 2041-2048</u>; bakery products; sugar and confectionery products; and fats and oils; beverages; and miscellaneous food preparations and kindred products and tobacco products manufacturing (SIC Code 21) <u>SIC Codes 2074-2079</u>.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: boiler blowdown, cooling tower overflow and blowdown, ammonia refrigeration purging, and vehicle washing and clean-out operations.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify the locations of the following activities if they are exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: vents and stacks from cooking, drying, and similar operations; dry product vacuum transfer lines; animal holding pens; spoiled product; and broken product container storage areas.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. In addition to food and kindred products processing related industrial activities, the plan shall also describe application and storage of pest control chemicals (e.g., rodenticides, insecticides, fungicides, etc.) used on plant grounds.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Routine facility inspections. At a minimum, the following areas, where the potential for exposure to stormwater exists, shall be inspected on a quarterly basis: loading and unloading areas for all significant materials; storage areas, including associated containment areas; waste management units; vents and stacks emanating from industrial activities; spoiled product and broken product container holding areas; animal holding pens; staging areas; and air pollution control equipment. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

b. Employee training. The employee training program shall also address pest control.

D. C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Dairy products, grain mills and fats and oils products facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 280.

	0	1
Pollutants of Concern		Benchmark Concentration
Dairy Products (SIC Codes 2021-2026)		

 Table 280

 Sector U – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	30 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Grain Mill Products (SIC Codes 2041-2048)		
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	1.5 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Fats and Oils Products (SIC Codes 2074-2079)		
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD <sub>5</sub> )	30 mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	2.2 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	

## 9VAC25-151-290. Sector V - Textile mills, apparel, and other fabric products. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from textile mills, apparel and other fabric product manufacturing, generally described by SIC 22 and 23. This section also covers facilities engaged in manufacturing finished leather and artificial leather products (SIC 31, except 3111). Facilities in this sector are primarily engaged in the following activities: textile mill products, of and regarding facilities and establishments engaged in the preparation of fiber and subsequent manufacturing of yarn, thread, braids, twine, and cordage, the manufacturing of broad woven fabrics, narrow woven fabrics, knit fabrics, and carpets and rugs from yarn; processes involved in the dyeing and finishing of fibers, yarn fabrics, and knit apparel; the integrated manufacturing of knit apparel and other finished articles of yarn; the manufacturing of felt goods (wool), lace goods, nonwoven fabrics, miscellaneous textiles, and other apparel products.

B. Special conditions. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. In addition to the general nonstormwater prohibition in Part I B 1, the following discharges are not covered by this permit: discharges of wastewater (e.g., wastewater as a result of wet processing or from any processes relating to the production process); reused or recycled water; and waters used in cooling towers. These discharges must be covered under a separate VPDES permit.

C. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities: industry specific significant materials and industrial activities (e.g., backwinding, beaming, bleaching, backing, bonding carbonizing, carding, cut and sew operations, desizing, drawing, dyeing, flocking, fulling, knitting, mercerizing, opening, packing, plying, scouring, slashing, spinning, synthetic felt processing, textile waste processing, tufting, turning, weaving, web forming, winging, yarn spinning, and yarn texturing).

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping measures.

(1) Material storage areas. All containerized materials (e.g., fuels, petroleum products, solvents, dyes, etc.) shall be clearly labeled and stored in a protected area, away from drains. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of stormwater runoff from such storage areas, and shall include a description of the containment area or enclosure for those materials that are stored outdoors. The permittee may consider an inventory control plan to prevent excessive purchasing of potentially hazardous substances. The permittee shall ensure that empty chemical drums and containers are clean (triple rinsing shall be considered) and residuals are not subject to contact with precipitation or runoff. Washwater from these cleanings shall be collected and disposed of properly.

(2) Material handling area. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from materials handling operations and areas. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): use of spill and overflow protection; covering fueling areas; and covering and enclosing areas where the transfer of materials may occur. Where applicable, the plan shall address the replacement or repair of leaking connections, valves, transfer lines and pipes that may carry chemicals, dyes, or wastewater.

(3) Fueling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from fueling areas. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): covering the fueling area; using spill and overflow protection; minimizing runon of stormwater to the fueling areas; using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling stormwater runoff collected from the fueling area.

(4) Aboveground storage tank areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from aboveground storage tank areas, including the associated piping and valves. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): regular cleanup of these areas; preparation of a spill prevention control and countermeasure program (SPCC) to provide spill and overflow protection; minimizing runon of stormwater from adjacent areas; restricting access to the area; insertion of filters in adjacent catch basins; absorbent booms in unbermed fueling areas; use of dry cleanup methods; and permanently sealing drains within critical areas that may discharge to a storm drain.

b. Routine facility inspections. Inspections shall be conducted at least monthly, and shall include the following activities and areas (at a minimum): transfer and transmission lines; spill prevention; good housekeeping practices; management of process waste products; all structural and nonstructural management practices. The requirement for routine facility inspections is waived for facilities that have maintained an active VEEP E3/E4 status.

c. Employee training. Employee training shall, at a minimum address, the following areas when applicable to a facility: use of reused or recycled waters; solvents management; proper disposal of dyes; proper disposal of petroleum products and spent lubricants; spill prevention and control; fueling procedures; and general good housekeeping practices.

## 9VAC25-151-300. Sector W - Furniture and fixtures. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities involved in the manufacturing of wood kitchen cabinets (generally described by SIC Code 2434), and furniture and fixtures (generally classified under SIC Major Group 25), including: household furniture (SIC 251); office furniture (SIC 252); public buildings and related furniture (SIC 253); partitions, shelving, lockers, and office and store fixtures (SIC 254); and miscellaneous furniture and fixtures (SIC 259).

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following item:

Site Map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: material storage areas (including tanks or other vessels used for liquid or waste storage); outdoor material processing areas; areas where wastes are treated, stored or disposed; access roads; and rail spurs.

#### 9VAC25-151-310. Sector X - Printing and publishing. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from printing and publishing facilities (generally classified under SIC Major Group 27), and include the following types of facilities: newspaper, periodical, and book publishing and printing (SIC Codes 271 through 273); miscellaneous publishing (SIC Code 274); commercial printing (SIC Code 275); manifold business forms, greeting cards, bankbooks, looseleaf binders and book binding and related work (SIC Codes 276 through 278); and service industries for the printing trade (SIC 279).

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Site description. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a description of the following additional sources and activities that have potential pollutants associated with them, as applicable: loading and unloading operations; outdoor storage activities; significant dust or particulate generating processes; and on-site waste disposal practices (e.g., blanket wash). Also, the pollutant or pollutant parameter (e.g., oil and grease, scrap metal, etc.) associated with each pollutant source shall be identified.

## 2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping measures.

(1) Material storage areas. All containerized materials (skids, pallets, solvents, bulk inks, and hazardous waste, empty drums, portable or mobile containers of plant debris, wood crates, steel racks, fuel oil, etc.)

shall be properly labeled and stored in a protected area, away from drains. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from such storage areas and shall include a description of the containment area or enclosure for those materials which are stored outdoors. The permittee may consider an inventory control plan to prevent excessive purchasing of potentially hazardous substances.

(2) Material handling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from material handling operations and areas (e.g., blanket wash, mixing solvents, loading and unloading materials). The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): the use of spill and overflow protection; covering fuel areas; and covering or enclosing areas where the transfer of materials may occur. When applicable, the plan shall address the replacement or repair of leaking connections, valves, transfer lines and pipes that may carry chemicals, or wastewater.

(3) Fueling areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from fueling areas. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): covering the fueling area; using spill and overflow protection; minimizing runon of stormwater to the fueling area; using dry cleanup methods; and treating or recycling stormwater runoff collected from the fueling areas.

(4) Aboveground storage tank areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from aboveground storage tank areas, including the associated piping and valves. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): regular cleanup of these areas; preparation of a spill prevention control and countermeasure program (SPCC) to provide spill and overflow protection; minimizing runon of stormwater from adjacent facilities and properties; restricting access to the area; insertion of filters in adjacent catch basins; absorbent booms in unbermed fueling areas; use of dry cleanup methods; and permanently sealing drains within critical areas that may discharge to a storm drain.

b. Employee training. Employee training shall, at a minimum, address the following areas when applicable to a facility: spent solvent management; spill prevention and control; used oil management; fueling procedures; and general good housekeeping practices.

9VAC25-151-320. Sector Y - Rubber, miscellaneous plastic products, and miscellaneous manufacturing industries.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from rubber and miscellaneous plastic products manufacturing facilities (SIC Major Group 30) and miscellaneous manufacturing industries, except jewelry, silverware, and plated ware (SIC Major Group 39, except 391), SIC Codes 3011, 3021, 3052, [3053,] 3061, and 3069.

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Site description. Summary of potential pollutant sources. Rubber manufacturing facilities shall review the use of zinc at the facility and the possible pathways through which zinc may be discharged in stormwater runoff.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Controls for rubber manufacturers. Rubber manufacturing facilities shall describe and implement specific controls to minimize the discharge of zinc in stormwater discharges from the facility. Listed below are possible sources of zinc. These shall be reviewed and the accompanying control measures (or their equivalents) shall be <del>considered</del> documented in the SWPPP. Also, some general control measure options to consider include: using chemicals that are purchased in pre-weighed, sealed polyethylene bags; storing materials that are in use in sealable containers; ensuring an airspace between the container and the cover to minimize "puffing" losses when the container is opened; and using automatic dispensing and weighing equipment.

(1) Zinc bags. All permittees shall review the handling and storage of zinc bags at their facilities. Following are some control measure options: employee training regarding the handling and storage of zinc bags; indoor storage of zinc bags; cleanup of zinc spills without washing the zinc into the storm drain; and the use of 2,500-pound sacks of zinc rather than 50- to 100-pound sacks.

(2) Dumpsters. The permittee shall minimize discharges of zinc from dumpsters. Following are some control measure options: provide a cover for the dumpster; move the dumpster to an indoor location; or provide a lining for the dumpster.

(3) Dust collectors or baghouses. Permittees shall minimize contributions of zinc to stormwater from dust collectors and baghouses. Improperly operating dust collectors and baghouses shall be replaced or repaired as appropriate.

(4) Grinding operations. Permittees shall minimize contamination of stormwater as a result of dust generation from rubber grinding operations. One control measure option is to install a dust collection system.

(5) Zinc stearate coating operations. Permittees shall minimize the potential for stormwater contamination from drips and spills of zinc stearate slurry that may be released to the storm drain. One control measure option is to use alternative compounds to zinc stearate.

b. Controls for plastic products manufacturers. Plastic products manufacturing facilities shall describe and implement specific controls to minimize the discharge of plastic resin pellets in stormwater discharges from the facility. The following control measures (or their equivalents) shall be <u>considered documented</u> in the SWPPP: minimizing spills; cleaning up of spills <u>promptly immediately</u> and thoroughly; sweeping thoroughly; pellet capturing; employee education; and disposal precautions.

C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Rubber product manufacturing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 320.

 Table 320

 Sector Y – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration
Tires and Inner Tubes; Rubber Footwear; Gasket Hose and Belting; and Fabricated Rubber Produc [3011-3069 3011, 3021, 3052, 3053, 3061, and 3	cts, Not Elsewhere Classified (SIC Codes
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L

## 9VAC25-151-330. Sector Z - Leather tanning and finishing. (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from leather tanning, currying and finishing (commonly identified by SIC Code 3111).

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: processing and storage areas of the beamhouse, tanyard, retan-wet finishing and dry finishing operations.

b. Summary of potential pollutant sources. A description of potential pollutant sources including (as appropriate): temporary or permanent storage of fresh and brine cured hides; leather dust, scraps, trimmings and shavings; and extraneous hide substances and hair.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping.

(1) Storage areas for raw, semiprocessed, or finished tannery by products. Pallets and bales of raw, semiprocessed or finished tannery by products (e.g., splits, trimmings, shavings, etc.) shall be stored indoors or protected by polyethylene wrapping, tarpaulins, roofed storage area or other suitable means. Materials shall be placed on an impermeable surface, the area shall be enclosed or bermed, or other equivalent measures shall be employed to prevent runon or runoff of stormwater.

(2) Material storage areas. Storage units of all materials should be labeled (e.g., specific chemicals, hazardous materials, spent solvents, waste materials). The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contact with stormwater.

(3) Buffing and shaving areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff with leather dust from buffing and shaving areas. The permittee may consider dust collection enclosures, preventive inspection and maintenance programs or other appropriate preventive measures.

(4) Receiving, unloading, and storage areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from receiving, unloading, and storage areas. The following measures (or their equivalents) shall be considered for exposed receiving, unloading and storage areas: hides and chemical supplies protected by a suitable cover; diversion of drainage to the process sewer; and grade berming or curbing area to prevent runoff of stormwater.

(5) Outdoor storage of contaminated equipment. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contact of stormwater with contaminated equipment. The following measures (or their equivalents) shall be considered: equipment protected by suitable cover; diversion of drainage to the process sewer; thorough cleaning prior to storage.

(6) Waste management. The permittee shall describe and implement measures that prevent or minimize contamination of the stormwater runoff from waste storage areas. The permittee shall consider the following measures (or their equivalents): inspection and maintenance programs for leaking containers or spills; covering dumpsters; moving waste management activities indoors; covering waste piles with temporary covering material such as tarpaulins or polyethylene; and minimizing stormwater runoff by enclosing the area or building berms around the area.

C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Leather tanning and finishing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 330.

Sector Z Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern Benchmark Concentration		
Leather Tanning and Finishing (SIC 3111)		
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	<del>1.5 mg/L</del>	

 Table 330

 Sector Z Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

## 9VAC25-151-340. Sector AA - Fabricated metal products.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from the <u>following</u> fabricated metals [<u>industry industries</u>] <del>listed below</del>, except for electrical related industries: fabricated metal products, except machinery and transportation equipment (SIC Code 34);, <u>SIC Codes 3411-3471, [3479], and 3482-3499</u>; and jewelry, silverware, and plated ware (SIC Code 391), SIC Codes 3911-3915.

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following items.

1. Site description.

a. Site Map. The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: raw metal storage areas; finished metal storage areas; scrap disposal collection sites; equipment storage areas; retention and detention basins; temporary or permanent diversion dikes or berms; right of way or perimeter diversion devices; sediment traps or barriers; processing areas including outside painting areas; wood preparation; recycling; and raw material storage.

b. Spills and Leaks. When listing significant spills and leaks, the permittee shall pay attention to the following materials, at a minimum: chromium, toluene, pickle liquor, sulfuric acid, zinc and other water priority chemicals and hazardous chemicals and wastes.

c. Summary of potential pollutant sources. The plan shall include a description of the potential pollutant sources from the following activities: loading and unloading operations for paints, chemicals and raw materials; outdoor storage activities for raw materials, paints, empty containers, corn cob, chemicals, scrap metals; outdoor manufacturing or processing activities such as grinding, cutting, degreasing, buffing, brazing, etc.; and on-site waste disposal practices for spent solvents, sludge, pickling baths, shavings, ingots pieces, refuse and waste piles.

2. Stormwater controls.

a. Good housekeeping.

(1) Raw steel handling storage. The permittee shall describe and implement measures for managing or recovering scrap metals, fines, and iron dust, including measures for containing materials within storage handling areas.

(2) Paints and painting equipment. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to prevent or minimize exposure of paint and painting equipment from exposure to stormwater.

b. Spill prevention and response procedures. The permittee shall ensure that the necessary equipment to implement a cleanup is available to personnel. The following areas shall be addressed:

(1) Metal fabricating areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures for maintaining clean, dry, orderly conditions in these areas. Use of dry clean-up techniques shall be considered in the plan.

(2) Storage areas for raw metal. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to keep these areas free of conditions that could cause, or impede appropriate timely response to, spills or leakage of materials. The following measures (or their equivalents) shall be considered: storage areas maintained such that there is easy access in the event of a spill; stored materials labeled to aid in identifying spill contents.

(3) Metal working fluid storage areas. The permittee shall describe and implement measures for storage of metal working fluids.

(4) Cleaners and rinse water. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to control and clean up spills of solvents and other liquid cleaners; control sand buildup and disbursement from sand blasting operations; and prevent exposure of recyclable wastes. Environmentally benign cleaners shall be substituted when possible.

(5) Lubricating oil and hydraulic fluid operations. The permittee shall describe and implement measures to minimize the potential for stormwater contamination from lubricating oil and hydraulic fluid operations. The permittee shall consider using devices or monitoring equipment or other devices to detect and control leaks and overflows. The installation of perimeter controls such as dikes, curbs, grass filter strips, or other equivalent measures shall also be considered.

(6) Chemical storage areas. The permittee shall describe and implement proper storage methods that prevent stormwater contamination and accidental spillage. The plan shall include a program to inspect containers, and identify proper disposal methods.

c. Inspections. Metal fabricators shall at a minimum include the following areas for inspection: raw metal storage areas; finished product storage areas; material and chemical storage areas; recycling areas; loading and unloading areas; equipment storage areas; paint areas; and vehicle fueling and maintenance areas.

d. Comprehensive site compliance evaluation. The site compliance evaluation shall also include inspections of: areas associated with the storage of raw metals; storage of spent solvents and chemicals; outdoor paint areas; and roof drainage. Potential pollutants include chromium, zinc, lubricating oil, solvents, aluminum, oil and grease, methyl ethyl ketone, steel and other related materials.

C. <u>B.</u> Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Metal fabricating facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 340.

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Fabricated Metal Products Except Coating (SIC Codes 3411-3471, 3482-3499, 3911-3915)		
Total Recoverable Aluminum	750 μg/L	
Total Recoverable Iron	1.0 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 μg/L	

 Table 340

 Sector AA – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Fabricated Metal Coating and Engraving (SIC Code 3479)	
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L

9VAC25-151-350. Sector AB - Transportation equipment, industrial, or commercial machinery.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from transportation equipment, and industrial or commercial machinery manufacturing facilities (commonly described by SIC Major Group 35 (except SIC Code 357), and SIC Major Group 37 (except SIC Code 373)) commonly described by SIC Codes 3511-3599, except SIC Codes 3571-3579.

B. Stormwater pollution prevention plan <u>SWPPP</u> requirements. In addition to the requirements of Part III, the SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following item:

Site description. [Site map.] The site map shall identify where any of the following may be exposed to precipitation or surface runoff: vents and stacks from metal processing and similar operations.

C. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Transportation equipment manufacturing facilities are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 350.

Sector AB – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Transportation equipment manufacturing facilities (SIC 35, except 357, and SIC 37, except 373) (SIC Codes 3511-3599 except SIC Codes 3571-3579)		
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)*	15.0 mg/L	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	100 mg/L	
Total Recoverable Copper	18 µg/L	
Total Recoverable Zinc	120 μg/L	
*Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) is the sum of individual gasoline range organics and diesel range organics (TPH-GRO and TPH-DRO) to be measured by EPA SW 846 Method 8015 for gasoline and diesel range organics, or by EPA SW 846 Methods 8260 Extended and 8270 Extended.		

 Table 350

 Sector AB – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

# 9VAC25-151-360. Sector AC - <del>Electronic, electrical equipment and components, photographic and optical goods.</del> (Repealed)

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities that manufacture: electronic and other electrical equipment and components, except computer equipment (SIC Major Group 36); measuring, analyzing, and controlling instruments; photographic, medical and optical goods; watches and clocks (SIC Major Group 38) and computer and office equipment (SIC Code 357).

B. Additional requirements. No additional sector-specific requirements apply to this sector.

# 9VAC25-151-370. Sector AD - Nonclassified facilities/stormwater discharges designated by the board as requiring permits.

A. Discharges covered under this section. Sector AD is used to provide permit coverage for facilities designated by the board as needing a stormwater permit under the provisions of 9VAC25-31-120 A 1 c or under 9VAC25-31-120 A 7 a (1) or (2) of the VPDES Permit Regulation. Therefore, almost any type of stormwater discharge could may be covered under this sector. Permittees shall be assigned to Sector AD by the board and may not choose Sector AD as the sector describing the facility's activities.

B. Additional requirements. No additional sector specific requirements apply to this sector.

C. <u>B.</u> Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Nonelassified facilities/stormwater discharges designated by the board as requiring permits are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 370. The board shall establish any additional monitoring requirements for your facility prior to authorizing coverage under this permit.

 Table 370

 Sector AD – Benchmark Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Nonclassified Facilities/Stormwater Discharges Designated By the Board As Requiring Permits		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	<del>100 mg/L</del>	

# 9VAC25-151-380. Sector AE - Facilities with no analytical benchmark monitoring requirements.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities with SIC Codes 2611, 2621, 2652-2657, 2833-2836, 2851, 2861-2869, 2891-2899, 3952, [2992, 2999.] 3211, 3221, 3229, 3231, 3241, 3281, 3291-3299, 3331-3339, 3398, 3399, 3341, 1311, 1321, 1381-1389, 2911, 4512-4581, Treatment Works (TW), 2011-2015, 2032-2038, 2051-2053, 2061-2068, 2082-2087, 2091-2099, 2111-2141, 2211-2299, 2311-2399, 3131-3199, 2434, 2511-2599, 2711-2796, 3081-3089, 3931, 3942-3949, 3951-3955 (except 3952 [facilities as specified in Sector C]), 3961, 3965, 3991-3999, 3111, 3711-3799 (except 3731 and 3732 as identified in Sector Q), 3571-3579, 3612-3699, and 3812-3873.

B. No additional sector-specific requirements apply to this sector.

# 9VAC25-151-390. Sector AF- Facilities limited to total suspended solids benchmark monitoring requirements.

A. Discharges covered under this section. The requirements listed under this section apply to stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from facilities with SIC Codes [2411,] [2421,] [2426,] [2429,] [2431-2433, 2435-2439, 2441, 2448, 2449, 2451, 2452, 2493,] 4011, 4013, 4111-4173, 4212-4231, 4311, and 5171.

<u>B. Benchmark monitoring and reporting requirements. Facilities or stormwater discharges included in this sector are required to monitor their stormwater discharges for the pollutants of concern listed in Table 390.</u>

Table 390		
Sector AF- Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Pollutants of Concern	Benchmark Concentration	
Facilities Limited to Total Suspended Solids Benchmark Monitoring Requirements		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	<u>100 mg/L</u>	

# **GENERAL VPDES PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES OF STORMWATER FROM CONSTRUCTION**

**ACTIVITIES, 9VAC25-880:** The current VPDES Construction General Permit will expire on June 30, 2019 and the regulation establishing this general permit is being amended to reissue another five-year permit. The staff is bringing this final regulation before the Board to request adoption. This regulation took into consideration the recommendations of a technical advisory committee (TAC) formed for this regulatory action. The TAC consisted of industry representatives, non-governmental organization representatives, local government representatives, consultants and DEQ staff.

The Board's authorization of the proposal was received at the September 20, 2018 meeting. A Notice of Public Comment Period (NOPC) was issued on October 29, 2018 and the public comment period ran from October 29, 2018 to December 28, 2018 with public hearings held in Glen Allen on November 27, 2018 and in Roanoke on November 28, 2018.

At the public hearing in Glen Allen, 23 people attended. Eleven individuals spoke on topics that included the relationship of the proposed permit to the post-development stormwater management technical criteria, citizen complaints, registration statement requirements, notice of termination requirements, and in support of various portions of the proposed permit.

Twenty-five people attended the public hearing in Roanoke. One representative of a consulting firm spoke requesting clarification on portions of the proposed permit language. Eighteen other individuals spoke out in opposition of the Mountain Valley Pipeline project.

Written comments were received from 41 individuals representing local governments, engineering and consulting firms, non-governmental organizations, and citizens. The comments and responses are summarized below:

Commenter	Торіс	Comment	Department Response
Jimmy	Authorizati	9VAC25-880-30. A.4.b This	The department has revised the
Edmonds	on to	section explains that an approved	regulation language for
(Loudoun	Discharge	SWM plan must be obtained by the	consistency.
County)		Operator prior in order to obtain	
		authorization to discharge. Later in	
		the regulation, 9VAC25-880-70	
		<b>PART II.A.3.b</b> states that projects	
		that have commenced or are	
		authorized to discharge under the	
		2009 or 2014 CGP do not require	
		an approved SWM Plan. We	
		understand how the 2009 CGP fits;	
		however, the 2014 permit required	
		an approved SWM plan for every	
		regulated LDA. Please provide a	
		clarification.	
Home	Authorized	9VAC25-880-30 F.5 and 9VAC25-	The department has included
Builders	non-	880-70 Part I.E.5 of Proposed	information on the fact sheet
Association	stormwater	Chapter 880 states: "Potable water	regarding this provision of the
of Virginia	discharges	source, including uncontaminated	permit.
		waterline flushings managed in a	
		manner to avoid an instream	
		impact."	
		Comment: DEQ does not clearly	
		define the term "instream impact"	
		in the Proposed Chapter 880,	
		9VAC25-840 (Erosion and	
		Sediment Control Regulations), or	
		9VAC25-870 (Virginia Stormwater	
		Management Program Regulation).	
		Therefore, to avoid confusion and	
		misinterpretation throughout the	
		construction industry, it is	
		recommended that DEQ add a	
		definition of the term "instream	
		impact" to the Proposed Chapter	
		880 definition section (9VAC25-	
		880-1).	

Barbara	Offsite	Section 9VAC25-880-30.D should	The proposed general permit
Brumbaugh	Support	be revised to clarify how it applies	retains language as specified in
(City of	Activities	to state projects. If a state agency is	9VAC25-880-30 D stating that off-
Chesapeake)	1100110000	the operator of the construction	site facilities are not required to be
chicap chica)		activity seeking general permit	covered by the general permit for
		coverage, they should be required	the primary construction activity.
		to include off-site support activities	Information has been added to the
		on the registration statement. The	fact sheet regarding permit
		Department of Environmental	coverage for off-site support
		Quality ("DEQ") should be the	activities. No changes to the permit
		VSMP Authority for state projects	are proposed in response to this
		and their associated off-site support	comment.
		activities, regardless of where they	
		are located. However, the Virginia	
		Department of Transportation	
		("VDOT") is interpreting this	
		section differently. VDOT's policy	
		requires contractors working on an	
		off-site support activity outside of a	
		VDOT right-of-way to obtain	
		Construction GP coverage from the local VSMP Authority. It is not the	
		local VSMP Authority's	
		responsibility to regulate a state	
		project, which is noted in 9VAC25-	
		870-104(C): "Nothing in this part	
		shall be construed as authorizing a	
		locality to regulate, or to require	
		prior approval by the locality for, a	
		state or federal project, unless	
		authorized by separate statute."	
		The suggested revision is to include	
		this sentence in the section: "Where	
		a state agency is the operator of the	
		construction activity seeking	
		general permit coverage, the land	
		area of the off-site support activity	
		shall be included in determining the	
		total land disturbance acreage of the construction activity." This	
		would require the off-site support	
		activity to be permitted with the	
		construction activity. In some	
		instances, VDOT contractors have	
		not applied for Construction GP	
		coverage when it was required.	
		When contractors do not apply for	
		permit coverage, the local VSMP	
		Authority is unaware of the off-site	
		support activity. The contractor	
		then operates the site without	
		oversight from the state or the	
		locality. VSMP authorities should	

never be held responsible for	
<u> </u>	
regulation and oversight of off0-	
site support activities for state	
projects. The City strongly	
recommends that DEQ support a	
change to VDOT's policy that	
would require VDOT to include	
off-site support activities are	
covered under a Construction GP.	

Hampton	Offsite	Section 9VAC25-880-30.D should	The proposed general permit
Roads	Support	be revised to clarify how it applies	retains language as specified in
Planning	Activities	to state projects. If a state agency is	9VAC25-880-30 D stating that off-
District		the operator of the construction	site facilities are not required to be
Commission		activity seeking general permit	covered by the general permit for
		coverage, they should be required	the primary construction activity.
		to include off-site support activities	Information has been added to the
		on the registration statement. The	fact sheet regarding permit
		Department of Environmental	coverage for off-site support
		Quality ("DEQ") should be the	activities. No changes to the permit
		VSMP Authority for state projects	are proposed in response to this
		and their associated off-site support	comment.
		activities, regardless of where they	
		are located. However, the Virginia	
		Department of Transportation	
		("VDOT") is interpreting this	
		section differently. VDOT's policy	
		requires contractors working on an	
		off-site support activity outside of a	
		VDOT right-of-way to obtain	
		Construction GP coverage from the	
		local VSMP Authority. It is not the local VSMP Authority's	
		responsibility to regulate a state	
		project, which is noted in 9VAC25-	
		870-104(C): "Nothing in this part	
		shall be construed as authorizing a	
		locality to regulate, or to require	
		prior approval by the locality for, a	
		state or federal project, unless	
		authorized by separate statute."The	
		suggested revision is to include this	
		sentence in the section: "Where a	
		state agency is the operator of the	
		construction activity seeking	
		general permit coverage, the land	
		area of the off-site support activity	
		shall be included in determining the	
		total land disturbance acreage of	
		the construction activity." This	
		would require the off-site support	
		activity to be permitted with the construction activity. In some	
		instances, VDOT contractors have	
		not applied for Construction GP	
		coverage when it was required.	
		When contractors do not apply for	
		permit coverage, the local VSMP	
		Authority is unaware of the off-site	
		support activity. The contractor	
		then operates the site without	
		oversight from the state or the	
		locality. Rather than having local	
		VSMP Authorities responsible for	

Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Administra tive Continuan ce of Permit Coverage	finding and permitting off-site support activities for state projects, DEQ should support a change to VDOT's policy that would include off-site support activities with the Construction GP for the roadway project and minimize the likelihood of off-site support activities operating without permit coverage. Section 9VAC25-880-30 (Authorization to Discharge); Item H (Continuation of General Permit Coverage) states: "coverages are automatically continued if the owner has submitted a complete registration statement". What is meant by the term "automatically"? Does this mean that, under the same conditions of renewal approval in 2014, permits will be renewed for the 2019- 2024 cycle such that the concern with Question 1 above is not an issue? or would the requirement for a "complete" registration mean that all items required for a registration statement listed in section 50 be included (to include a SWPPP, which requires ESC plans)? Why was the term "automatically" added here, as that implies that only those items required for the registration statement under the current 2014- 2019 permit would be required	Item H in section 30 of 9VAC25- 880 allows that in the circumstance that the general permit expires and the permittee has submitted a complete registration statement in accordance with the requirements of 9VAC25-880-50, the permittee may continue to operate under the 2014 permit until such time that the department approves coverage under the new general permit. This "administrative continuance" is authorized under the Clean Water Act, federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System regulations, and the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation. This proposed updated language provides consistency with other VPDES general permit regulations. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
		was the term "automatically" added here, as that implies that only those items required for the registration statement under the current 2014-	regulations. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to

Home	Administra	9VAC25-880-30 H1 and 9VAC25-	There are more there 5 000 active
			There are more than 5,000 active
Builders	tive	880-50 A.2.a(1) of Proposed	construction general permits across
Association	Continuan	Chapter 880 states: "Permit	the Commonwealth, and the
of Virginia	ce of	coverage shall expire at the end of	department will have to review and
	Permit	its term. However, expiring permit	process coverage for all registration
	Coverage	coverages are automatically	statements received, including
		continued if the owner has	those received by local VSMP
		submitted a complete registration	authorities. Receipt of registration
		statement at least 60 days prior to	statements 60 days prior to
		the expiration date of the permit, or	expiration is the minimum amount
		a later submittal date established	of time needed to ensure all permits
		<i>by the board</i> "Comment: The	are reissued prior to expiration and
		timeframe for permit renewal	is consistent with other VPDES
		levied onto existing permittees of	general permits. No changes to the
		"at least 60 days prior to the	permit are proposed in response to
		expiration date of the permit" is	this comment.
		burdensome and unnecessary.	
		When a new permittee is applying	
		for new coverage under the new	
		permit [Proposed Chapter 880-50	
		1.a], their only deadline is that the	
		Registration Statement is submitted	
		"to the VSMP authority prior to	
		the commencement of land	
		disturbing." If the permittee is	
		extending their permit coverage	
		without any major modifications to	
		the originally approved erosion and	
		sediment control plan, and the	
		stormwater management plan why	
		does DEQ need 60 days to approve	
		a renewal Registration Statement?	
		Therefore, DEQ should change the	
		timeframe deadline for submitting a	
		renewal Registration Statement	
		from 60 days to "prior to the	
		expiration date of the permit."	
L		explution dute of the permit.	

Tyler Emery	Registratio	Section B.3. currently states: A site	The purpose of the site map is to
(American	n	map in a format specified by the	document the extent of the
Electric	Statement	VSMP authority showing the	construction activities proposed for
Power)		location of the existing or proposed	coverage as part of the registration
		land-disturbing activities, the limits	statement since there are instances
		of land disturbance, construction	in which erosion and sediment
		entrances, and all water bodies	control and stormwater
		receiving stormwater discharges	management plans are not required
		from the site.	to be submitted (such as with an
			annual standards and specifications
		Please further clarify or specify in	holder or for Part II C projects
		what formats these site maps are	eligible under 9VAC25-870-47). A
		required for a complete registration	street map, topographic map, or
		statement.	aerial map provided in an 8.5 x 11
			inch format as part of the
			registration statement will satisfy
			the requirement. Please note that
			the site map should not be
			submitted as a plan-sized sheet.
			Additionally, a VSMP authority
			may allow a vicinity map included
			with the stormwater management
			plan to satisfy this requirement.
			The registration statement
			requirements have been updated for
			clarity.

Tyler Emery	Registratio	Section B.17. currently states: If	After further consideration, the
(American	n	nutrient credits are to be used to	department concurs that it is
Electric	Statement	demonstrate compliance with the	appropriate for operators to provide
Power)		water quality technical criteria as	proof of nutrient purchase at the
		allowed in 9VAC25-870-65 F, a	time of permit termination. The
		letter of availability from an	registration statement requirements
		appropriate nutrient bank that	have been revised to remove the
		nonpoint source nutrient credits	requirement for the affidavit of sale
		are available. Prior to issuance of	to be provided prior to issuance of
		state permit coverage, an affidavit	permit coverge.
		of sale documenting that nonpoint	
		source nutrient credits have been obtained shall be submitted. We feel	
		that purchase of credits prior to a	
		permit being issued is an	
		unnecessary change to the	
		application and request that it be	
		removed. As written, the permit	
		does not take into account the	
		potential for changes in scope	
		during the life of a project that	
		could affect the final amount of	
		nutrient credits ultimately required.	
		Therefore, proof of purchase of	
		these credits should be a function	
		of the permit termination and not	
		the permit issuance. Enforcement	
		mechanisms are currently in place	
		through the regulations to require compliance by permittees with the	
		final accounting of credits. AEP	
		proposes additional options for	
		consideration if there is a	
		documented need: Require an	
		affidavit of sale be provided prior	
		to the commencement of	
		construction rather than the permit	
		issuance. This would add an	
		additional step to the permitting	
		process and could potentially cause	
		delays; however, it would provide	
		permittees with some flexibility to purchase the credits on a slightly	
		longer timeline. If the	
		concern is of a lack of available	
		credits, AEP suggests the creation	
		of a system where a permit holder	
		could reserve rights to mitigation	
		credits for a project without	
		committing project funds in the	
		design stage. If construction of a	
		project gets delayed or canceled for	
		any number of reasons, those	
		credits would not have already been	

		purchased and could be returned to	
		the bank.	
Melanie	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50(B)(17):	After further consideration, the
Mason	n ~	Comment: The requirement to	department concurs that it is
(City of Alexandria)	Statement	purchase nutrient credits prior to the issuance of state coverage may cause delays in releasing plans for construction. Complete SWPPPs (including approved stormwater management plans) are often approved by the locality early in the site plan process. Permit processing can take several weeks and nutrient credits are typically not purchased until the entire site plan has achieved approval from the locality and just before the plan is released for construction. Final plan approval/release or land disturbance permits should be sufficient to make sure credits are	appropriate for operators to provide proof of nutrient purchase at the time of permit termination. The registration statement requirements have been revised to remove the requirement for the affidavit of sale to be provided prior to issuance of permit coverage.
Devilage	Desistantia	purchased.	
Barbara Brumbaugh (City of Chesapeake)	Registratio n Statement	The City strongly recommends that DEQ allow electronic submissions of Registration Statements and Notices of Terminations in order to expedite the permitting process. Permit coverage is currently issued electronically by DEQ, and allowing electronic submissions of Registrations Statements would provide consistency in processes.	At this time, electronic acceptance of registration statements and notice of terminations from operators is not available through the SWCGP database. Prior to the next permit term and in response to EPA's E-reporting rule, the department will be exploring the viability of accepting these types of documents electronically. Please note, however, that VSMP authorities may accept scanned registration statements and notice of terminations electronically if the scanned document includes a wet
			signature. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Barbara	Registratio	The draft Construction GP	The purpose of the site map is to
Barbara Brumbaugh (City of Chesapeake)	Registratio n Statement	The draft Construction GP regulations Section 9VAC25-880- 50 B.3. requests that "a site map in a format specified by the VSMP Authority showing the location of the existing or proposed land disturbance activities, the limits of land disturbance, construction entrances, and all water bodies receiving stormwater discharges from the site" to be submitted with the Registration Statement. The City already receives this information through the site or subdivision plan review process (prior to submission of the Registration Statement to DEQ) and this information is also required to be included in the SWPPP. To avoid redundancy, the City recommends that this requirement be removed or limited to only projects where DEQ is the VSMP Authority.	The purpose of the site map is to document the extent of the construction activities as part of the registration statement since there are instances in which erosion and sediment control and stormwater management plans are not required to be submitted (such as with an annual standard and specification holder or for Part II C projects eligible under 9VAC25-870-47). A street map, topographic map, or aerial map provided in an 8.5 x 11 inch format as part of the registration statement will satisfy the requirement. Please note that the site map should not be submitted as a plan-sized sheet. Additionally, a VSMP authority may allow a vicinity map included with the stormwater management plan to satisfy this requirement. The registration statement requirements have been updated for
Home Builders Association of Virginia	Registratio n Statement	9VAC25-880-50 B.7 There are 9VAC25-880-50 B.7 of Proposed Chapter 880 states: "A copy of the annual standard and specification entity form shall be submitted with the registration statement." Comment: Section 9VAC25-880- 50 B.7 is new text added to the Proposed Chapter 880, and it is unclear what documentation DEQ is referring to when stating "A copy of the annual standard and specification entity form" Therefore, it is strongly recommended that DEQ either add a definition of the annual standard and specification entity form, or remove this text from 9VAC25- 880-50 of the Proposed Chapter 880.	clarity. Those operators applying for permit coverage for projects covered under an approved under a department annual standard and specification program are required to provide certification to the department that the erosion and sediment control and stormwater management plans have been reviewed in accordance with the annual standard and specification program. This form is available on DEQ's Construction Stormwater website. The registration statement includes instructions as to when this form is required. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

John Woodburn (Goochland County)	Registratio n Statement	9VAC25-880-50.A.5 - What does this mean in regard to "authorization to discharge will not be retroactive"?	This phrase indicates that permit coverage begins only on the date that coverage is approved if after the effective date of the general permit regulation. For example, if an operator applies for permit coverage after beginning land- disturbing activities, the permit coverage would not apply for the period of time before the permit coverage is approved. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
John Woodburn (Goochland County)	Registratio n Statement	9VAC25-880-50.B.15 – need to define "prior developed lands" in this document, or reference where the term is defined.	"Prior developed lands" is defined in Section 10 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation (9VAC25-870-10). As stated in 9VAC25-880-1 of this general permit regulation, "words and terms used in this chapter shall have the meanings defined in the Virginia Stormwater Management Act (Article 2.3 (§ 62.1-44.15:24 et seq.) of Chapter 3.1 of Title 62.1 of the Code of Virginia), this chapter, and 9VAC25-870 unless the context clearly indicates otherwise." No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Mark	Registratio	Santian OVAC25 880 50 Itam D	Pagistration statement
Williams	e	Section 9VAC25-880-50, Item B	Registration statement
	n Statamant	(Draft); sub-item 3 requires a site	requirements for a site map were
(Koontz	Statement	map that shows the limits of	added at the recommendation of the
Bryant		disturbance as well as construction	technical advisory committee. The
Johnson		entrances. What would be shown	map is meant to demonstrate the
Williams)		for a phased project, required to	land-disturbing activity for the
		have permit coverage for the initial	proposed project that includes the
		phase (prior to plan approval for	estimated area to be disturbed
		that initial phase), however, does	under the permit coverage being
		not have an approved ESC plans	sought as well as denote and
		for future phases? What	distinguish future phases of land
		information is to be shown on the	disturbance. Detailed information
		site map for future sections not yet	for future phases is not necessary
		designed? If sub-item 13 (regarding	until such time that the operator
		projects that are part of a larger	registers for permit coverage for the
		common plan of development) is	future phase, but the map should
		checked, would the requirement of	outline the estimated limits of
		sub-item 3 need to show	disturbance for future phases. The
		construction entrances and limits of	permit condition has been revised
		disturbance for the entire common	to provide further clarification.
		plan of development area or just for	1
		the initial section. The initial phase,	
		being the only portion fully	
		designed, would be the only area in	
		which this information could be	
		accurately reflected on a site map.	
Mark	Registratio	Section 9VAC25-880-50, Item B	A BMP maintenance agreement is
Williams	n	(Draft); sub-item 15 Please	only required if the operator is
(Koontz	Statement	clarify the first part of the sentence	proposing a stormwater
Bryant	Statement	which states "Where applicable"	management facility to demonstrate
Johnson		When would a SWM agreement not	compliance with water quality or
Williams)		be required for a site with a BMP?	quantity requirements. No
vv mains)		be required for a site with a BIMP?	changes to the permit are proposed
			in response to this comment.

N/ 1	D		
Mark	Registratio	Section 9VAC25-880-50, Item B	Upon further review, the
Williams	n	(Draft); sub-item 15. This section	department has moved the
(Koontz	Statement	lists a requirement to have an	requirement for the maintenance
Bryant		approved SWM agreement in place,	agreement to be submitted with the
Johnson		prior to issuance of a permit (as this	registration statement and added as
Williams)		section lists information that must	part of the notice of termination
		be contained within the registration	and is required to be fully executed
		statement submitted by the	and recorded at the time of
		Operator). Sub-item 15 references	termination. Please note, however,
		9VAC25-870-112A, which states	that 9VAC25-870-112 A.1 requires
		that the agreement must be	a draft BMP maintenance
		recorded " prior to state permit	agreement be submitted with the
		termination or earlier as required by	stormwater management plans.
		the VSMP authority" Many	
		localities will approve a site plan	
		without a SWM agreement in	
		place, knowing that they can hold	
		up C of O if required. If a recorded	
		SWM agreement is required with	
		the registration statement, it would	
		directly conflict with the referenced	
		section 9VAC25-870-112A, which	
		gives the reviewing authority the	
		ability to approve a plan without	
		requiring a SWM agreement.	
		Please clarify if only a draft	
		(nonexecuted copy) of a SWM	
		agreement is required with the	
		registration statement. Otherwise,	
		since a complete registration	
		statement is required prior to	
		authorization to discharge (per	
		9VAC25-880-30-A1), the authority	
		would no longer have the flexibility	
		of approving a plan, as previously	
		afforded to them in 9VAC25-870-	
		112A, without evidence of an	
		agreement. Could this requirement	
		simply be deleted? Section	
		9VAC25-880-60 (Termination of	
		general permit coverage), Item B,	
		number 8 already requires evidence	
		that a SWM Maintenance	
		Agreement has been recorded.	
		Requiring, evidence of a recorded	
		SWM Maintenance Agreement within the termination requirements	
		(Section 60) is the appropriate	
		place. (A SWM Maintenance	
		Agreement is further required	
		under Part 1 of VAR-10, Item F,	
		sub-item 1a)	
		suo-nom raj	

Kristin Carter (University of Virginia)	Registratio n Statement	9VAC25-880-50 – For paragraph A.4 – should the paragraph be titled "Late registration statements" rather than "Late notifications"?	The titles are correct. "Late notifications" applies to those operators who begin land disturbing activities prior to submittal of the registration statement and obtaining permit coverage. "Late registration statements" applies to existing permittees who submit a
			registration statement for permit coverage after the due date established in the general permit regulation. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Kristin	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50 – For paragraph	Thank you for your comment;
Carter	n	A.5 - would it be more appropriate	however, the department believes
(University	Statement	to move this text under paragraph $A_{2}^{2} = a^{2}$	the current location of the language
of Virginia) Kristin	Registratio	A.2 – perhaps renumber A.2.a.(3)? 9VAC25-880-50 – For paragraph	is appropriate. After further consideration, the
Carter	n	B.17 - I recommend documenting	department concurs that it is
(University	Statement	purchase of nutrient credits be due	appropriate for operators to provide
of Virginia)	Statement	at the same time record	proof of nutrient purchase at the
or virginia)		drawings/stormwater maintenance	time of permit termination. The
		agreements are recorded (NOT	proposed permit has been revised to
		phase) in case there are slight	require the affidavit of sale at the
		changes to the post-development	time of permit termination. The
		land cover that impact the required	proposed general permit has been
		credit purchase. Accordingly, this	revised accordingly.
		language should move to 9VAC25-	
		880-60 sec on C.	
Logan	Registratio	I support the requirement of	Thank you for your comment.
Kendle	n	documentation of nutrient credits.	
(Superintend	Statement		
ent			
Commercial			
Contractor)			

Street (Spotsylvani a County)n Statementitem A-3 "Transfer". We should probably state the three basic options that we use Basically there are 3 options in this scenario:permit occurs when an existing operator transfers permit coverage to a new operator. The circumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit overage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.00. Original operator transfers neur permit to new operator - Transfer fee 3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeSwepP or a new contractor obtains their own permit coverage is not coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.1I'm not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	Richard	Registratio	Page 767 under 9VAC25-880-50	"Transfer" as used in the general
(Spotsylvani a County)Statementprobably state the three basic options that we use Basically there are 3 options in this scenario:operator transfers permit coverage to a new operator. The circumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit - New issuance fee 2. Original operator transfers entrie permit to new operator - Transfer fee 3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeoperator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeI'm not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed		e		
a County)options that we use Basically there are 3 options in this scenario:is a new operator. The circumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit - New issuance fee 2. Original operator transfers fee 3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeis a new operator. The circumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.7 m not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language a swritten in the proposed regulation requires the physical adver sof the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				1 0
are 3 options in this scenario:circumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit - New issuance fee 2. Original operator transfers entire permit to new operator - Transfer fee 3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPP - No feecircumstances in which an operator identifies a sub-contractor in the SWPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.1. New operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeI'm not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the cordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	· •	Statement		· · · · ·
RichardRegistrationPage 768 under the same section of the sub-section obtains their own permit - New operator of the sub-section obtains their own permit - New issuance feeidentifies a sub-contractor in the SWPP or a new contractor obtains their own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit2. Original operator transfers entire permit to new operator - Transfer fee3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feecomment.1'm not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical acounty)RichardRegistratio n above [9VAC25-880-50 ] item B-2 u aclounty)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical acounty)A County)Statementthe address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical acounty of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	u county)		· · ·	
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registration nPage 768 under the same section a County)their own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50 ] item B-2 that the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed is a well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registration statementPage 768 under the same section a County)their own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50 ] item B-2 the address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical a didress of the project. No changes to the permit coverage. No changes to the permit coverage. No changes to the permit coverage. No changes to the considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to this comment.No their own permit to new operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeHeir own permit coverage is not considered a transfer of permit coverage. No changes to this comment.No the available as the firmer a County)Pim not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			1. New operator of the sub-section	SWPPP or a new contractor obtains
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registratio Statement2. Original operator transfers entire permit to new operator - Transfer fee 3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feecoverage. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.Image: Comparison operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeImage: Comparison operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeImage: Comment.Image: Comparison operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeImage: Comment.Image: Comment.Image: Comparison operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeImage: Comment.Image: Comment.Image: Comparison operator if the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.Image: Comment.Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Page 768 under the same section available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language a swritten in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			obtains their own permit - New	their own permit coverage is not
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registratio StatementPage 768 under the same section n submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anare proposed in response to this comment.Richard a County)Registratio pPage 768 under the same section n submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language a swella as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			issuance fee	considered a transfer of permit
RichardRegistratio n a County)Page 768 under the same section a County)The registration a county and public to public the ddress is almost always not a county on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed			<b>č</b> 1	<b>U U U</b>
3. Original operator identifies new operator as a contractor working under them in the SWPPP - No feeI'm not certain if we should just have a handout at the local level or if DEQ needs a fact sheet or if it needs to be placed in the permit update to just tell everyone. I'll leave that up to you and your staff. I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registratio n StatementPage 768 under the same section a bove [9VAC25-880-50 ] item B-2 the address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			1 1	
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registratio N StatementPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the proposed relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language address of the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the proposed relying on the Long/Lat until an				comment.
Richard Street (Spotsylvani a County)Registratio NPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical a ddress of the construction activity when it is available as well as the relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement are proposed regulation to the permit are proposed				
Richard Street a County)Registratio n statementPage 768 under the same section a county)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement are proposed regulation requires the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
RichardRegistratioPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language available at the time we need to available at the time we need to relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			under them in the SWPPP - No fee	
RichardRegistratioPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language available at the time we need to available at the time we need to relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			I'm not certain if we should just	
Image: section of the section.a County)a count of the section of the section.a County)a count of the section of the				
RichardRegistratioPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe regist of the project. No conditionation the proposed				
Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section a County)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement are proposed				
I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.I will however create a simple sheet that explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50 ] item B-2 available at the time we need to available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
Image: Registratiothat explains the options (unless you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.The registration statement language as written in the proposedRichardRegistratioPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2The registration statement language as written in the proposedStreetnabove [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2as written in the proposed(Spotsylvani a County)Statementthe address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anwhen it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			leave that up to you and your staff.	
you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.you have one already) to give to our VAEPO members.Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2 available at the address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anThe registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed			<u>^</u>	
Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2 the address is almost always not a County)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
Richard StreetRegistratio nPage 768 under the same section above [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2 the address is almost always not a County)The registration statement language as written in the proposed regulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
Streetnabove [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2as written in the proposed(Spotsylvani a County)Statementabove [9VAC25-880-50] item B-2as written in the proposedvailable at the address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anas written in the proposedregulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	D: 1 1	<b>D</b>		
(Spotsylvani a County)Statementthe address is almost always not available at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anregulation requires the physical address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed		e		
a County) a County) a vailable at the time we need to submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until an address of the construction activity when it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed				
submit the VSMP. We generally get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until anwhen it is available as well as the coordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	` <b>*</b> •	Statement		
get a road name but we have been relying on the Long/Lat until ancoordinates of the project. No changes to the permit are proposed	a County)			5
relying on the Long/Lat until an changes to the permit are proposed				
			e	
address is assigned. I think maybe in response to this comment.				
keeping the "if available" but place			<b>e</b> .	in response to this comment.
it behind the word address example				
"address (if available)".				

Jody Greene	Registratio	Associated plan sets and supporting	The purpose of the site map is to
(Wetland	n	information requirements The	document the extent of the
Studies and	Statement	following three recommendations	construction activities as part of the
Solutions,		regarding associated plan sets are	registration statement since there
Inc.)		necessary to avoid requiring	are instances in which erosion and
,		redundant effort when the	sediment control and stormwater
		requested documentation is already	management plans are not required
		provided in the plan submission	to be submitted (such as with an
		process. When VSMP authorities	annual standard and specification
		link the plans directly to the	holder or for Part II C projects
		Registration Statement there should	eligible under 9VAC25-870-47). A
		be no need to suggest the	street map, topographic map, or
		information contained in the plans	aerial map provided in an 8.5 x 11
		has to be submitted again.	inch format as part of the
		However, the recommended change	registration statement will satisfy
		would not prohibit any VSMP	the requirement. Please note that
		authority from requested a specific	the site map should not be
		format that differs from the plan	submitted as a plan-sized sheet.
		set. Also note, that VSMP	Additionally, a VSMP authority
		Authorities that choose to use the	may allow a vicinity map included
		plans instead of separate submittals	with the stormwater management
		will reduce the chances for	plan to satisfy this requirement.
		conflicting information as site plans	The registration statement
		change and are updated.9VAC25-	requirements have been updated for
		880-50 B.3 Currently Proposed: 3.	clarity.
		A site map in a format specified by	
		the VSMP authority showing the	
		location of the existing or proposed	
		land disturbing activities, the limits	
		of land disturbance, construction	
		entrances, and all water bodies	
		receiving stormwater discharges	
		from the site;Recommend Change:	
		3. Unless provided in the associated	
		plan set, a site map in a format	
		specified by the VSMP authority	
		showing the location of the existing	
		or proposed land disturbing	
		activities, the limits of land	
		disturbance, construction entrances,	
		and all water bodies receiving	
		stormwater discharges from the	
		site;	

Jody Greene	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50 B.17	After further consideration, the
(Wetland	n	Currently Proposed	department concurs that it is
Studies and	Statement	16. If nutrient credits are to be used	appropriate for operators to provide
Solutions,	Statement	to demonstrate compliance with the	proof of nutrient purchase at the
Inc.)		water quality technical criteria as	time of permit termination. The
inc.)		allowed in 9VAC25-870-65 F, a	proposed permit has been revised to
		letter of availability from an	require an affidavit of sale at the
		appropriate nutrient bank that	time of permit termination. The
		nonpoint source nutrient credits are	proposed general permit has been
		available. Prior to issuance of state	revised accordingly.
		permit coverage, an affidavit of	
		sale documenting that nonpoint	
		source nutrient credits have been	
		obtained shall be submitted;	
		Recommended Change	
		16. If nutrient credits are to be used	
		to demonstrate compliance with the	
		water quality technical criteria as	
		allowed in 9VAC25-870-65 F, a	
		letter of availability from an	
		appropriate nutrient bank that	
		nonpoint source nutrient credits are	
		available. Prior to issuance of state	
		permit coverage, an affidavit of	
		sale documenting that nonpoint	
		source nutrient credits have been	
		obtained shall be submitted, unless	
т.	<b>D</b>	provided in the associated plan set;	
Jimmy Edmonds	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50.A.2.a(1) This	A draft registration statement was
(Loudoun	n Statement	section requires that an updated (amended) Registration Statement	provided on DEQ's website on
County)	Statement	be submitted by the Operator at	February 14, 2019 and sent to local VSMP authorities on February 20,
County)		least 60 days prior to the expiration	2019. The department believes that
		of the existing permit. We desire to	due to the minimal changes on the
		provide the amended Registration	registration statement, existing
		Statement to our clients in order for	permittees will have sufficient time
		them to have plenty of time to meet	to complete the document and
		the deadline. Will DEQ be able to	provide it to the VSMP authority
		provide this document in a timely	by the due date. VSMP authorities
		fashion or will the current	may accept draft registration
		Registration Statement need to	statements to fulfill the re-
		suffice in order to meet these time	application requirements under the
		constraints?	general permit. A final registration
			statement will be made available
			after approval of the proposed
			regulation by the State Water
			Control Board. No changes to the
			permit are proposed in response to
			this comment.

Jimmy	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50.B.15 This section	Upon further review, the
Edmonds	n	mandates that the stormwater	department has removed the
(Loudoun	Statement	management maintenance	requirement for the maintenance
County)		agreement be submitted with the	agreement to be submitted with the
		Registration Statement. We believe	registration statement and added as
		that it is important that all parties	part of the notice of termination
		realize that this agreement will be	and is required to be fully executed
		in "draft" (unexecuted) form at the	and recorded at the time of
		time the Registration Statement is	termination. Please note, however,
		submitted. The processing of a	that 9VAC25-870-112 A.1 requires
		maintenance agreement requires	a draft BMP maintenance
		careful review by both engineering	agreement be submitted with the
		and legal teams in our locality and	stormwater management plans.
		is subject to change as a result of	
		the SWM plan review process.	
		We recommend that the following	
		highlighted word be added to this	
		section for clarification as follows:	
		"9VAC-880-50.B.15an	
		unexecuted stormwater	
		management agreement in	
		accordance with 9VAC25-870-	
		112A. "	

Jimmy Edmonds (Loudoun County)	Registratio n Statement	<ul> <li>9VAC25-880-50.B.16 This section mandates that the "letter of availability" for nutrient credit purchase be submitted with the Registration Statement. It also requires that an "affidavit of sale" be provided prior to the issuance of the CGP.</li> <li>We believe that it is premature to require the letter of availability with the Registration Statement as the credit requirement could change as part of the local SWM plan review or it could be eliminated by a change in BMP selection. We support requiring the letter prior to the approval of the SWM Plan.</li> <li>Regarding the actual purchase of nutrient credits, we believe that the affidavit should be required prior to the issuance of the grading permit. The use of this later deadline again allows for unforeseen amendments to the SWM plan and provides flexibility for the Operator should the project start be delayed.</li> <li>We recommend that this entire section be removed from 9VAC25-880-50.B.</li> </ul>	After further consideration of several comments received, the department believes that it is appropriate for operators to provide proof of nutrient purchase at the time of permit termination. However, the department contends that it is appropriate for operators that intend to use credits to demonstrate compliance with the stormwater quantity requirements to provide documentation to the VSMP that the credits are available. Therefore, the registration statement requirements have been revised to remove the requirement for the affidavit of sale prior to permit coverage, but has retained the requirement to provide "Letter of availability" from an appropriate nutrient bank at the time of registration statement submittal. The proposed general permit has been revised accordingly.
Jimmy	Registratio	9VAC25-880-50.A.1.c This section	In accordance with Section 62.1-
Edmonds (Loudoun	n Statement	states that no state permit is required for the construction single-	44.15:28 A.8 of the Stormwater Management Act and 9VAC25-
County)		family detached dwellings;	870-59 of the VSMP regulation,
		however, it is our understanding	registration statements for
		(from the VSMP regulations & our local program procedures) that the	construction activities involving a single-family detached residential
		need for a permit comes into play if	structures are not required
		the land-disturbance associated	regardless of the area of land
		with single-family residence construction reaches 5 acres or	disturbance. However, a VSMP authority permit may be required
		more. Is our understanding correct?	by the local government. No
			changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

John	Permit	Suggest that a section be added	The general permit specifies in
Woodburn	Modificati	regarding modifications of permits	9VAC25-880-70 (prior to Part I),
(Goochland	ons	that reflects the content of	that "The authorized discharge shall
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0115		be in accordance with the
County)		9VAC25-870-630. – in particular	
		item A.1 of that section. I am	registration statement filed with the
		interested in having the permit	Department of Environmental
		require the permittee to apply for a	Quality" Operators are required
		permit modification when	to submit a complete and accurate
		information on his registration	registration statement in order to
		statement is to be changed (in	obtain permit coverage. In the
		particular – the owner, operator or	circumstance that the information
		the total area of development and	on the registration statement is no
		estimated area to be disturbed), and	longer valid, such as a change in
		that he will be subject to a fee for	operator or the area of estimated
		such modification of transfer. (Note	land disturbance, the operator is
		that Part II Section C of the permit	required to submit a revised
		– SWPPP Amendments – really	registration statement or transfer of
		does not address that issues raised	ownership form. The department
		in Section 630)	also requires a new registration
		,	statement if modified stormwater
			management plan is submitted for
			review. In the case of an operator
			increasing the area of estimated
			land disturbance, land disturbance
			outside of the original approval is
			not authorized until revised permit
			coverage is approved. No changes
			to the permit are proposed in
			response to this comment.

Sanner (Chesapeake BayPermit Coveragerequirement that the permittee submit a signed statement indicating that a new owner of a recently constructed residential site has been notified of final site stabilization requirements. While we understand the operator cannot RiverAdvisory Committee discussed stabilization requirements for transferred property extensively to determine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require theAdvisory Committee discussed stabilization requirements for transferred property extensively to determine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.	ransf	r	Transfer of	The Draft Permit includes a new	The general permit Technical
(Chesapeake BayCoveragesubmit a signed statement indicating that a new owner of a recently constructed residential site has been notified of final site stabilization requirements. While (James Riverstabilization requirements. While we understand the operator cannot control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thestabilization requirements for transferred property extensively to determine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.					e 1
Bayindicating that a new owner of a recently constructed residential site has been notified of final site stabilization requirements. While (James Rivertransferred property extensively to determine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the genera permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thetransferred property extensively to determine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i stabilization is achieved resulting i situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.					
Foundation) and Bill Street (James Riverrecently constructed residential site has been notified of final site stabilization requirements. While we understand the operator cannot control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thedetermine how best to ensure final stabilization is achieved resulting i tabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.	000010	June	coverage		<b>^</b>
and Bill Street (James Riverhas been notified of final site stabilization requirements. While we understand the operator cannot control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thestabilization is achieved resulting i the proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		(on)		6	
Bill Street (James Riverstabilization requirements. While we understand the operator cannot control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thethe proposed changes to the general permit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		011)			
(James Riverwe understand the operator cannot control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thePermit in a practical matter in situations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		at			e
River Association)control the actions of a new residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thesituations of individual lots in new residential construction. As discussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		el			
Association) residential owner, taking appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require the is not regulated by the department.					
appropriate steps to ensure that the new owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require thediscussed in the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		. 、			
Image: New owner recognizes the importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require theAdvisory Committee meetings, the Board does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.		10n)			
importance of site stabilization is critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require theBoard does not have the authority require the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.					
critical for water quality. We urge the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require therequire the signature of a 3rd party/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.					
the Board, therefore, to amend the Draft Permit to require theparty/new owner as suggested that is not regulated by the department.				-	
Draft Permit to require the is not regulated by the department.					
nermittee to secure written I The department has revised the				·	
				permittee to secure written	The department has revised the
acknowledgement of site proposed language to require					
stabilization requirements by the written notification by the builder					•
new owner (whether residential or to the new homeowner, maintain					
				commercial).	documentation of that notification,
and sign a certification statement					6
that they have provided the					
appropriate information on					
stabilization to the new owners.					
The department believes that this i					The department believes that this is
an improvement from previous					
					versions of the permit and results in
					a practically enforceable condition.
No changes to the permit are					No changes to the permit are
proposed in response to this					proposed in response to this
comment.					comment.

Tyler Emery (American Electric Power)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	Section B. 2. currently states: Termination of authorizations to discharge for the conditions set forth in subdivision A 1 of this section shall become effective upon notification from the department that the provisions of subdivision A 1 of this section have been met or 60 days after submittal of a complete and accurate notice of termination, whichever occurs first.	While the department understands the concerns regarding timely notification from the agency on termination packages, inclusion of a time frame regulating the agency's actions in the general permit regulation is not appropriate. The department notifies operators of incomplete packages typically within 2 weeks of receipt of the termination package. No changes to the permit are proposed in
		In order to provide the permit holder with assurance that the notice of termination has been reviewed timely to consider it "complete and accurate," AEP requests inclusion of a timeframe to receive notice that the notice of termination is not complete, similar to plan review timeframes. That would then document the start of the 60-day clock if no request for additional information is received.	response to this comment.
Melanie Mason (City of Alexandria)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	9VAC25-880-60 (B)(7) and 9VAC25-880-70 PART II D: Under the proposed language, projects will have to maintain signage until as-builts are submitted. Often projects are completely closed with residents inside the buildings before as-builts are received and construction signage has been removed. Please allow for construction signage to be removed once final stabilization has been achieved.	SWPPP requirements are effective until such time that permit coverage is terminated. In order to meet the public notification requirements, signage must stay in place until permit termination has occurred.
Melanie Mason (City of Alexandria)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	9VAC25-880-70 PART II F: Projects will have to implement all aspects of the SWPPP including inspections until as-builts are submitted. Often projects are completely closed with residents inside the buildings for months or years before as-builts are received. Requiring inspections until as- builts are submitted even though final stabilization has been achieved is overly burdensome for both the developer and the locality. Please allow for inspections to cease once final stabilization has been achieved.	In accordance with Part II B 4 c of the existing permit (Part II C 4 c of the proposed permit), those areas of a site that have reached final stabilization no longer require SWPPP inspections. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Dauharra	Terminatio	The City accomments is that a	The dependence will service the
Barbara		The City recommends that a	The department will review the
Brumbaugh	n of	checklist of permanent stormwater	Notice of Termination form to
(City of	General	control measures be added to	ensure it meets the proposed
Chesapeake)	Permit	Section 5. of the Notice of	general permit requirements and to
	Coverage	Termination form. The	determine if there are areas in
		owners/operators frequently have a	which clarification can be provided
		difficulty completing this section	as suggested.
		and often misname the practices or	
		includes practices such as	
		"seeding" or "final stabilization"	
		which do not belong in this section.	
		Receiving incomplete or incorrect	
		Notices of Termination adds a great	
		deal of additional work for the	
		VSMP Authority. Adding a	
		checklist would ensure consistent	
		classification of the permanent	
		measure which would improve	
		state data collection for permanent	
		stormwater control measures.	
Barbara	Terminatio	Section 9VAC25-880-60 C.9.	The department has revised the
Brumbaugh	n of	states the complete Notice of	definition of final stabilization in
(City of	General	Termination shall include the	9VAC25-880-1 and language in
Chesapeake)	Permit	following information: "For	9VAC25-880-60 and Part I F of the
	Coverage	individual lots in residential	general permit to require that for
		construction only, a signed	individual lots in residential
		statement from the permittee that	construction only, operators are to
		the new owner, if not the same as	provide homeowners with written
		the permittee, has been notified of	information about the importance
		the final stabilization	of final stabilization and require
		requirements" Individual lots	signed documentation from the
		within subdivisions received	permittee that the homeowner has
		automatic permit coverage and	been notified as part of the SWPPP
		therefore do not require submission	documents that must be maintained
		of a Notice of Termination.	for 3 years. This requirement
		Individual lots with single family	applies to those projects for which
		homes generally transfer from the	permit coverage is issued as well as
		builder directly to the homeowner,	those covered under automatic
		therefore, the VSMP Authority will	coverage.
		be unable to enforce this provision.	
		If this is not DEQ's intent, then the	
		City recommends that the language	
		be modified to provide	
		clarification.	

Dale	Terminatio	With updates to the Notice of	While the department understands
Chestnut	n of	Termination form, would it be	the concern to ensure the BMP
(James	General	possible to add a section to record	information provided for use in the
Madison	Permit	situations in redevelopment where	Chesapeake Bay watershed model
University)	Coverage	a pre-existing BMP will be	reflects accurate information, this
		removed or retrofitted? The goal is	comment is out of the scope of the
		to ensure removed BMPs are also	general permit regulatory action.
		taken out of the model and retrofits	Retrofit and other BMP
		are accurately portrayed in the	information should be reported
		model.	with information uploaded to the
			BMP Warehouse. No changes to
			the permit are proposed in response
			to this comment.

Home	Terminatio	<b>9VAC25-880-60 C.9</b> 9VAC25-	The department has revised the
Builders	n of	880-60 C.9 of Proposed Chapter	The department has revised the definition of final stabilization in
Association	General	880 states: "For individual lots in	9VAC25-880-1 and language in
of Virginia	Permit	residential construction only, a	9VAC25-880-60 and Part I F of the
6	Coverage	signed statement from the permittee	general permit to require that for
	C	that the new owner, if not the same	individual lots in residential
		as the permittee, has been notified	construction only, operators are to
		of the final stabilization	provide homeowners with written
		requirements."	information about the importance
			of final stabilization and require
		Comment: The requirement to	signed documentation from the
		include a signed statement that the	permittee that the homeowner has
		new owner (if not the same as the	been notified as part of the SWPPP
		permittee) has been notified of the	documents that must be maintained
		final stabilization requirements by	for 3 years.
		the permittee does not always occur and therefore may not be applicable	
		for some permittees. In 9VAC25-	
		880-1 of Proposed Chapter 880,	
		Final Stabilization is defined as:	
		"Final stabilization" means that	
		one of the following situations has	
		occurred: 1. All soil disturbing	
		activities at the site have been	
		completed and a permanent	
		vegetative cover has been	
		established on denuded areas not	
		otherwise permanently stabilized.	
		Permanent vegetation shall not be considered established until a	
		ground cover is achieved that is	
		uniform (e.g., evenly distributed),	
		mature enough to survive, and will	
		inhibit erosion. 2. For individual	
		lots in residential construction,	
		final stabilization can occur by	
		either: a. The homebuilder	
		completing final stabilization as	
		specified in subdivision 1 of this	
		definition; or, b. The homebuilder	
		establishing temporary soil	
		stabilization, including perimeter controls for an individual lot prior	
		to occupation of the home by the	
		homeowner, and informing the	
		homeowner of the need for, and	
		benefits of, final stabilization.	
		In residential construction, many	
		times the permittee installs	
		permanent sod stabilization to the	
		individual lot prior to completion	
		which would satisfy subdivision 1	
		of the Final Stabilization definition.	

In these instances, there is no need	
for the permittee to inform the	
homeowner (new owner) of final	
stabilization requirements.	
Therefore, the requirement to	
include a signed statement [on the	
Notice of Termination] that the new	
owner, if not the same as the	
permittee, has been notified of the	
final stabilization requirements by	
the permittee should either be	
removed from Proposed Chapter	
880, or be updated to make its	
inclusion in the notice of	
termination optional only if	
temporary stabilization measures	
were installed on the individual lots	
when transferred to a new owner	
that is not the same as the	
permittee.	
permittee.	

Home	Terminatio	9VAC25-880-70 Part I.F.1.a In	The department has revised the
Builders	n of	regards to the requirements to	language in 9VAC25-880-60 A.1 to
Association	General	terminate permit coverage, Part	be consistent with the proposed
	Permit	I.F.1.a of 9VAC25-880-70 of the	
of Virginia			language in 9VAC25-880-70 F.1.a.
	Coverage	Proposed Chapter 880 states:	
		"Necessary permanent control	
		measures included in the SWPPP	
		for the site are in place and	
		functioning effectively and final	
		stabilization has been achieved on	
		all portions of the site for which the	
		operator has operational control.	
		When applicable, long term	
		responsibility and maintenance	
		requirements for permanent control	
		measures shall be recorded in the	
		local land records prior to the	
		submission of a complete and	
		accurate notice of termination, and	
		the construction record drawing	
		prepared; "However, 9VAC25-	
		880-60 A.1 states: "Necessary	
		permanent control measures	
		included in the SWPPP for the site	
		are in place and functioning	
		effectively and final stabilization	
		has been achieved on all portions	
		of the site for which the operator	
		has operational control. When	
		applicable, long-term responsibility	
		and maintenance requirements for	
		permanent control measures shall	
		be recorded in the local land	
		records prior to the submission of a	
		complete and accurate notice of	
		<i>termination;</i> "Comment: Part	
		I.F.1.a of 9VAC25-880-70 of the	
		Proposed Chapter 880 adds the	
		requirement to add the construction	
		record drawing. It is recommended	
		that DEQ either add the text "and	
		the construction record drawing	
		prepared" to 9VAC25-880-60 A.1	
		or remove it from Part I.F.1.d of	
		9VAC25-880-70 of the Proposed	
		Chapter 880.	
		Chapter 000.	

John Woodburn (Goochland County)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	Suggest a restatement of Section 9VAC25-870.650.A – Termination of State Permits - in the general permit, as this section of the regulations explores the subject of early termination of a permit for non-compliance or for other reasons (such as the plan not being protective of the environment) - items that are not really discussed in the current version of the permit. I do not feel that the Duty to Comply Section (Section L of Part III) adequately addresses this issue. It just says that failure to comply with the permit is a reason for terminating the permit. Where is non-compliance with the permit spelled out in the current permit in as good a way as in Section	The termination requirements as listed in the proposed general permit regulation address those situations in which the permittee may terminate permit coverage. Section 650 of the VSMP regulation, 9VAC25-870, contemplates situations in which the department and the VSMP authority may terminate permit coverage for situations of non- compliance. Therefore, it is not appropriate to include the items in 9VAC25-870-650 A in the general permit. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
John Woodburn (Goochland County)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	9VAC25-870.650? The permit does not address the obligations of the permittee to address the site if his permit has been terminated early for non- compliance, failure to pay a fee, failure to renew a permit for an ongoing project, etc. What happens if a permit expires or is terminated and the required stormwater construction has not been completed? Should there be a statement in the permit to the effect that a permittee cannot simply walk away from a site because his permit has terminated before complete the stormwater management in a manner acceptable the VDEQ or stormwater local authority?	Depending on the circumstance, non-compliance may be addressed through local ordinances, the Erosion and Sediment Control regulations and/or the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulations even if permit coverage has been terminated. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Mark	Terminatio	Section 9VAC25-880-60, Item C –	As specified in 9VAC 25-870-55
Williams	n of	Notice of Termination (Draft); sub-	D of the VSMP regulation, the
(Koontz	General	item 7 requires record drawings for	construction records drawing must
Bryant	Permit	SWM facilities. What would need	include the as-built plans of the
Johnson	Coverage	to be included with the N.O.T.	actual permanent stormwater
Williams)	e e renege	application submittal? Would the	management facilities constructed
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		As-Built documents need to be	and the seal and signature of a
		submitted along with the N.O.T.	professional registered in the
		application on projects where the	Commonwealth of Virginia,
		DEQ is the authority? Please clarify	certifying that the stormwater
		the required format and level of	management facilities have been
		detail/survey required for	constructed in accordance with the
		construction record drawings when	approved plan. The construction
		the DEQ is the authority.	record drawings would be
		(Construction Record Drawings are	submitted to the appropriate VSMP
		further required under Part 1 of	authority with the notice of
		VAR-10, Item F, sub-item 1a).	termination package. No changes
		Please either be specific with the	to the permit are proposed in
		permitted tolerance for design vs.	response to this comment.
		actual conditions or provide further	1
		guidance for engineers to determine	
		what is acceptable. What one	
		engineer deems to be "close	
		enough" may not be the same as	
		other engineers for inspections to	
		cease once final stabilization has	
		been achieved.	
Kristin	Terminatio	9VAC25-880-60 – For paragraph	9VAC 25-870-55 D of the VSMP
Carter	n of	C.7, should reference to entities	regulation requires construction
(University	General	with annual standards and	record drawings be submitted to the
of Virginia)	Permit	specifications be included in	VSMP authority. Any requirement
	Coverage	addition to VSMP authorities	by an operator to submit the
			construction record drawing to an
			annual standard and specification
			holder should be included in the
			contract or other mechanism
			between those two parties. No
			changes to the permit are proposed
			in response to this comment.

Jody Greene (Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.)	Terminatio n of General Permit Coverage	9VAC25-880-60:C.7 Currently Proposed 7. A construction record drawing in a format as specified by the VSMP authority for permanent stormwater management facilities in accordance with 9VAC25-870-55 D appropriately sealed and signed by a professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, certifying that the stormwater management facilities have been constructed in accordance with the approved plan; Recommended Change 7. A construction record drawing in a format as specified by the VSMP authority for permanent stormwater management facilities in accordance with 9VAC25-870-55 D appropriately sealed and signed by a professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, certifying that the stormwater management facilities have been constructed in accordance with the approved plan, unless already	Section 55 D of the VSMP regulation, 9VAC 25-870, requires construction record drawings be submitted to the VSMP authority. The VSMP regulation does not provide authorization for the suggested revision. If the stormwater management facility is not constructed as designed in an approved plan, then the operator will need to submit modified stormwater management plans to demonstrate compliance with the stormwater management technical criteria.
Jimmy	Terminatio	provided in the associated plan set; 9VAC25-880-60.C.7 Based upon	After further consideration, the
Edmonds	n of	our recommendation to remove	department concurs that it is
(Loudoun	General	9VAC25-880-50.B.16, we	appropriate for operators to provide
(Loudoun County)	General Permit Coverage	<b>9VAC25-880-50.B.16</b> , we recommend that the information on nutrient credit availability and purchase remain in the Notice of Termination. Including the information in this document will ensure that there is an accurate accounting of nutrient credits purchased should there have been amendments to the SWM plan during the construction process which impacted the number of credits required.	appropriate for operators to provide proof of nutrient purchase at the time of permit termination. The registration statement requirements have been revised to require a "Letter of availability" from an appropriate nutrient bank at the time of registration statement submittal, and the affidavit of sale at the time of permit termination. The proposed general permit has been revised accordingly.

Katlyn Schmitt (Waterkeepe rs Chesapeake) & Phillip Musegaas	General Permit Conditions 9VAC25- 880-70	Part II, bullet B.1.c – a copy of the permit is not currently provided by DEQ. The coverage letter gives a web link to the CGP. I recommend updating the proposed language since "upon receipt" doesn't apply, perhaps changing it to read "A copy of the general VPDES permit	While the sentiment of this comment is understood, permittees, VSMP authorities, and other stakeholders understand that "Upon receipt" applies to the permit coverage letter with the link to the general permit regulation. No changes to the permit are proposed
(Potomac Riverkeeper		for discharges of stormwater from construction activities, obtained	in response to this comment.
Network)		from the DEQ website" Give the link if it won't change for 5 years.	
Tyler Emery	ESC	Sections G.3.a.(5)(a)&(b) refer to	Thank you for your comment,
(American Electric	Requireme	sites that will remain dormant for	however, the proposed revision is inconsistent with Minimum
Power)	nts	14 days needing to be stabilized immediately or within seven days of	Standard #1 of the Erosion and
		reaching grade or stopping work.	Sediment Control Regulation,
		AEP requests flexibility from the VSMP authority regarding unforeseen weather events causing work to not resume within 14 days. The USEPA General Permit's intent is to initiate stabilization as soon as the permittee knows that construction work on the portion of the site is temporarily ceased and will not resume for 14 days. If rain causes work on the site to be stopped, this is unpredictable and something that was not part of the construction schedule. Therefore, the 14-day dormant period requirement would not be exceeded due to unforeseeable circumstances such as this.	9VAC25-840. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Katlyn	ESC	Stabilization measures should be	When properly installed and
Schmitt	Requireme	clearly spelled out in the permit.	maintained, perimeter controls are
(Waterkeepe	nts	Construction sites generate the	crucial to preventing the discharge
rs		greatest amount of turbidity, by far,	of sediment via stormwater runoff.
Chesapeake)		compared to other land use	Additionally, this comment is out
&		activities in the Chesapeake Bay	of the scope of this regulatory
Phillip		region. The muddiness leaving	action. No changes to the permit
Musegaas		construction areas is mostly caused	are proposed in response to this
(Potomac		by clay particles from exposed soil.	comment.
Riverkeeper		Some pollution control measures,	
Network)		like the silt fence, fiber rolls, and	
		ponds do not trap clay and	
		dissolved pollutants very well.	
		These perimeter controls are a poor	
		means to control sediment and do	
		not prevent erosion. Straw mulch	
		and grass, on the other hand, reduce	
		pollution by 90% to 99%, making	
		them far more effective than silt	
		fences, ponds or other perimeter	
		sediment controls. For this reason,	
		the permit should be amended to	
		remove "perimeter controls" as an	
		effective way to achieve final	
		stabilization and, instead, should	
		require straw mulch and grass.	

Katlyn	ESC	Likewise, many construction sites	As written, the proposed permit is
Schmitt	Requireme	do not use the appropriate level of	consistent with the stabilization
(Waterkeepe	nts	stabilization. In a review of	requirements in the Virginia
rs	iits	construction sites from one county	Erosion and Sediment Control
Chesapeake)		in the Chesapeake Bay region,	regulations and EPA's Construction
&Phillip		approximately two-thirds of	General Permit. No changes to the
Musegaas		construction sites had too much	permit are proposed in response to
(Potomac		disturbed soil exposed to be	this comment.
Riverkeeper		properly stabilized. For proper	
Network)		sediment and erosion control,	
		vegetative cover (i.e. grasses) under	
		the permit should be defined as	
		requiring at least 95 percent	
		groundcover. For straw mulch, the	
		permit should require it to be	
		blanketed uniformly across the	
		disturbed area at a depth of 1 to 2	
		inches. More broadly, this means	
		that the soil surface is not exposed	
		because more exposure means	
		more polluted runoff. Failure to	
		meet these standards translates into	
		greater erosion and unnecessary	
		pollution of local waterways. By	
		not addressing this in the permit,	
		Virginia will continue to allow vast	
		quantities of nutrients and turbidity	
		pollution to needlessly foul our	
		waters.Virginia's permit could be	
		strengthened to add a temporal	
		element to site stabilization. The	
		EPA recommends that sites are	
		stabilized as soon as possible to	
		help minimize erosion and	
		sediment problems. The permit, as drafted, only requires the "initiation	
		of stabilization activities" when	
		construction activities have	
		"permanently ceased on any	
		portion of the site, or temporarily	
		ceased on any portion of the site	
		and will not resume for a period	
		exceeding 14 days" This	
		language allows too much time	
		before stabilization - meaning more	
		time for erosion and sedimentation,	
		especially during rainy seasons.	
		Erosion-prone areas (i.e. slopes and	
		drainage ways) or areas with bare	
		soil need to be stabilized as soon as	
		possible, even if temporarily, to	
		minimize runoff. The permit should	
		be amended to remove the 14 day	
		provision and incorporate language	

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1
		requiring construction operators to	
		stabilize areas that are prone to	
		erosion as soon as possible.	
Katlyn	ESC	The permit should require	The proposed permit retains a
Schmitt	Requireme	construction phasing or include	requirement that stabilization be
(Waterkeepe	nts	language tailored to minimize the	initiated immediately on disturbed
rs		duration of exposed soils. This	areas when land-disturbing
Chesapeake)		means that construction operators	activities have permanently ceased
&		will only clear land that will be	on any portion of the site, or
Phillip		under construction in the near	temporarily ceased on any portion
Musegaas		future. This practice can reduce off-	of the site and will not resume for a
(Potomac		site sediment loads by 36 percent	period exceeding 14 days. No
Riverkeeper		for a typical construction projects	changes to the permit are proposed
Network)		and erosion "dramatically."	in response to this comment.
,		Without incorporating these	1
		practices, the state will need to	
		include language requiring	
		vegetative cover on as much of the	
		site as possible for erosion and	
		sediment control. Similarly,	
		stronger language could be built	
		into the permit around reducing	
		impervious surfaces and promoting	
		infiltration. Both of these are	
		important for reducing the amount	
		of stormwater runoff leaving any	
		construction site.	
Katlyn	ESC	Perimeter controls must be secured	The proposed permit retains
Schmitt	Requireme	around the site and remain in place	requirements for operators of land-
(Waterkeepe	nts	until the site has been finally	disturbing activities to design and
rs	1113	stabilized. While we recommend	implement erosion and sediment
Chesapeake)		that the state remove perimeter	control measures that meet the
&		controls from the permit (and	Minimum Standards of the Virginia
Phillip		replace them with controls that	Erosion and Sediment Control
		prevent both sediment and erosion),	regulations (9VAC25-840). No
Musegaas (Dotomag		if perimeter controls are going to be	e (
(Potomac Diverkeener		included there should be basic	changes to the permit are proposed
Riverkeeper			in response to this comment.
Network)		parameters in place for their use.	
		This also means incorporating the	
		possible diversion of stormwater	
		that comes on to the site ('run-on')	
		and ensuring that it is conveyed	
		safely around the site to minimize	
		additional polluted runoff. To	
		promote vegetation, the permit	
		should also incorporate language to	
		divert runoff from rooftops and	
		other impervious surfaces to	
		vegetated areas, if possible.	

Katlyn Schmitt (Waterkeepe rs Chesapeake) &Phillip Musegaas (Potomac Riverkeeper Network)	ESC Requireme nts	While the permit, as written, requires SWPPPS to "minimize the disturbance of steep slopes," it should require the conveyance of stormwater runoff around the top of any steep slope and the stabilization of the slope as soon as possible. Conveyance of stormwater can be easily achieved with pipe slope drains or earthen berms.	The proposed permit retains requirements for operators of land- disturbing activities to design and implement erosion and sediment control measures that meet the Minimum Standards as required in the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control regulations (9VAC25-840) including requirements for stabilization to be initiated where land-disturbing activities have permanently ceased on any portion of the site, or temporarily ceased on any portion of the site and will not resume for a period exceeding 14 days. Additionally, permanent or temporary soil stabilization must be applied to denuded areas within seven days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Ryan Terry (Lane Construction )	Waste Disposal	PART II, STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN, B. Contents., 4. Pollution prevention plan., e. (7), "Prevent the discharge ofexcess concrete," creates issues on construction projects. Discharge in this instance needs to be more clearly defined. Consultants performing inspections for owners interpret this as any hardened concrete cannot touch the ground and must be removed from the site immediately. This becomes costly and difficult to manage. Since hardened concrete that is stored on a site that has bmp's installed and maintained has no significant environmental risk, there is no benefit to enforcing the permit in this way. Paragraph (5) in the same section addresses concrete and concrete waste water. Adding "excess concrete" to paragraph (7) creates confusion on the enforcement of the permit and	As defined in 9VAC25-870-10, <i>discharge</i> or <i>discharge of a</i> <i>pollutant</i> includes "Any addition of any pollutant or combination of pollutants to state waters from any point source." Additionally, pollutant is defined in 9VAC25- 870-10 to include "dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, filter backwash, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materialsdischarged into water." Please also note that the department has replaced the word "excess" with "waste" for clarification in response to other comments received. No change to the permit is proposed in response to this comment.

Katlyn	Waste	The SWPPP should also require the	The proposed permit retains
Schmitt	Disposal	proper disposal of garbage and	requirements for waste to be
(Waterkeepe		waste at sites, with special attention	properly managed on site in
rs		to hazardous materials and	accordance with local, state, and
Chesapeake)		chemicals. In order to protect	federal requirements. No changes
&		Virginia's surface waters, it is vital	to the permit are proposed in
Phillip		that these pollutants stay on site	response to this comment.
Musegaas		and do not runoff due to	_
(Potomac		stormwater.	
Riverkeeper			
Network)			

Townhall	Waste	Part II.B.4.e.(9), proposes that	Thank you for your comment,
Comment-	Disposal	waste containers be closed during	however, the requirement to cover
No Name	1	precipitation events and at the end	waste containers at the end of the
Provided		of the business day, or	day and during precipitation events
		implementation of similarly	provides consistency with EPA's
		effective practices While this is	2017 Construction General Permit
		an excellent pollution prevention	and 40 CFR 450 (d)(2) to minimize
		concept and we do not intend to	the exposure of construction waste
		oppose it, it fails, in practice, when	to precipitation. Alternative
		we try to implement such practices	measures that prevent the discharge
		for large, roll-off dumpsters (e.g.,	of stormwater exposed to waste
		20- or 30-yard dumpsters), as the	materials such as the installation of
		waste management industry does	berms, is an acceptable alternative
		not, currently, have the ability to	covering a waste container. No
		supply covers for these waste	changes to the permit are proposed
		containers. In the past, when we	in response to this comment.
		have attempted similar measures,	
		such as tarps, we've found that	
		following a precipitation event of	
		multiple-inches of rain or heavy,	
		wet snow, the tarps fall into the	
		roll-offs and are unretrieveable	
		without dispensing the stormwater	
		within the dumpsters. In order to	
		meet this requirement, the construction industry will need	
		explicit guidance on how to meet	
		the second half of this proposed	
		requirement: "or implementing	
		other similarly effective practices.	
		Minimization of exposure is not	
		required in cases where the	
		exposure to precipitation will not	
		result in a discharge of	
		pollutants". In such a case, and	
		simply as an example, would roll-	
		off dumpsters positioned, without	
		cover, in a sloped area that has	
		containment berms along its lower	
		three sides (the upper side utilized	
		for access by the vendor) be	
		sufficient to meet the "cases where	
		the exposure to precipitation will	
		not result in a discharge of	
		pollutants", particuarly in those	
		cases of dumpster sizes that are	
		unable to be supplied with covers?	

Tyler Emery (American Electric Power)	Impaired, TMDL, and Exceptiona I Waters	Section B.4. b. currently states: Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) impaired waters. Discharges of stormwater from construction activities that include the demolition of any structure with at least 10,000 square feet of floor space built or renovated before January 1, 1980, to <u>surface waters</u> identified as impaired in the 2016 § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report or for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has been established and approved prior to the term of this general permit for PCB are not eligible for coverage under this general permit unless the operator develops, implements, and maintains a SWPPP in accordance with Part II B 6 of this permit that minimizes the pollutants of concern and, when applicable, is consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the approved TMDL wasteload allocations, and implements an inspection frequency consistent with Part II G 2 a.	The requirements for discharges to PCB impaired waters applies to the specific receiving water segment to which the site discharges. No changes to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.
		AEP interprets these impaired surface waters being discharged to as the listed water bodies	
		themselves, and not the entire	
Peggy Sanner (Chesapeake Bay Foundation) & Bill Street (James River Association)	Impaired, TMDL, and Exceptiona I Waters	upstream watershed of tributaries. In view of the more frequent and more destructive storms that Virginia is experiencing, the Draft Permit should require the operator of sites discharging to these sensitive waters to achieve temporary or permanent soil stabilization within 3 (not 7) days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site. This timeframe should also apply if construction has temporarily ceased and the site is inactive for longer than 10 days.	This requirement is consistent with federal Construction and Development Effluent Limitation Guidelines and Standards (40 CFR 450.21 b). No changes to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.

Peggy Sanner (Chesapeake Bay Foundation) & Bill Street (James River Association)	Impaired, TMDL, and Exceptiona I Waters	The Draft Permit should set a maximum of 3 (not 7) days within which to take corrective action on control measures discovered during inspections not be operating properly.	The proposed permit retains requirements for corrective actions to be implemented as soon as practicable, but no later than 7 days after discovery. This requirement is consistent with EPA's 2017 Construction General Permit. No changes to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.
Peggy Sanner (Chesapeake Bay Foundation) & Bill Street (James River Association)	Impaired, TMDL, and Exceptiona 1 Waters	The Draft Permit should require the operator to notify DEQ of instances of accumulated sediment deposits discovered on required inspections. Such notification will ensure DEQ can require appropriate, environmentally sensitive corrective steps.	Part III G and I of the permit requires the operator to provide notification to the department in the case of unauthorized discharges and provide reports of non- compliance. Deposition of sediment to a receiving water is not an authorized discharge under the general permit and therefore would require notification under the Part III provisions. No changes to the permit are proposed to the permit condition as a result of this comment.

Peggy SannerImpaired, TMDL, (Chesapeake BayImpaired, TMDL, and ExceptionaFoundation)I waters&I watersBill Street (James River Association)I watersAssociation)I watersI waterI	The Draft Permit should require the operator to adopt specific, identified measures ( <i>e.g.</i> , Level 3 active sediment management) to protect these sensitive waters from risky turbidity levels. To assist operators in this effort, we recently requested that DEQ develop numeric turbidity standards for use across the Commonwealth. ( <i>e.g.</i> , the Maryland standard of 150 NTUs at any time or 50 NTUs as a monthly average). At a minimum, however, this permit should require appropriately heightened numeric levels of protection for these sensitive waters.	The proposed general permit is consistent with the requirements for protection of water quality contained in EPA's 2017 construction general permit effective February 16, 2017. EPA established effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) and new source performance standards (NSPS) to control the discharge of pollutants from construction activities in 40 CFR Part 450 referred to as the "Construction and Development Rule" or "C&D Rule". These requirements were published in the Federal Register on December 1, 2009 (74 FR 62996) and became effective on February 1, 2010 and contained a numeric limitation on the allowable level of turbidity in discharges from certain construction sites. On November 5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75 FR 68215), effective January 4, 2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a) and (b) that contained the numeric turbidity limitations as the result of a petition. EPA published amendments to the C&D Rule (79 FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with an effective date of May 5, 2014. The amendments lifted the indefinite stay, withdrew the numeric discharge standards. As a result, numeric turbidity limitation and monitoring requirements are not required to be incorporated into NPDES permits. As currently written, the general permit requires construction activity operators to implement erosion and sediment controls and pollution prevention practices to address the narrative technology- based effluent limitations contained in 40 CFR Part 450. In addition, the general permit requires operators to select, install, implement, and maintain control measures at the construction site that minimize (i.e., reduce or eliminate) pollutants in
---	--	--

the discharge as necessary to ensure that the operator's discharge does not cause or contribute to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard. Also, 9VAC25-870-460.I of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation allows for the use of best management practices to control or abate the discharge of pollutants from stormwater discharges and when numeric effluent limitations
when numeric effluent limitations are infeasible. The department
believes that the proposed general permit establishes the requirements necessary to protect water quality
standards. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Barbara	Impaired,	If the site discharges to PCB-	The requirement for operators
Brumbaugh	TMDL,	impaired waters, Part II(B)(6)	discharging to waters impaired for
(City of	and	requires that a permittee who will	polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) to
Chesapeake)	Exceptiona	demolish a structure with at least	implement controls to minimize the
Спезареаке)	1 Waters	10,000 square feet of floor space	exposure of building materials
	1 waters	that was built or renovated prior to	containing PCB was added to the
		January 1, 1980 develop a	proposed permit in order to ensure
		Stormwater Pollution Prevention	that discharges meet water quality
		Plan ("SWPPP") to minimize the	standards by preventing releases of
		exposure of PCB-containing	PCB into receiving waters. The
		building materials to stormwater.	provisions only apply for
		The section goes on to provide	demolition of a structure greater
		examples of controls, including	than 10,000 square feet built prior
		"separating work areas from	to January 1, 1980, <u>and</u> that require
		non-work areas and selecting	construction general permit
		appropriate personal protective	coverage. The proposed condition
		equipment and tools, constructing a	mirrors language in EPA's 2017
		containment area so that all dust or	CGP. It is not the department's
		debris generated by the work	intention to regulate the demolition
		remains within the protected area,	of buildings or require VSMP
		using tools that minimize dust and	inspectors to evaluate safety
		heat (<212°F)."The Construction	conditions on a site, but to ensure
		GP is not the appropriate place to	adequate protection of state waters.
		regulate demolition. An operator	Upon further review, the
		would not need to obtain a	department has determined that
		Construction GP if their activities	since PCB affixes to sediment, the
		are limited to demolition and do not	proper implementation and
		include land disturbance greater	maintenance of erosion and
		than one acre. Demolition is	sediment control as well as proper
		covered by the Virginia Uniform	waste management, both already
		Statewide Building Code, which	required by the permit, provide the
		may be a better place to include	necessary minimization and control
		these requirements. While it is	of PCB to protect surface waters.
		reasonable to require controls to	Therefore, the condition is not
		minimize the exposure of PCB-	necessary. Conditions will be
		containing materials to stormwater,	retained in the permit that require
		it is unclear why personal	increased SWPPP inspections for
		protective equipment or	those sites that discharge to surface
		recommended tools would be	waters that have a PCB
		included in a SWPPP. In	impairment.
		accordance with the definitions	
		listed in 9VAC25 870-10, a	
		SWPPP is "a document that is	
		prepared in accordance with good	
		engineering practices and that	
		identifies potential sources of	
		pollutants that may reasonably be expected to affect the quality of	
		expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges." Safety	
		protocols and tool selection are	
		beyond the scope of a SWPPP.	
		Additionally, SWPPP inspections	
		are required to be conducted by	
		qualified personnel. In accordance	
L	I	quantica personnei. In accordance	

with the definitions listed in	
9VAC25-870-10, qualified	
personnel refers to "a person	
who possesses the skills to assess	
conditions at the construction site	
for the operator that could impact	
stormwater quality and quantity	
and to assess the effectiveness of	
any sediment and erosion control	
measures or stormwater	
management facilities selected to	
control the quality and quantity of	
stormwater discharges from the	
construction activity." VSMP	
inspectors are not qualified to	
evaluate safety conditions for the	
operator and their employees. The	
suggested revision is to omit Part	
II(B)(6) and instead include PCB-	
containing building materials in the	
existing language in Part	
II(B)(4)(e)(6). This section requires	
SWPPPs to include pollution	
prevention practices that "minimize	
the discharge of pollutants from	
storage, handling, and disposal of	
construction products, materials,	
and wastes including (i) building	
products such as asphalt sealants,	
copper flashing, roofing materials,	
adhesives, and concrete	
admixtures; (ii) pesticides,	
herbicides, insecticides, fertilizers,	
and landscape materials; (iii)	
construction and domestic wastes	
such as packing materials, scrap	
construction materials, masonry	
products, timber, pipe and electrical	
cuttings, plastics, Styrofoam,	
concrete, and other trash or	
building materials." This revision	
will be protective of water quality	
by requiring the implementation of	
controls to minimize the exposure	
of PCB-containing building	
materials to stormwater.	

Hampton	Impaired,	If the site discharges to PCB-	The requirement for operators
Hampton Roads	TMDL,	impaired waters, Part II(B)(6)	
Planning	and		discharging to waters impaired for
District		requires that a permittee who will	polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) to
	Exceptiona	demolish a structure with at least	implement controls to minimize the
Commission	1 Waters	10,000 square feet of floor space	exposure of building materials
		that was built or renovated prior to	containing PCB was added to the
		January 1, 1980 develop a	proposed permit in order to ensure
		Stormwater Pollution Prevention	that discharges meet water quality
		Plan ("SWPPP") to minimize the	standards by preventing releases of
		exposure of PCB-containing	PCB into receiving waters. The
		building materials to stormwater.	provisions only apply for
		The section goes on to provide	demolition of a structure greater
		examples of controls, including	than 10,000 square feet built prior
		"separating work areas from	to January 1, 1980, <u>and</u> that require
		non-work areas and selecting	construction general permit
		appropriate personal protective	coverage. The proposed condition
		equipment and tools, constructing a	mirrors language in EPA's 2017
		containment area so that all dust or	CGP. It is not the department's
		debris generated by the work	intention to regulate the demolition
		remains within the protected area,	of buildings or require VSMP
		using tools that minimize dust and	inspectors to evaluate safety
		heat (<212°F)."The Construction	conditions on a site, but to ensure
		GP is not the appropriate place to	adequate protection of state waters.
		regulate demolition. An operator	Upon further review, the
		would not need to obtain a	department has determined that
		Construction GP if their activities	since PCB affixes to sediment, the
		are limited to demolition and do not	proper implementation and
		include land disturbance greater	maintenance of erosion and
		than one acre. Demolition is	sediment control as well as proper
		covered by the Virginia Uniform	waste management, both already
		Statewide Building Code, which	required by the permit, provide the
		may be a better place to include	necessary minimization and control
		these requirements. While it is	of PCB to protect surface waters.
		reasonable to require controls to	Therefore, the condition is not
		minimize the exposure of PCB-	necessary. Conditions will be
		containing materials to stormwater,	retained in the permit that require
		it is unclear why personal	increased SWPPP inspections for
		protective equipment or	those sites that discharge to surface
		recommended tools would be	waters that have a PCB
		included in a SWPPP. In	impairment.
		accordance with the definitions	
		listed in 9VAC25 870-10, a	
		SWPPP is "a document that is	
		prepared in accordance with good	
		engineering practices and that	
		identifies potential sources of	
		pollutants that may reasonably be	
		expected to affect the quality of	
		stormwater discharges." Safety	
		protocols and tool selection are	
		beyond the scope of a SWPPP.	
		SWPPP inspections are required to	
		be conducted by qualified	
		personnel. In accordance with the	

	definitions listed in 9VAC25-870-	
	10, qualified personnel refers to "a	
	person who possesses the skills	
	to assess conditions at the	
	construction site for the operator	
	that could impact stormwater	
	quality and quantity and to assess	
	the effectiveness of any sediment	
	and erosion control measures or	
	stormwater management facilities	
	selected to control the quality and	
	quantity of stormwater discharges	
	from the construction activity."	
	VSMP inspectors are not qualified	
	to evaluate safety conditions for the	
	operator and their employees. The	
	suggested revision is to omit Part	
	II(B)(6) and instead include PCB-	
	containing building materials in the	
	existing language in Part	
	II(B)(4)(e)(6). This section requires	
	SWPPPs to include pollution	
	-	
	prevention practices that "minimize	
	the discharge of pollutants from	
	storage, handling, and disposal of	
	construction products, materials,	
	and wastes including (i) building	
	products such as asphalt sealants,	
	copper flashing, roofing materials,	
	adhesives, and concrete	
	admixtures; (ii) pesticides,	
	herbicides, insecticides, fertilizers,	
	and landscape materials; (iii)	
	construction and domestic wastes	
	such as packing materials, scrap	
	construction materials, masonry	
	products, timber, pipe and electrical	
	cuttings, plastics, Styrofoam,	
	concrete, and other trash or	
	building materials." This revision	
	will be protective of water quality	
	by requiring the implementation of	
	controls to minimize the exposure	
	of PCB-containing building	
	materials to stormwater.	
I	inavertaile to brothit/tateit.	

Kristin Carter (University of Virginia)	Impaired, TMDL, and Exceptiona I Waters	c. Part II, bullet B.6.b – For consistency with bullets B.5.b and B.7.b, should this state "Provide clear direction in the SWPPP that:"? I think the PCB-specific procedures should be replaced with the same ones for sites subject to sediment and nutrient TMDLs since PCBs can a ach to sediments and be washed off site. The proposed PCB-specific procedures seem to be inappropriate for stormwater and E&SC inspectors to enforce and are more applicable to building and/or VOSH inspectors. Building demolition does not always equate to land disturbance so much of the PCB abatement activity could occur before SWM/E&SC inspectors are called in.	The requirement for operators discharging to waters impaired for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) to implement controls to minimize the exposure of building materials containing PCB was added to the proposed permit in order to ensure that discharges meet water quality standards by preventing releases of PCB into receiving waters. The provisions only apply for demolition of a structure greater than 10,000 square feet built prior to January 1, 1980, <u>and</u> that require construction general permit coverage. The proposed condition mirrors language in EPA's 2017 CGP. It is not the department's intention to regulate the demolition of buildings or require VSMP inspectors to evaluate safety conditions on a site, but to ensure adequate protection of state waters. Upon further review, the department has determined that since PCB affixes to sediment, the proper implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment control as well as proper waste management, both already required by the permit, provide the necessary minimization and control of PCB to protect surface waters. Therefore, the condition is not necessary. Conditions will be retained in the permit that require increased SWPPP inspections for those sites that discharge to surface waters that have a PCB impairment.
--	---	--	---

Lisa	Impaired,	Part II(B)(6) of the Proposed CGP	The requirement for operators
Ochsenhirt	TMDL,	(9VAC25-880-70) requires that a	discharging to waters impaired for
(VAMSA)	and	permittee who will demolish a	polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) to
(********	Exceptiona	structure with at least 10,000	implement controls to minimize the
	1 Waters	square feet of floor space built or	exposure of building materials
	1 Waters	renovated before January 1, 1980	containing PCB was added to the
		include specific management	proposed permit in order to ensure
		controls in its stormwater pollution	that discharges meet water quality
		prevention plan (SWPPP) if the site	standards by preventing releases of
		will discharge to PCB impaired or	PCB into receiving waters. The
		TMDL waters. Controls are meant	provisions only apply for
		to minimize exposure of building	demolition of a structure greater
		materials that may contain PCBs to	than 10,000 square feet built prior
		stormwater. Controls listed in the	to January 1, 1980, and that require
		Proposed CGP include separating	construction general permit
		work and nonwork areas, using	coverage. The proposed condition
		appropriate protective equipment	mirrors language in EPA's 2017
		and tools, containing dust within a	CGP. It is not the department's
		protected area, and using tools that	intention to regulate the demolition
		minimize dust and heat.VAMSA	of buildings or require VSMP
		requests that DEQ not adopt	inspectors to evaluate safety
		specific PCB requirements at this	conditions on a site, but to ensure
		time, including the requirements in	adequate protection of state waters.
		Part II(B)(6). DEQ should instead	Upon further review, the
		address PCB requirements more	department has determined that
		generically, and without specific	since PCB affixes to sediment, the
		reference to the management	proper implementation and
		controls that are explicitly	maintenance of erosion and
		delineated in Part II(B)(6) of the	sediment control as well as proper
		Proposed CGP. If DEQ wishes to consider more detailed future	waste management, both already
		requirements, it should coordinate	required by the permit, provide the necessary minimization and control
		enforcement responsibility with	of PCB to protect surface waters.
		other state and local agencies.	Therefore, the condition is not
		VAMSA's request is based on two	necessary. Conditions will be
		significant concerns.First, VAMSA	retained in the permit that require
		is concerned that the Proposed	increased SWPPP inspections for
		CGP, as it is currently drafted, will	those sites that discharge to surface
		be out of sync with existing local	waters that have a PCB
		building codes relating to building	impairment.
		demolition. Demolition is covered	
		by the Virginia Uniform Statewide	
		Building Code (USBC), and is	
		largely the responsibility of local	
		building inspectors. Respectfully, if	
		DEQ has not already reached out, it	
		should, at a minimum, specifically	
		request feedback from the Virginia	
		Department of Housing and	
		Community Development	
		(DHCD), the Virginia Board of	
		Housing and Community Development (the Board, the	
		citizen board responsible for	
<u> </u>	I		

adopting and amending the USBC),	
and local building inspectors before	
adding requirements that impact the	
demolition of buildings or	
structures. The USBC includes	
numerous requirements for	
buildings that may contain	
asbestos; it may be more	
appropriate to add requirements	
relating to PCBs to the USBC (and	
not the CGP) in a similar manner.	
VAMSA would look to the experts,	
including the DHCD, the Board,	
and local inspectors for advice	
about the most efficient way to	
work together to tackle this	
environmental issue. As an aside, it	
is possible that if a developer is	
demolishing a building on an	
existing site, but is not conducting	
any land-disturbance, the developer	
may be allowed to move forward	
without obtaining a land-	
disturbance permit. In these cases,	
VAMSA Members responsible for	
erosion and sediment (E&S)	
control and stormwater review	
would not be contacted about the	
project. If the Commonwealth's	
goal is to reduce stormwater	
discharges that may contain PCBs,	
we should apply rules consistently on all demolition across the State	
(permitted and non-permitted).	
Again, the USBC may be the more	
appropriate place to include these	
rules.Second, VAMSA is	
concerned that local employees are	
not trained to manage these	
requirements. Localities regularly	
send VSMP employees (working	
with public works, public utilities,	
or a planning department) to	
regulated sites to inspect for	
compliance with E&S control	
plans, stormwater management	
plans, SWPPPs, pollution	
prevention plans, and the CGP.	
Most employees are certified to	
conduct these inspections, and	
receive regular training to keep	
their skills up-to-date with current	
legal and regulatory requirements.	

	how to review a SWPPP or inspect	
	a permitted site that has specialized	
	requirements for PCBs. For	
	example, these employees are not	
	familiar with the following: (1) the	
	types of housing materials that may	
	contain PCBs and how to identify	
	them; (2) the appropriate protective	
	gear that must be worn if there are	
	PCB-containing materials on-site;	
	or (3) the right tools to reduce dust	
	and heat from materials that may	
	contain PCBs. Moreover,	
	appropriate protective gear	
	presumably raises questions	
	relating to worker safety. Local	
	environmental inspectors are not	
	trained to determine whether a	
	SWPPP will protect construction	
	workers during demolition or	
	whether the SWPPP is being	
	implementing in a way that is fully	
	protective. VAMSA supports clean	
	water goals, and our Members with	
	MS4 permits are working	
	steadfastly to implement best	
	management practices to reduce	
	applicable TMDL pollutants to the	
	maximum extent practicable.	
	VAMSA also acknowledges that	
	DEQ has proposed these new	
	measures because EPA included	
	similar requirements in the 2017	
	CGP. However, as explained	
	above, VAMSA opposes including	
	specific PCB requirements in the	
	Proposed CGP given the complex	
	and significant issues above—i.e.,	
	the CGP and how it relates to the	
	USBC, etc.	
I		

Tyler Emery	SWPPP	In Section G.2.b.(2) the inspection	The proposed general permit
(American Electric Power)		requirements changed from no later than 48 hours following a measurable storm event to no later than 24 hours following a measurable storm event.	change is a result of discussions of the general permit Technical Advisory Committee that determined SWPPP inspections immediately following storm events are essential to ensure the
		AEP's service territory covers large portions of the mountainous region of southwest Virginia. Travel time in difficult terrain on large linear projects is problematic and this is compounded in adverse weather conditions. AEP inspects multiple projects in these difficult areas and a 48-hour timeframe allows for mobilization of inspectors and completion of reviews of major project sites. Our recommendation is to change the language to "as soon as practical, but no later than 48 hours following a measurable storm event."	protection of water quality from the potential discharge of stormwater from construction sites. The requirement to inspect sites 24 hours after a storm event only applies when an operator chooses to inspect at a frequency of every 10 business days (or 5 business days if the site discharges to an impaired, TMDL approved, or exceptional water). Operators may choose an alternative SWPPP inspection frequency of once every 5 business days (or every 4 business days if the site discharges to an impaired or exceptional water) in which case the 24 hour requirement would not apply. No changes to the permit are proposed to the permit condition.
Tyler Emery (American Electric Power)	SWPPP	Section G.2.3. states that If adverse weather causes the safety of the inspection personnel to be in jeopardy, the inspection may be delayed until the next business day on which it is safe to perform the inspection. Any time inspections are delayed due to adverse weather conditions, evidence of the adverse weather conditions shall be included in the SWPPP with the dates of occurrence. AEP is very grateful for this addition to the General Permit. Safety is a critical part of our culture and we are very appreciative of VDEQ's considerations for safety as well. We recommend that documentation of the delay be kept in a log, on the inspection form, or similar document, kept in accordance with the SWPPP rather than literally a part of the SWPPP	Thank you for the comment. The department believes that it is appropriate for the operator to include documentation of adverse conditions as part of the SWPPP to explain why a SWPPP inspection may not meet the inspection frequency specified in the permit. Additionally, the permit requires inspection reports to be included as part of the SWPPP. No changes to the permit are proposed to the permit condition as a result of this comment.

Charlie	SWPPP	I have been blessed after a lifetime	Proposed changes to the general
White	5	of hard work and saving to get to	permit revised the requirement for
,, inte		move to and live on Beautiful	construction site operators to
		Smith Mountain Lake for my	conduct inspections every 10
		retirement years. For approximately	business days and 48 hours after a
		the last year and a half, I have	measureable storm event to every
		witnessed large amounts of	10 business days (or 5 business
		sediment from a nearby	days if the site discharges to an
		development, Kennedy Shores,	impaired, TMDL approved, or
		flow into Smith Mountain Lake	exceptional water) and 24 hours
		during rain events. I personally	after a measurable storm event.
		witnessed on the deck of my home	Alternatively, construction site
		a massive sea of yellow mud	operators may conduct inspections
		flowing into Smith Mountain Lake	once every 5-business days (or in
		from Kennedy Shores on February	the case of impaired, TMDL
		11, 2108. The rain occurred on the	approved, or exceptional waters,
		night of February 10th and morning	every 4-business days).
		of February 11th. These dates were	Additionally, the permit does not
		a Saturday and a Sunday. The	prohibit operators from including
		development was not being	photographs as part of an
		monitored by the developer or any	inspection report. No additional
		state or local agency during this	changes to the permit condition are
		major rain event. Since the	proposed as a result of this
		February 2018 event, I have taken pictures after many other large rain	comment.
		events when the site continued to	
		let silt flow into SML. I reported	
		the initial event to the developer,	
		DEQ, Franklin County, and AEP.	
		The only agency that showed me	
		any significant concern was the	
		DEQ but I learned after viewing	
		this event that the primary enforcer	
		was supposed to be Franklin	
		County.	
		As a follow up to my story above, I	
		believe that sediment run-off	
		should be the holy grail of concern	
		under the Storm Water Permitting	
		process. I also believe that the	
		inspection process during and	
		immediately after storm events	
		needs to be beefed up substantially.	
		With the Kennedy Shores property,	
		I as a private citizen was often the only one inspecting the run off into	
		the lake after storms. I believe that	
		a self inspection process by the	
		developer should be mandatory and	
		it should be a process that would	
		include pictures and scientific	
		evidence that could be easily	
		verified by the responsible	

		inspection agency.	
Peggy Sanner (Chesapeake Bay Foundation) & Bill Street (James River Association)	SWPPP	The Draft Permit would unwisely allow operators of linear projects to meet the SWPPP inspection requirements through representative inspections. Required site inspections serve many functions; these include determination of whether control measures have been installed in accordance with approved plans, whether the control measures have been incorrectly used, the effectiveness of the control measures in minimizing sediment discharges, and similar issues that are fundamental to ensuring the site does not discharge sediment and other pollutants into waterways. Experience with the large natural gas pipeline projects has shown that regular on the ground inspections of the entire length of the construction site's disturbed areas is essential. The Board should delete the provision in the Draft Permit that would allow "representative inspections" for pipeline or other linear activities.	The use of representative inspections is only authorized for those areas for which temporary or permanent stabilization has occurred in order to prevent disturbing these areas, where accessing the site may interfere with site stabilization. The concept of minimizing inspections of stabilized sites is consistent with EPA's 2017 Construction General Permit. No changes to the permit are proposed to this permit condition as a result of this comment.

Home	SWPPP	9VAC25-880-70 Part II.F.5	Implementation and undeter of
Builders	SWFFF	9VAC25-880-70 Part II.F.5 of	Implementation and updates of
Association			SWPPPs are vital to ensuring that the protection of state water from
		Proposed Chapter 880 states: "The	-
of Virginia		inspection report shall be included	construction sites. The department
		into the SWPPP no later than 4	does not believe that the proposed
		business days after the inspection is	revisions to the general permit
		complete."Comment: DEQ's	requiring inspection reports to be
		requirement that a [hard copy]	included in the SWPPP within 4
		inspection report shall be included	days is burdensome to operators or
		into the SWPPP no later than 4	creates circumstances that prohibit
		business days after the inspection is	operators from implementing
		complete is burdensome to the	corrective measures within 7 days.
		construction industry and in	No changes to the permit are
		conflict with the Proposed Chapter	proposed to this permit condition as
		880. The Proposed Chapter 880, as	a result of this comment.
		does the existing permit, affords the	
		permittee seven (7) days to	
		implement the corrective action(s)	
		identified in the inspection report.	
		Many permittees utilize either	
		proprietary or third party inspection	
		software to generate and retain all	
		inspection reports created to	
		comply with the Permit. It is very	
		likely that since the permittee is	
		allowed seven (7) days to complete	
		an action item identified on an	
		inspection report, the permittee will	
		not document an action item as	
		complete on the electronic	
		inspection report until the seventh	
		day. Therefore, it is very likely that the permittee will only print out a	
		completed hardcopy inspection	
		report which may be on the seventh	
		day. If the requirement to have the	
		hardcopy report in the SWPPP in 4	
		business days remains and the	
		permittee places an incomplete	
		hardcopy inspection report into the	
		SWPPP, then upon completion of	
		the action items completed on days	
		five, six and seven, the permittee	
		would have to document the	
		completion of the action item in	
		their inspection software and on the	
		hardcopy report in the SWPPP.	
		This is duplicative and does not	
		provides any tangible water quality	
		benefit. Additionally, the	
		requirement to have the hardcopy	
		report in the SWPPP in 4 business	
		days is in conflict with the intent of	
		EPA's paperwork reduction	
L			

John Woodburn (Goochland County)	SWPPP	policies. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that DEQ remove the language in 9VAC25-880-70 Part II.F.5 of Proposed Chapter 880 requiring the inspection reports be included in the SWPPP no later than 4 business days. Also, it is strongly recommended that DEQ add language to the Proposed Chapter 880 that affords the permittee the ability to use inspection software programs, and allows the permittee the ability to provide access to the electronic reports in a timely manner: "The permittee shall furnish in a timely manner, upon request, to DEQ or the VSMP authority copies of reports required to be kept by this permit." 9VAC25-880-70, Part II,G.2.a(2)Define "representative inspections" in this document, or reference where the term is discussed.	The proposed permit retains provisions for representative inspections as an option for operators to inspect control measures above and below an area of the site where stabilization has been initiated and where accessing the area may cause additional disturbance that increases the potential for erosion. The department believes that the

Detricie	CWDDD	T	The second second to the last second
Patricia	SWPPP	I am most concerned about	The proposed permit includes a
VonOhlen		sediment pollution that flows in the	requirement for operators to inspect
		urban storm drains when I ride past	sites 24 hours after a storm event at
		road or near by road construction	a frequency of every 10 business
		projects. I would like to see the	days (or 5 business days if the site
		permit strengthened to ensure more	discharges to an impaired. TMDL
		numerous and rigorous inspections.	approved, or exceptional water).
		Along with firm inspection	Operators may choose an
		schedules, it will help to specify a	alternative SWPPP inspection
		specific the time frame construction	frequency of once every 5 business
		permit holders need to correct any	days (or every 4 business days if
		deficiencies. The protections (to	the site discharges to an impaired,
		prevent polluted storm water	TMDL approved, or exceptional
		runoff) should be reflect the need	water) which is equivalent to the
		for more stringent standards due to	frequency of measurable rainfall
		increased number of storms and	events in Virginia. Additionally,
		intensity we are now experiencing.	the proposed permit retains the
		Inspectors should visit during rain	requirement that corrective
		events. So often, I ride by a site that	measures be implemented as soon
		has a coir log which seems to be	as possible but no later than 7 days
		intended to cover the storm drain.	of after discovery unless the
		Yet, more often than not, this 'log'	overseeing stormwater authority
		has been moved so that storm water	approves otherwise. The proposed
		(full of dirt/sediment from the	permit also retains requirements for
		construction) is allowed to flow	stabilization to be initiated
		freely down the storm drain. I'm	immediately but no later than 7
		assuming water would build up if	days after final grade is reached on
		not allowed to run-off. So possibly	any portion of a site or temporarily
		permits might require some other	ceased and will not resume for a
		measures to hold exposed dirt in	period of greater than 14 days.
		place so it will not end up in run-	"Immediately" is defined in the
		off. Maybe this would require	general permit regulation as "soon
		construction supervisors to avoid	as practicable, but no later than the
		digging and exposing excessive	end of the next business day when
		amounts of uncovered dirt for long	the land disturbing activities have
		periods of time between between	temporarily or permanently
		activity. I have observed land	ceased." This requirement is
		disturbances that are left with no	consistent with requirements
		activity for long periods of time	contained within EPA's 2017
		before work resumes. It seems that	Construction General Permit. No
		this problem could be addressed	changes to the permit are proposed
		during permitting and inspecting.	to this permit condition as a result
		Thank you for considering my	of this comment.
		comments. I appreciate your work	
		helping keep Virginia's waterways	
		clean.	
		cicail.	

Rogard Ross	SWPPP	The Inspection Schedule - the	The SWPPP inspection frequency
-		current requirement for	in the proposed permit is consistent
		development by impaired	with the inspection requirements in
		waterways is for every 4 days OR	EPA's 2017 Construction General
		every 5 days and within 1 day of a	Permit. The proposed permit also
		storm event; except if it happens	retains requirements for more
		over a long weekend when the next	frequency SWPPP inspections for
		business day may be 4 or 5 days	those construction sites that
		away. If there is a storm event, we	discharge to impaired, TMDL
		really should require inspection	approved, or exceptional waters.
		with 24 hours; yes that may mean	No changes to the permit are
		doing an inspection on a non-	proposed to this permit condition as
		business day, but we really don't	a result of this comment.
		want damaged mitigation systems	
		to go unfixed, especially if more	
		rain is forecast. Let's tighten this	
		up! .	

Jody Greene	SWPPP	Inspecting following adverse	The new language in the proposed
(Wetland	SWITT	weather and Inspection report	The new language in the proposed permit was included to address
Studies and		inclusion in the SWPPP The CGP	safety concerns of performing
Solutions,		provides various inspection	inspections during adverse weather
,		frequency options. Adding next	
Inc.)			conditions. The suggested
		"scheduled" inspection to both the	language would ultimately decrease
		requirements for inspecting	the number of SWPPP inspections
		following adverse weather	and potentially lead to
		conditions and for report inclusion	circumstances of permit non-
		in the SWPPP provides the ability	compliance and adverse impacts to
		to resume inspections and file	water quality. No changes to the
		reports at the inspection the	permit are proposed to this permit
		frequency that meets the	condition as a result of this
		requirements of the permit (4 days,	comment.
		5 days, 10 days, rain events and	
		monthly etc.). Additionally, unsafe	
		conditions that delay inspections	
		for multiple days, like a blizzard,	
		would create a log jam problem for	
		third party inspectors where all	
		delayed inspections would be	
		required on the next safe day. The	
		recommendations below address	
		these concerns.9VAC25-880-70:	
		Part II G.2e Currently Proposede. If	
		adverse weather causes the safety	
		of the inspection personnel to be in	
		jeopardy, the inspection may be	
		delayed until the next business day	
		on which it is safe to perform the	
		inspection. Any time inspections	
		are delayed due to adverse weather	
		conditions, evidence of the adverse	
		weather conditions shall be	
		included in the SWPPP with the	
		date(s) of	
		occurrence.Recommended Change	
		e. If adverse weather causes the	
		safety of the inspection personnel	
		to be in jeopardy, the inspection	
		may be delayed until the next	
		scheduled business day on which it	
		is safe to perform the inspection.	
		Any time inspections are delayed	
		due to adverse weather conditions,	
		evidence of the adverse weather	
		conditions shall be included in the	
		SWPPP with the date(s) of	
		occurrence.9VAC25-880-70: Part	
		II G.5 Currently Proposed5. The	
		inspection report shall be included	
		into the SWPPP no later than 4	
		business days after the inspection is	
		complete.Recommended Change:5.	

		The inspection report shall be included into the SWPPP no later than the next regularly scheduled inspection. 4 business days after the inspection is complete.	
Jimmy Edmonds (Loudoun County)	SWPPP	<ul> <li>9VAC25-880-70 PART II.A.4.e.7 This section, located under</li> <li>9VAC25-880-70 PART II.A.4</li> <li>"Pollution Prevention Plan," lists several types of discharges that are prohibited. We recommend a wording change for clarity and for consistency with DEQ technical standards for concrete washout water. Replace the highlighted word with "waste."</li> <li>9VAC25-880-70 PART II.A.4.e.7 "Prevent the discharge</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. The condition has been revised as suggested.
		of fuels, oils, and other petroleum products, hazardous or toxic wastes, excess concrete, and sanitary wastes, and"	
Katlyn Schmitt (Waterkeepe rs Chesapeake) & Phillip Musegaas (Potomac Riverkeeper Network)	SWPPP	The SWPPP should include language around protecting receiving waters adjacent to the construction site covered under the permit and stronger general pollution prevention measures. While erosion and sediment controls are recommended as BMPs throughout the construction site under the draft permit, construction operators should also be required to place additional controls in adjacent areas with receiving waters (or environmentally sensitive area).	In general, traditional erosion and sediment controls are employed to minimize the discharge of pollutants from construction activities. However, more frequent inspection requirements enhances an operator's ability to find and correct problems before a discharge of pollutants to impaired waters occurs. No changes to the permit are proposed to this permit condition as a result of this comment.

Townhall	SWPPP	Per Part II.B.1.a, a signed copy of	Thank you for your comment,
Comment-	5	the registration statement is	however, it is the responsibility of
No Name		required to be available with the	the new owner to ensure they
Provided		SWPPP. Often times, permitting is	obtain the necessary information
11001404		completed by an owner/developer	from the previous owner. In the
		or their representative and,	event that the new owner is unable
		subsequently, a Transfer	to obtain the previous SWPPP
		Agreement is completed to assign	documents, the new owner can
		the permit to a contractor. With the	contact the VSMP authority to
		transfer agreement process, it is	obtain a copy of the registration
		uncommon that a contractor	statement and permit coverage
		acquires the original, signed copy	letter. No changes to the permit
		of the registration statement. Would	are proposed in response to this
		it be possible to update this section	comment.
		to indicate that a signed copy of the	
		registration statement, OR a signed	
		copy of the transfer agreement be	
		required to be available with the	
		SWPPP, since the DEQ would have	
		copies of both of these documents	
		on file for both entities anyway?	
Jimmy	SWPPP	VAC25-880-70 PART II.A.1 In	The department will revise the
Edmonds		this section, there is a reference to a	SWPPP template and post the
(Loudoun		SWPPP Template for land	updated copy on the DEQ
County)		disturbing activities that disturb	Construction Stormwater website
		less than one (1) acre but are within	prior to the registration due date.
		a Common Plan of Development. Is	
		DEQ planning to update all	
		SWPPP templates based upon these	
		amended regulations and when will	
		they be available to local programs	
		so that they we can alert our clients	
		in a timely fashion?	

Catherine	Monitoring	There are several more	The proposed general permit is
Lukaszewic	monitoring	improvements needed that have	consistent with the requirements for
Z		become apparent as a result of	protection of water quality
		Virginia's experience with pipeline	contained in EPA's 2017
		construction (while not governed	Construction General permit
		by the CGP the same challenges	effective February 16, 2017.
		apply). Please further improve the	
		CGP by including the following:	EPA established effluent limitation
		Require use of filtering or settling	guidelines (ELGs) and new source
		of sediment laden or turbid flows of stormwater to remove sediment	performance standards (NSPS) to control the discharge of pollutants
		prior to discharge as well as require	from construction activities in 40
		turbidity monitoring according to	CFR Part 450 referred to as the
		clear protocol (e.g., ambient	"Construction and Development
		conditions and at the me of	Rule" or "C&D Rule". These
		discharge conditions) for projects	requirements were published in the
		discharging to waters impaired for	Federal Register on December 1,
		sediment.	2009 (74 FR 62996) and became
			effective on February 1, 2010 and
			contained numeric limitation on the
			allowable level of turbidity in discharges from certain
			construction sites. On November
			5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75
			FR 68215), effective January 4,
			2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a)
			and (b) that contained the numeric
			turbidity limitations as the result of
			a petition. EPA published
			amendments to the C&D Rule (79
			FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with
			an effective date of May 5, 2014.
			The amendments lifted the
			indefinite stay, withdrew the
			numeric discharge standards. As a
			result, numeric turbidity limitation
			and monitoring requirements are
			not required to be incorporated in
			to NPDES permits.
			The general permit requires
			construction activity operators to
			develop an erosion and sediment
			control plan consistent with the
			requirements of the Virginia
			Erosion and Sediment Control
			Program regulations, which require
			filtering and infiltration practices.
			The permit also incorporates the
			narrative technology-based effluent
			limitations contained in 40 CFR Part 450. In addition, the general
			permit requires operators to select,
L	l		permit requires operators to serect,

install, implement, and maintain control measures at the construction site that minimize (i.e., reduce or eliminate) pollutants in the discharge as necessary to ensure that the operator's discharge does not cause or contribute to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard. Also, 9VAC25-870-460.I of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program
Stormwater Management Program regulation allows for the use of best management practices to control or abate the discharge of pollutants from stormwater discharges and when numeric effluent limitations are infeasible. The department
believes that the proposed general permit establishes the requirements necessary to protect water quality standards. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Peggy	Monitoring	Virginia's recent experience with	The proposed general permit is
Sanner	litering	major natural gas pipeline projects	consistent with the requirements for
(Chesapeake		which the CGP program governs	protection of water quality
Bay		indirectly through DEQ-approved	contained in EPA's 2017
Foundation)		Standards and Specifications has	construction general permit
and Bill		amply demonstrated that discharges	effective February 16, 2017.
Street		from land disturbing activities can	EPA established effluent limitation
(James		cause significant and risky turbidity	guidelines (ELGs) and new source
River		and sedimentation in receiving	performance standards (NSPS) to
Association)		waterways. Yet, discharges leading	control the discharge of pollutants
		to turbidity and sedimentation in	from construction activities in 40
		receiving waters are inconsistent	CFR Part 450 referred to as the
		with Virginia's water quality	"Construction and Development
		standards (WQS) general criteria:	Rule" or "C&D Rule". These
		State waters, including wetlands,	requirements were published in the
		shall be free from substances	Federal Register on December 1,
		attributable to sewage, industrial	2009 (74 FR 62996) and became
		waste, or other waste in	effective on February 1, 2010 and
		concentrations, amounts, or	contained numeric limitation on the
		combinations which contravene	allowable level of turbidity in
		established standards or interfere	discharges from certain
		directly or indirectly with	construction sites. On November
		designated uses of such water or	5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75
		which are inimical or harmful to	FR 68215), effective January 4,
		human, animal, plant, or aquatic	2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a)
		life. Specific substances to be	and (b) that contained the numeric
		controlled include, but are not	turbidity limitations as the result of
		limited to: floating debris, oil,	a petition. EPA published
		scum, and other floating materials;	amendments to the C&D Rule (79
		toxic substances (including those	FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and
		which bioaccumulate); substances	May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with
		that produce color, tastes, turbidity,	an effective date of May 5, 2014.
		odors, or settle to form sludge	The amendments lifted the
		deposits; and substances which	indefinite stay, withdrew the numeric discharge standards. As a
		nourish undesirable or nuisance aquatic plant life. Turbidity and	result, numeric turbidity limitation
		sedimentation have a variety of	and monitoring requirements are
		harmful effects on aquatic life. As	not required to be incorporated in
		CBF detailed to DEQ in connection	to NPDES permits.
		with its triennial review of water	to IN DES permits.
		quality standards, sediment loads	As currently written, the general
		can degrade aquatic life by	permit requires construction
		sedimentation, which smothers	activity operators to implement
		stream bottoms with a layer of fine	erosion and sediment controls and
		material that eliminates habitat.	pollution prevention practices to
		Sediment also increases the	address the narrative technology-
		turbidity of the water through	based effluent limitations contained
		suspended solids, preventing	in 40 CFR Part 450. In addition, the
		sunlight from reaching underwater	general permit requires operators to
		grasses and plants. In this way,	select, install, implement, and
		turbidity can eliminate habitat,	maintain control measures at the
		reduce food resources and degrade	construction site that minimize (i.e.,
		aquatic plants that form part of the	reduce or eliminate) pollutants in
		food web for many	the discharge as necessary to ensure
		•	<u>.</u>

species.Turbidity can also reduce	that the operator's discharge does
fish hatching success, affect the	not cause or contribute to an
ability to acquire food, damage gill	excursion above any applicable
tissue, and even induce direct	water quality standard. Also,
mortality. The Draft Permit duly	9VAC25-870-460.I of the Virginia
prohibits discharges that cause,	Stormwater Management Program
may reasonably be expected to	regulation allows for the use of best
cause, or contribute to a violation	management practices to control or
of water quality standards, and it	abate the discharge of pollutants
requires permittees to ensure that	from stormwater discharges and
discharges from construction sites	when numeric effluent limitations
do not cause or contribute to an	are infeasible. The department
excursion above any applicable	believes that the proposed general
water quality standard. Courts	permit establishes the requirements
have held that permit conditions	necessary to protect water quality
requiring adherence to narrative	standards.
WQS are enforceable, and indeed,	
DEQ and the Attorney General are	In accordance with section
currently engaged in enforcement	402(1)(2) of the Clean Water Act
activities relating in part to	(CWA) discharges of stormwater
stormwater runoff and	runoff from the construction of oil
sedimentation from pipeline	and gas transmission pipelines are
construction activities.Nonetheless,	exempt from National Pollutant
as DEQ has publically stated it is	Discharge Elimination System
unsure how to enforce Virginia's	(NPDES) and Virginia Pollutant
narrative turbidity WQS, we are not	Discharge Elimination System
confident of the level or regularity	(VPDES) permitting. Therefore,
of enforcement action regarding	Virginia's Construction General
this standard at other, less	Permit is not applicable to the
prominent sites. To ensure	natural gas transmission pipeline
protection of water quality from	projects. No changes to the permit
turbidity and sedimentation in the	are proposed in response to this
manner intended by the	comment. Please note, however,
longstanding turbidity WQS, the	that Virginia regulates construction
reissued CGP should require	activities from pipelines through
appropriate monitoring for	the annual standards and
sediment-caused turbidity	specifications program in
downstream of construction sites.	accordance with the Virginia
At a minimum, monitoring	Erosion and Sediment Control Law
according to an appropriate	and the Virginia Stormwater
protocol would give the site	Management Act.
operator the ability to discern	management Act.
whether its onsite controls are	
working effectively and to modify	
them where needed. Effective	
monitoring and reporting of results	
would also allow the operator and	
DEQ to understand the duration of	
any turbid discharges and,	
therefore, its likely effects on	
aquatic life. DEQ, which conducts	
real-time continuous turbidity	
monitoring before, during and after	
specific construction activities for	

the natural gas pipeline projects, is	
certainly capable of devising and	
implementing an appropriate	
turbidity monitoring protocol. To	
the extent additional guidance is	
considered helpful, DEQ could	
consult with neighboring states,	
including Maryland, which also	
have and implement WQS for	
turbidity. Larger than most other	
land disturbing projects, the natural	
gas pipeline projects starkly	
illustrate the turbidity and	
sedimentation risks that smaller	
land disturbing projects can pose to	
local and downstream waterways.	
Virginia should learn from these	
examples and take the important	
step of requiring turbidity	
monitoring downstream of covered	
construction sites. That step will	
help protect water quality by	
warning of inadequate controls due	
to unanticipated weather events,	
inappropriate BMP installation, lax	
maintenance or other problems.	
maintenance of other problems.	

Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Monitoring	I recommend the addition of required settling or filtering of sediment laden or Turbid stormwater prior to discharge. & Monitoring of said settling or filtering prior to discharge. I recommend the addition of public posting of those results in a log attached to the electronically available SWPPP permit.	The proposed general permit is consistent with the requirements for protection of water quality contained in EPA's 2017 Construction General permit effective February 16, 2017. EPA established effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) and new source performance standards (NSPS) to control the discharge of pollutants from construction activities in 40 CFR Part 450 referred to as the "Construction and Development Rule" or "C&D Rule". These requirements were published in the Federal Register on December 1, 2009 (74 FR 62996) and became effective on February 1, 2010 and contained numeric limitation on the allowable level of turbidity in discharges from certain construction sites. On November 5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75
Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial	Monitoring	required settling or filtering of sediment laden or Turbid stormwater prior to discharge. & Monitoring of said settling or filtering prior to discharge. I recommend the addition of public posting of those results in a log attached to the electronically	consistent with the requirements for protection of water quality contained in EPA's 2017 Construction General permit effective February 16, 2017. EPA established effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) and new source performance standards (NSPS) to control the discharge of pollutants from construction activities in 40 CFR Part 450 referred to as the "Construction and Development Rule" or "C&D Rule". These requirements were published in the Federal Register on December 1, 2009 (74 FR 62996) and became effective on February 1, 2010 and contained numeric limitation on the allowable level of turbidity in discharges from certain construction sites. On November
			narrative technology-based effluent limitations contained in 40 CFR Part 450. In addition, the general permit requires operators to select, install, implement, and maintain

	control measures at the construction site that minimize (i.e., reduce or eliminate) pollutants in the discharge as necessary to ensure that the operator's discharge does not cause or contribute to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard. Also, 9VAC25-870-460.1 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation allows for the use of best management practices to control or abate the discharge of pollutants from stormwater discharges and when numeric effluent limitations are infeasible. The department believes that the proposed general permit establishes the requirements necessary to protect water quality standards. No changes to the permit
	standards. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Rogard Ross	Monitoring	Sediment runoff is a major concern. I do not think it would be	The proposed general permit is consistent with the requirements for
		unreasonable to require the site	protection of water quality
		operator to monitor turbidity in the	contained in EPA's 2017
		runoff from the construction sites	Construction General permit
		and take proactive steps to	effective February 16, 2017. EPA
		eliminate sediment runoff in	established effluent limitation
		alignment with their SWPPP	guidelines (ELGs) and new source performance standards (NSPS) to
			control the discharge of pollutants
			from construction activities in 40
			CFR Part 450 referred to as the
			"Construction and Development
			Rule" or "C&D Rule". These
			requirements were published in the
			Federal Register on December 1,
			2009 (74 FR 62996) and became
			effective on February 1, 2010 and contained numeric limitation on the
			allowable level of turbidity in
			discharges from certain
			construction sites. On November
			5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75
			FR 68215), effective January 4,
			2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a)
			and (b) that contained the numeric
			turbidity limitations as the result of a petition. EPA published
			amendments to the C&D Rule (79
			FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and
			May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with
			an effective date of May 5, 2014.
			The amendments lifted the
			indefinite stay, withdrew the
			numeric discharge standards. As a result, numeric turbidity limitation
			and monitoring requirements are
			not required to be incorporated in
			to NPDES permits.
			The general permit requires
			construction activity operators to develop an erosion and sediment
			control plan consistent with the
			requirements of the Virginia
			Erosion and Sediment Control
			Program regulations, which require
			filtering and infiltration practices.
			The permit also incorporates the
			narrative technology-based effluent
			limitations contained in 40 CFR Part 450. In addition, the general
			permit requires operators to select,
			install, implement, and maintain
L	1	1	

	control measures at the construction site that minimize reduce or eliminate) pollutants the discharge as necessary to er that the operator's discharge do not cause or contribute to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard. Also, 9VAC25-870-460.I of the Virg Stormwater Management Progr regulation allows for the use of management practices to contro abate the discharge of pollutant from stormwater discharges and when numeric effluent limitation are infeasible. The department believes that the proposed gene permit establishes the requirem necessary to protect water quali- standards. No changes to the per-	in insure bes inia am best bl or is d ons ral ents ity
	standards. No changes to the pe are proposed in response to this comment.	ermit

Denise	Monitoring	After experiencing more frequent,	Thank you for your comment,
Mosca	linemoning	intense storms currently, please	however revisions to the storm
		reconsider the use of historical	event used for erosion and sediment
		storm record guidelines underlying	control measure sizing is outside
		the recommendations and	the scope of this regulatory action.
		requirements for this permit. For	Additionally, the proposed general
		example, please revisit inspection	permit is consistent with the
		schedules and shortening	requirements for protection of
		timeframes to make corrections	water quality contained in the EPA
		after inspections so that the	2017 Construction General permit
		occurrence of more severe storms	effective February 16, 2017.
		do not result in consistently more	EPA established effluent limitation
		severe impacts. In addition, some	guidelines (ELGs) and new source
		form of settling prior to discharge	performance standards (NSPS) to
		should be a requirement, as well as the elimination of representative	control the discharge of pollutants from construction activities in 40
		inspections for linear activities. For	CFR Part 450 referred to as the
		projects with discharge to waters	"Construction and Development
		impaired due to sediment,	Rule" or "C&D Rule". These
		background and discharging	requirements were published in the
		turbidity monitoring should be	Federal Register on December 1,
		required.	2009 (74 FR 62996) and became
			effective on February 1, 2010 and
			contained numeric limitation on the
			allowable level of turbidity in
			discharges from certain
			construction sites. On November
			5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75
			FR 68215), effective January 4,
			2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a)
			and (b) that contained the numeric
			turbidity limitations as the result of a petition. EPA published
			amendments to the C&D Rule (79
			FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and
			May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with
			an effective date of May 5, 2014.
			The amendments lifted the
			indefinite stay, withdrew the
			numeric discharge standards. As a
			result, numeric turbidity limitation
			and monitoring requirements are
			not required to be incorporated in
			to NPDES permits.
			m 1 · .
			The general permit requires
			construction activity operators to
			develop an erosion and sediment control plan consistent with the
			requirements of the Virginia
			Erosion and Sediment Control
			Program regulations, which require
			filtering and infiltration practices.
			The permit also incorporates the
L	L	1	

Melanie Mason (City of Alexandria)	"Portions of a project not under constructio n"	9VAC25-880-45 2(b)(3)(d)(1): Please clarify that this definition means that construction has begun on any portion of the project included on the stormwater management plan, including regional stormwater facilities.	narrative technology-based effluent limitations contained in 40 CFR Part 450. No revisions to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment. The language proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, the department has determined that the language has caused more confusion than clarification. Therefore, the language proposed in 9VAC25- 880-45 is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	"Portions of a project not under constructio n"	The definition of "portions of a project not under construction" included in Section 9VAC25-880- 45.2.d (1) is subject to various interpretations and should be clarified. It is our understanding that DEQ's intent is to have Part IIC (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) continue to apply to the portions of a project that are addressed in the approved stormwater management plan, and where land disturbance has begun by either June 30, 2024 for time limits on applicability projects or June 30, 2019 for grandfathered projects. The suggested revision is to add the following language to Section 9VAC25-880-45.2.d (1) of the permit: "All portions of the project covered by the approved stormwater management plan that were developed in accordance with Part IIC shall remain subject to Part IIC so long as land disturbance has commenced by either June 30, 2024 for projects meeting subdivision 2a or June 30, 2019 for projects meeting subdivision 2b of this section."	The language proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, the department has determined that the language has caused more confusion than clarification. Therefore, the language proposed in 9VAC25- 880-45 is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Hampton	"Portions	Another suggestion that will help	The language proposed in 9VAC
Roads	of a project	permittees determine which	25-880-45 was added to provide
Planning	not under	projects remain under Part IIC is to	further clarification regarding the
District	constructio	include the examples that were	applicability of the stormwater
Commission	n"	provided to the TAC in May 2018	technical criteria contained in the
		in the Fact Sheet for the permit.	Virginia Stormwater Management
		The project examples, including a	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		road widening project, a utility	After receiving numerous
		readjustment, and a phased	comments during the comment
		subdivision, were particularly	period, the department has
		helpful to the TAC discussions and	determined that the language has
		would also be helpful to permittees.	caused more confusion than
			clarification. Therefore, the
			language proposed in 9VAC25-
			880-45 is being removed from the
			proposed permit and a discussion of
			applicable technical criteria has
			been included in the fact sheet.

Mark	"Portions	Section 9VAC25-880-45, item B	The language proposed in 9VAC
Williams	of a project	(draft) states "Portions of the	25-880-45 was added to provide
(Koontz	not under	project not under construction as of	further clarification regarding the
Bryant	constructio	June 30, 2024 shall no longer be	applicability of the stormwater
Johnson	n"	eligible to use the technical design	technical criteria contained in the
Williams)		criteria in Part II C of the VSMP	Virginia Stormwater Management
)		regulation."	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		Items to note:	After receiving numerous
			comments during the comment
		a. Section 9VAC25-870-47 (under	period, the department has
		the general "Part II" of the Chapter	determined that the language has
		870 VSMP Regulations NOT the	caused more confusion than
		Chapter 880 General Permit	clarification. Therefore, the
		Regulations), section B states	language proposed in 9VAC25-
		similar language (i.e "After such	880-45 is being removed from the
		time, portions of the project not	proposed permit and a discussion of
		under construction shall be subject	applicable technical criteria has
		to any new technical criteria	been included in the fact sheet.
		adopted by the board"). It is my	
		understanding that changes to	Additionally, suggested changes to
		Chapter 870 have NOT been	the provisions of Section 47 and 48
		authorized; Therefore, only the	of the Virginia Stormwater
		interpretation of the term "portions	Management Program regulation,
		of a project not under construction"	9VAC25-870, are not authorized
		can be addressed. Unfortunately,	under the regulatory action to
		this wording doesn't account for	amend the general permit. Also,
		items outside the control of the	please note that the provisions of
		engineer or developer.	9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow
			certain projects to use the post
		b. Section 9VAC25-880-45, item	development stormwater technical
		B4 (draft) defines "Portions of	criteria in effect prior to July 1,
		the project not under construction"	2014 criteria apply specifically to
		Based on the current wording of the	stormwater management associated
		regulations (related to "portions of	with land-disturbing activities. The
		a project not under construction"),	vesting requirements set out in the
		a locality could approve a site plan	Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1
		(which may have taken 8 months or	have no relationship to the
		more to get approved) in late June	stormwater provisions and the
		of 2024. In many localities, the	technical criteria that are applicable
		actual issuance of a land	to a given project as stated in the
		disturbance permit is not done until	VSMP regulatory development
		the pre-construction meeting,	documents from 2011.
		which needs to be scheduled with	
		the authority. If the locality, as the	
		authority, approved a plan in late	
		June of 2024, they could find	
		themselves setting up a pre-	
		construction meeting in July,	
		knowing the plans at that time will	
		not be in compliance with the	
		regulations (as the project may not	
		be under construction prior to June	
		30, 2019, depending on the DEQ's	
		definition of "under construction").	

		Could this section be modified to	
		require "Plan Approval" by June	
		30, 2019 for grandfathered projects	
		and "Plan Approval" by June 30,	
		2024 for projects with previous	
		permit coverage and which are	
		renewed. Since Chapter 870 uses	
		the same language, and changes to	
		Chapter 870 have not been	
		authorized, can the suggested	
		change noted above be made (by	
		superseding Chapter 870 via	
		changes within Chapter 880)?	
		A preferred addition to the	
		definition of "portions of a project	
		not under construction" would be a	
		statement that any project or	
		portions of projects meeting the	
		vesting requirements of Virginia	
		Code § 15.2-2307, paragraph A	
		would be deemed to be a project	
		under construction. This would	
		allow ongoing residential projects	
		with approved zoning and tentative	
		plans to continue moving toward	
		completion of the overall project	
		under the same criteria that was	
		known to them when the project	
		started. Arbitrary dates should not	
		be defined for developers who have	
		and continue to invest substantial	
		sums of money actively pursuing	
		completion of their multi-phased	
		projects. Will the DEQ be willing	
		to include language within the	
		definition for "portions of a project	
		not under construction" that	
		includes any project or portions of	
		projects meeting the vesting	
		requirements of Virginia Code §	
		15.2-2307, paragraph A?	
John	"Portions	9VAC25-880-45.2.b(1).	The department has included
Woodburn	of a project	Grandfathering – If grandfathered,	information regarding applicable
(Goochland	not under	how does the 'portions of project	post development stormwater
County)	constructio	not under construction" part get	technical criteria in the fact sheet.
	n"	implemented?	No changes to permit are proposed
			in response to this comment.
	•	•	

Kristin Carter (University of Virginia)	"Portions of a project not under constructio n"	9VAC25-880-45 – For paragraph 2.d.2, why do locality, state and federal projects have until 12/31/2020 to issue a contract and consider that equivalent to initiating construction on by 06/30/19? A year and a half seems like an excessive grace period beyond what was originally intended for grandfathered projects.	Thank you for comment. Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
Jimmy Edmonds	"Portions of a project	9VAC25-880-45.B.4(a) The definition for "portions of a project	Thank you for comment. Language in the proposed permit was not
(Loudoun County)	not under constructio n"	not under construction" is provided. Does the first part of the definition, "any construction activity permitted as described in 9VAC-25-880-45 B 1 or 2 and included on an approved stormwater management plan for which land disturbance has not commenced for any activities on the approved stormwater management plan" infer that this includes any proposed land disturbance on a site for which the stormwater plan/measures are proposed (e.g., Phase 1 ESC measure installation on a project that has an approved SWM Plan)? In other words, please verify that the definition does not limit the land disturbance to that involved in the construction of SWM facilities (which typically takes place very late in project construction).	intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Jimmy Edmonds (Loudoun County)	"Portions of a project not under constructio n"	9VAC25-880-45.B.4(a) Detailed guidance from DEQ on the interpretation of the definition of "portions of a project not under construction" is requested. Please	Thank you for comment. Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		provide recommendations and guidance related to procedures for a local VSMP program to follow in determining this project status and in revoking the "grandfathered" status of a project and enforcing the new criteria should it be determined that construction has not begun. This process has the potential to be resource demanding for local VSMPs.	Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Melanie	Part II C	9VAC25-880-45 2(b)(1): Per DEQ	Thank you for comment. Language
Mason	Technical	guidance memo 14-2014 issued	in the proposed permit was not
(City of	Criteria	August 25, 2014, land-disturbing	intended to change applicability of
Alexandria)	Cinteria	activities that obtain first-time	the Part II C criteria as authorized
<sup>1</sup> Hexalici ia)		coverage under the 2014 general	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		permit, with the exception of	Virginia Stormwater Management
		"grandfathered" projects or projects	regulation. The language originally
		served by an existing stormwater	proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was
		management facility, are subject to	added to provide further
		the new Part II B technical criteria	clarification regarding the
		for two (2) additional general	applicability of the stormwater
		permit cycles. Any land-disturbing	technical criteria contained in the
		activities served by an existing on-	Virginia Stormwater Management
		site or off-site stormwater	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		management facility, including a	After receiving numerous
		regional (watershed wide)	comments during the comment
			period, it is clear to the department
		stormwater management facility, designed and implemented in	that the language did not provide
		accordance with the old Part II C	clarification and introduced
			confusion. Therefore, the language
		technical criteria remain subject to the old Part II C technical criteria	
		for two (2) additional general	is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of
		permit cycles. The use of	
		grandfathered existing on site or	applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
		0	been included in the fact sheet.
		offsite facilities, including regional	
		facilities designed to meet the Part IIC criteria is not reflected in the	
		language in the proposed permit.	
		This will affect projects that have	
		been permitted to use a regional	
		facility designed to the Part IIC	
		criteria, but have not yet begun	
		construction or still have portions	
		of the project that are not under	
		construction. Please include	
		language consistent with the	
		guidance.	

Barbara	Part II C	Section 9VAC25-880-45.2.b (2) of	Thank you for comment. Language
Brumbaugh	Technical	the proposed Construction GP	in the proposed permit was not
(City of	Criteria	includes the requirements for	intended to change applicability of
Chesapeake)		locality, state, and federal projects	the Part II C criteria as authorized
1 )		to be eligible to conduct land	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		disturbance in accordance with Part	Virginia Stormwater Management
		II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.). The	regulation. The language originally
		provision specifically states that the	proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was
		project has to meet the	added to provide further
		grandfathering requirements of	clarification regarding the
		9VAC25-870-48 B, which includes	applicability of the stormwater
		an obligation of funding prior to	technical criteria contained in the
		July 1, 2012. There are situations in	Virginia Stormwater Management
		which a local government project	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		has approved plans; however,	After receiving numerous
		funding was obligated after July 1,	comments during the comment
		2012. It is expected that most local	period, it is clear to the department
		government projects that are	that the language did not provide
		grandfathered would have secured	clarification and introduced
		funding by July 1, 2012 and met	confusion. Therefore, the language
		the requirements of 9VAC25-870-	is being removed from the
		48 B; however, local government	proposed permit and a discussion of
		budgets are impacted by any	applicable technical criteria has
		number of factors beyond a	been included in the fact sheet.
		locality's control, such as extreme	Additionally, the proposed changes
		weather events. Local governments	to 9VAC25-870 are outside of the
		need flexibility in terms of funding	scope of this regulatory action.
		schedules to allow them to manage	
		their limited resources in the most	
		cost effective manner. Extending	
		the applicability of Part IIC to projects grandfathered under Parts	
		A and B of 9VAC25-870-48 will	
		provide flexibility to local	
		governments. The suggested	
		revision is to add a reference to Part	
		A of 9VAC25-870-48 to the	
		following sentence in Section	
		9VAC25-880-45.2.b(2) of the	
		Construction GP: "For locality,	
		state, and federal projects, any	
		operator that obtained initial permit	
		authorization to discharge under the	
		general permit effective July 1,	
		2014, for projects meeting the	
		requirements of 9VAC25-870-48 A	
		or B, has maintained continuous	
		permit coverage since initial permit	
		coverage was approved, and	
		obtains coverage under the general	
		permit effective July 1, 2019, shall conduct land disturbance in	
		accordance with Part II C	
		(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the	
		(3 v AC25-070-35 et seq.) of the	

		VSMP Regulation or more stringent standards at the operator's discretion."	
Barbara Brumbaugh (City of Chesapeake)	Part II C Technical Criteria	§15.2-2209.1. of the Code of Virginia, which was promulgated to address the housing crisis, extends the approval of any subdivision recorded plat or final site plan that was outstanding as of January 1, 2017 to July 1, 2020. This requirement is inconsistent with the grandfathering provisions in Section 9VAC25-880-45.b that specify an expiration date of June 30, 2019 for the stormwater management plans of grandfathered projects. The City recommends that DEQ review the legislation and the proposed Construction GP to ensure that the expiration dates are consistent and do not present conflicting information to the development community.	The provisions of 9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow certain projects to use the post development stormwater technical criteria in effect prior to July 1, 2014 criteria apply specifically to stormwater management associated with land- disturbing activities. The vesting requirements set out in the Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1 have no relationship to the stormwater provisions and the technical criteria that are applicable to a given project as stated in the VSMP regulatory development documents from 2011. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Hampton	Part II C	Section 9VAC25-880-45.2.b (2) of	Thank you for comment. Language
Roads	Technical	the proposed Construction GP	in the proposed permit was not
Planning	Criteria	includes the requirements for	intended to change applicability of
District		locality, state, and federal projects	the Part II C criteria as authorized
Commission		to be eligible to conduct land	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		disturbance in accordance with Part	Virginia Stormwater Management
		II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.). The	regulation. The language originally
		provision specifically states that the	proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was
		project has to meet the	added to provide further
		grandfathering requirements of	clarification regarding the
		9VAC25-870-48 B, which includes	applicability of the stormwater
		an obligation of funding prior to	technical criteria contained in the
		July 1, 2012. There are situations in	Virginia Stormwater Management
		which a local government project	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		has approved plans; however,	After receiving numerous
		funding was obligated after July 1,	comments during the comment
		2012. It is expected that most local	period, it is clear to the department
		government projects that are	that the language did not provide
		grandfathered would have secured	clarification and introduced
		funding by July 1, 2012 and met	confusion. Therefore, the language
		the requirements of 9VAC25-870-	is being removed from the
		48 B; however, local government	proposed permit and a discussion of
		budgets are impacted by any	applicable technical criteria has
		number of factors beyond a	been included in the fact sheet.
		locality's control, such as extreme	Additionally, the proposed changes
		weather events. Local governments	to 9VAC25-870 are outside of the
		need flexibility in terms of funding	scope of this regulatory action.
		schedules to allow them to manage	
		their limited resources in the most	
		cost effective manner. Extending	
		the applicability of Part IIC to projects grandfathered under Parts	
		A and B of 9VAC25-870-48 will	
		provide flexibility to local	
		governments. The suggested	
		revision is to add a reference to Part	
		A of 9VAC25-870-48 to the	
		following sentence in Section	
		9VAC25-880-45.2.b(2) of the	
		Construction GP: "For locality,	
		state, and federal projects, any	
		operator that obtained initial permit	
		authorization to discharge under the	
		general permit effective July 1,	
		2014, for projects meeting the	
		requirements of 9VAC25-870-48 A	
		or B, has maintained continuous	
		permit coverage since initial permit	
		coverage was approved, and	
		obtains coverage under the general	
		permit effective July 1, 2019, shall conduct land disturbance in	
		accordance with Part II C	
		(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the	
		(3 v AC23-070-33 et seq.) of the	

		VSMP Regulation or more stringent standards at the operator's	
		discretion."	
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Part II C Technical Criteria	\$15.2-2209.1. of the Code of Virginia, which was promulgated to address the housing crisis, extends the approval of any subdivision recorded plat or final site plan that was outstanding as of January 1, 2017 to July 1, 2020. This requirement is inconsistent with the grandfathering provisions in Section 9VAC25-880-45.b that specify an expiration date of June 30, 2019 for the stormwater management plans of grandfathered projects. The suggestion is for the DEQ to review the legislation and the proposed Construction GP to address the inconsistent expiration dates and to provide guidance to permittees.	The provisions of 9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow certain projects to use the post development stormwater technical criteria in effect prior to July 1, 2014 criteria apply specifically to stormwater management associated with land- disturbing activities. The vesting requirements set out in the Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1 have no relationship to the stormwater provisions and the technical criteria that are applicable to a given project as stated in the VSMP regulatory development documents from 2011. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Jimmy Edmonds (Loudoun County)	Part II C Technical Criteria	9VAC25-880-45.B.1 This section describes "time limits of applicability." We recommend the following sentence be amended for clarity: 9VAC25-880-45.B.1 "project not under construction as of June 30, 2024 shall no longer be eligible to use the technical design criteria in Part II C of the VSMP regulation." Amend highlighted language to read, "subject to the technical design criteria in Part IIC of the VSMP Regulations, and shall become subject to and shall be conducted in accordance with the technical criteria in Part II B."	Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870- 47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Jon Tibbs	Part II C	McAirlaid's, Inc. submitted a	Thank you for comment. The
(McAirlaid's	Technical	master plan (copy attached) to DEQ	language proposed in 9VAC 25-
Inc)	Criteria	in May 2007. This master plan	880-45 was added to provide
,		reflected all phase of development	further clarification regarding the
		for the site. McAirlaid's, Inc.	applicability of the stormwater
		renewed our General Permit in	technical criteria contained in the
		2014 and received approval from	Virginia Stormwater Management
		DEQ on 19 Sept 14 (copy	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		attached). This renewal process	After receiving numerous
		also included a master plan (copy	comments during the comment
		attached) that demonstrated all	period, the department has
		phases of the project. The reason to	determined that the language has
		renew and not close this permit was	caused more confusion than
		to allow us to construct the final	clarification. The department has
		phase of our approved site (Phase	included information in the fact
		V) as business allows under the	sheet regarding applicability of the
		erosion and sediment control laws	post development stormwater
		and regulations at the time the	technical criteria.
		General Permit was issued and not	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		be subject to any changes that may develop to the laws since that time	of the Virginia Stormwater
		(grandfather). We continue to	Management regulation, "land-
		maintain the maintenance fee with	disturbing activities that obtain an
		Franklin County. Will McAirlaid's,	initial state permit or commence
		Inc. be allowed to construct Phase	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		V under the laws that govern the	2014, shall be conducted in
		2014 permit if we continue to	accordance with the Part II C
		update the General Permit with no	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		changes to the master plan?	criteria of this chapter." These
			projects remain subject to the Part
		McAirlaid's, Inc. wishes to	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		understand more clearly the	which time those portions of the
		definition of "under construction".	project not under construction shall
		With our SWPPP, our continued renewals of the General Permit, and	become subject to any new
		paying the yearly maintenance fee,	technical criteria.
		we consider our site still "under	Additionally, as clarified in
		construction". Will the "substantial	Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
		changes to the existing regulation"	the department on August 25, 2014,
		that are predicted by DEQ allow	any land-disturbing activities
		McAirlaid's, Inc. to continue along	served by an existing on-site or off-
		our existing path and allow us to	site stormwater management
		construct our Phase V addition	facility, including a regional
		under laws and regulations	(watershed-wide) stormwater
		governing the 2014 general permit?	management facility, designed and
			implemented in accordance with
		To simplify, McAirlaid's, Inc. feels	the old Part II C technical criteria
		that we were very forward thinking during the design of the master plan	remain subject to the old Part II C
		during the design of the master plan in 2007; therefore submitting this	technical criteria until July 1, 2024 as long as the land-use assumptions
		plan to DEQ and subsequently	upon which the stormwater
		receiving approval in 2007. We	management facility was designed
		have maintained our General	and implemented have not changed
		Permit with no changes to the	(e.g., an unanticipated increase in

master plan with the understanding	impervious cover).
that we will, as business	
opportunities allow, build out this	
site in accordance with this master	
plan. Our fear, due to a lack of	
clear understanding, is that we will	
either end up with a detention pond	
on our site (currently shared by the	
park), or we will not be allowed to	
complete the master plan at all.	

Monte	Part II C	We still have a few projects under	Thank you for comment. Language
Lewis (ED	Technical	the IIC requirements where the	in the proposed permit was not
Lewis and	Criteria	overall storm water plan has been	intended to change applicability of
Assoc)		worked out but the last sections or	the Part II C criteria as authorized
,		phases have not been started. If the	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		IIB requirements are applied to the	Virginia Stormwater Management
		rest of the project it would be	regulation. The language originally
		disastrous. Layouts of the site have	proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was
		been approved in zoning and	added to provide further
		tentative approvals. Storm water	clarification regarding the
		management systems have been	applicability of the stormwater
		planned and some have been	technical criteria contained in the
		installed based on 2C requirements	Virginia Stormwater Management
		for the entire project. Our clients	Program regulation, 9VAC25-870.
		have spent an enormous amount of	After receiving numerous comments during the comment
		capital outlay for these projects based on the IIC requirements.	period, it is clear to the department
		When we renewed our permits in	that the language did not provide
		2014 we were told that we would	clarification and introduced
		have 2 permit cycles under these	confusion. Therefore, the language
		regulations. I think if we have a	is being removed from the
		permit and the registration	proposed permit and a discussion of
		statement stated the overall project	applicable technical criteria has
		area was let's say 100 acres then we	been included in the fact sheet.
		should be allowed to renew for the	
		entire 100 acres under the	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		requirements at that time. Let the	of the Virginia Stormwater
		IIC permits play out with the	Management regulation, "land-
		development of the project like it was intended. That is only fair and	disturbing activities that obtain an initial state permit or commence
		equitable. For instance, If we	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		change a bmp location on a	2014, shall be conducted in
		tentative plan in Chesterfield they	accordance with the Part II C
		will void that tentative and we have	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		to meet all of their current	criteria of this chapter." These
		regulations relative to setbacks,	projects remain subject to the Part
		buffers, etc. which has nothing to	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		do with renewing a permit that we	which time those portions of the
		already have in hand.	project not under construction shall
			become subject to any new
			technical criteria.
			Additionally as clarified in
			Additionally, as clarified in Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
			the department on August 25, 2014,
			any land-disturbing activities
			served by an existing on-site or off-
			site stormwater management
			facility, including a regional
			(watershed-wide) stormwater
			management facility, designed and
			implemented in accordance with
			the old Part II C technical criteria
			remain subject to the old Part II C

			technical criteria until July 1, 2024 as long as the land-use assumptions upon which the stormwater management facility was designed and implemented have not changed (e.g., an unanticipated increase in impervious cover).
Jimmy Edmonds (Loudoun County)	Part II C Technical Criteria	9VAC25-880-45.B.4(b) Based upon the language in this section, we believe that local, state, & federal projects which fall under "time limits on applicability" and which have a contract award issued by December 31, 2020 will remain grandfathered to the II C Technical Criteria in perpetuity. Was this the intent of this section?	Thank you for comment. Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, the department has determined that the language has caused more confusion than clarification. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Alvin Mistr	Part II C	There are specific concerns to	Thank you for comment. Language
(Midview	Technical	interpretations of the sections of the	in the proposed permit was not
Managemen	Criteria	Regulations regarding	intended to change applicability of
t		grandfathered status and previously	the Part II C criteria as authorized
Corporation)		permitted status. These	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
1 /		interpretations of the Regulations	Virginia Stormwater Management
		will potentially have severe	regulation. The language proposed
		implications to the ability of	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		numerous landowners to re-develop	provide further clarification
		the Innsbrook Office Park. The	regarding the applicability of the
		Innsbrook Owners Association	stormwater technical criteria
		(operator) obtained Coverage under	contained in the Virginia
		the 2009 VPDES on June 6, 2014	Stormwater Management Program
		(VAR10E112). Subsequently, the	regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		IOA obtained Coverage under the	receiving numerous comments
		2014 VPDES General Construction	during the comment period, the
		Permit (VAR10E112) on August	department has determined that the
		22, 2014. Henrico County, as the	language has caused more
		VSMP Authority, deemed, via a	confusion than clarification.
		letter from Keith White dated July	Therefore, the language is being
		20, 2011, that the Innsbrook	removed from the proposed permit
		Comprehensive Stormwater	and a discussion of applicable
		Management Plan (ICSMP) was	technical criteria has been included
		consistent with the stormwater	in the fact sheet.
		management plan being	
		administered by Henrico County. In	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		doing so, the County agreed that	of the Virginia Stormwater
		the ICSMP was a "document	Management regulation, "land-
		equivalent thereto" to a currently	disturbing activities that obtain an
		valid proffered or conditional	initial state permit or commence land disturbance prior to July 1,
		zoning plan, preliminary or final	2014, shall be conducted in
		subdivision plat, preliminary or final site plan, or zoning with a	accordance with the Part II C
		plan of development. This was in	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		accordance with the "Guidance	criteria of this chapter." These
		Document on the implementation	projects remain subject to the Part
		of the Virginia Stormwater	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		Management Regulations	which time those portions of the
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	project not under construction shall
		May 15, 2012, and signed by DCR	become subject to any new
		Director David E. Johnson.By	technical criteria. Additionally, as
		virtue of VAR10E112, the entire	clarified in Guidance Memo 14-
		Innsbrook Office Park was	2014 issued by the department on
		previously permitted for two permit	August 25, 2014, any land-
		cycles, and the Innsbrook Owners	disturbing activities served by an
		Association relied on this status to	existing on-site or off-site
		move forward with plans to re-	stormwater management facility,
		develop all of the office park under	including a regional (watershed-
		UMU zoning standards. The	wide) stormwater management
		County had already designated	facility, designed and implemented
		Innsbrook, as well as some of the	in accordance with the old Part II C
		surrounding area, as an Urban	technical criteria remain subject to
		Development Area (UDA), which	the old Part II C technical criteria
		is a prerequisite to requesting UMU	until July 1, 2024 as long as the

ICSMP were in accordance with the technical criteria of Patt II C of the Regulations. These calculation of phosphorus reductions by the Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stornwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requireed stornwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of required stornwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of requireed to re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have ny ety been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the USRP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the legal requirements of the eredits does nothing to enhance the legal requirements of the eredition of site credits on so		
<ul> <li>the technical criteria of Part II C of the Regulations. These calculations of phosphorus reductions by the Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stornwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this itime, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for treducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico Courty has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel with Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel with Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel with Rumerous phases to be developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel with Rumerhas, Multe purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>	zoning.All of the calculations in the	land-use assumptions upon which
<ul> <li>the Regulations. These calculations of phosphorus reductions by the Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stornwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the reducelopment of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook as an innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County 185/0112, Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zones to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 1104 parcels within Innsbrook is redeveloped and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel within Innsbrook is redeveloped and exceeds the impervious area allotment as the treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits metation of best maagement tractica of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through is in 9VAC25-870-63.</li> <li>Keyleyton and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>of phosphorus reductions by the Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stornwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcele must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite creditis does notify to the lakes. The</li> </ul>		<b>e</b> 1
Innsbrock Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrock. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrock as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrock to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Vrignina BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrock as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrock as a single complete project with Innsbrook is re- developed over the next couple of decades. As a each of the 110 $\pm$ parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	the Regulations. These calculations	have not changed (e.g., an
in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stornwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, within intend of the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not y the been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 1104 pareels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allottment as determined by the ICSMP, that pareel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	of phosphorus reductions by the	unanticipated increase in
<ul> <li>Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of lnmsbrook as a single complet project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotent as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional or site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of ffisite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>	Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized	impervious cover).
<ul> <li>Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of lnmsbrook as a single complet project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotent as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional or site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of ffisite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>	in the preparation of Plans of	
<ul> <li>ICSMP vas deemed to be consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 pervit, cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re-development of Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110<sup>10</sup> Innsbrook is as a defined in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria in set set forth in guarcel must provide additional on site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits forom an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits dese nothing to the lakes. The water quality of the lakes. The water quality</li></ul>		Please note that the 2014
consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel swithin Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allottent as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel swithin Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allottent as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel swithin Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allottent as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 1104 parcels within Innsbrook is treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Autrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits dees nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
<ul> <li>method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners, within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stornwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project within Innsbrook is re- developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction of purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>		
requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an autorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		-
cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 1104 parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		•
<ul> <li>consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook, The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginin BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complet project with numerous phases to be developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>		• •
development of Innsbrook. The intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		-
intentions of the owners, at this time, are to re-develop Insbrook as an Inovation District. This wave to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110- parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized nutrient trading a lank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized nutrient trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized nutrient trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized nutrient trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized of the lakes. The		
<ul> <li>time, are to re-develop Innsbrook as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The</li> </ul>	-	
as an Innovation District. This will allow the owners within Innsbrok to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrok as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrok as a single complet project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrok is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
allow the owners within Innsbrook to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits mets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
to initiate innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal autority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits mores notice of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does noting to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does noting to enhance the water quality of the lakes. TheIt should also be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation applies only to new land disturbing activities. Re- development on prior developed lands" as defined in 9VAC25-870-10 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation of best management provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does noting to enhance the water quality of the lakes. TheIt should also be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management provide additional on- site treatment opf	to initiate innovative methods of	contain an approved erosion and
advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	treating stormwater runoff and	sediment control.
Ioads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Theapplicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance witigina Stormwater Management Program regulation applies only to new land disturbing activities. Re- development of parcels ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") (Do fbe Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation) require a decrease in phosphorus load from the site as set forth in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	utilizing new technological	
Ioads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Theapplicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance witigina Stormwater Management Program regulation applies only to new land disturbing activities. Re- development of parcels ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") ("development of parcels") (Do fbe Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation) require a decrease in phosphorus load from the site as set forth in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse listed in 9VAC25-870-69.		It should also be noted that
approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		applicability of the Part II C
Clearinghouse. Henrico County has the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	-	· · ·
the legal authority to designate areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110 $\pm$ parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	· · ·	
areas of the County as Technology Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
Zones. Designating Innsbrook as a Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
Technology Zone would allow the County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
County flexibility in making waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
waivers to regulations and their implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		· ·
implementation. With that in mind, the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
the IOA proposes to treat all of Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
Innsbrook as a single complete project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Therequire a decrease in phosphorus load from the site as set forth in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	-	
project with numerous phases to be developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		8 8 9
developed over the next couple of decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870- 65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	<b>č</b> 1	
decades. As each of the 110± parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Thecompliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-69.		
parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Thetechnical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870- 65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	· ·	
parcels within Innsbrook is re- developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. Thetechnical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870- 65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	decades. As each of the $110\pm$	compliance with the stormwater
developed and exceeds the impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. TheII C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870- 65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in 9VAC25-870-69.	parcels within Innsbrook is re-	
impervious area allotment as determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		II C can only be achieved through
determined by the ICSMP, that parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
parcel must provide additional on- site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
site treatment (pollutant reduction) or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	-	
or purchase nutrient offset credits from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		-
from an authorized Nutrient Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	<u> </u>	
Trading Bank. While purchasing nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The	-	
nutrient offset credits meets the legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
legal requirements of the Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		$3 \times AC23-0/0-07.$
Regulations, a purchase of offsite credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
credits does nothing to enhance the water quality of the lakes. The		
water quality of the lakes. The		
Innsbrook Lakes currently have	· ·	
	Innsbrook Lakes currently have	

BMP removal efficiencies between	
50% and 60%. Sampling of the	
outfall of Lake Rooty (Lake #5)	
indicates that the lakes are actually	
removing more phosphorus than	
has been calculated. In order to	
verify the water quality benefits of	
the Lakes, Innsbrook proposes to	
monitor each of the five lakes to	
determine whether that lake is	
exceeding the nutrient removal	
efficiency as currently allowed by	
the BMP Clearinghouse. When the	
removal efficiency exceeds that	
allowed by current guidelines for a	
specified length of time, Innsbrook	
would get credit for the additional	
nutrient removal. These lakes have	
served as a Regional BMP for the	
Innsbrook Office Park since its	
inception. It is in the best interest of	
Innsbrook, Henrico County and the	
DEQ for these lakes to be allowed	
to continue to function as a	
Regional BMP.The Innsbrook	
Owners Association wants	
assurances, either from Henrico	
County, DEQ, or through	
clarifications for Chapter 880 of the	
Virginia Stormwater Regulations,	
that the re-development of	
Innsbrook can continue based on	
the technical criteria in Part II C.	
The VSMP, which is currently	
valid, must be extended and remain	
in effect. If there are requirements	
that must be met, such as, E&S	
plans for individual sites, we need	
to discuss that immediately so that	
we have sufficient time for the	
preparation of said requirements.	
Preparation of sala requirements.	

Paul	Part II C	Representatives of the Innsbrook	Thank you for comment. Language
Kreckman	Technical	Owners Association have been	in the proposed permit was not
(Innsbrook	Criteria	reviewing the draft changes to	intended to change applicability of
Owners		Chapter 880 of the Virginia	the Part II C criteria as authorized
Association)		Stormwater Regulations. I	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
,		represent the Innsbrook Owners	Virginia Stormwater Management
		Association which obtained	regulation. The language proposed
		General Permit coverage	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		(VAR10E112) for the entire 630	provide further clarification
		acres of the Innsbrook Office Park.	regarding the applicability of the
		The Innsbrook Owners Association	stormwater technical criteria
		(operator) obtained Coverage under	contained in the Virginia
		the 2009 VPDES on June 6, 2014	Stormwater Management Program
		(VAR10E112). Subsequently, the	regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		IOA obtained Coverage under the	receiving numerous comments
		2014 VPDES General Construction	during the comment period, the
		Permit (VAR10E112) on August	department has determined that the
		22, 2014. Henrico County, as the	language has caused more
		VSMP Authority, deemed, via a	confusion than clarification.
		letter from Keith White dated July	Therefore, the language is being
		20, 2011, that the Innsbrook	removed from the proposed permit
		Comprehensive Stormwater	and a discussion of applicable
		Management Plan (ICSMP) was	technical criteria has been included
		consistent with the stormwater	in the fact sheet.
		management plan operated by	
		Henrico County. In doing so, the	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		County agreed that the ICSMP was	of the Virginia Stormwater
		a "document equivalent thereto" to	Management regulation, "land-
		a currently valid proffered or	disturbing activities that obtain an
		conditional zoning plan,	initial state permit or commence
		preliminary or final subdivision	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		plat, preliminary or final site plan,	2014, shall be conducted in
		or zoning with a plan of	accordance with the Part II C
		development. This was in	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		accordance with the "Guidance	criteria of this chapter." These
		Document on the implementation	projects remain subject to the Part
		of the Virginia Stormwater	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		Management Regulations	which time those portions of the
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	project not under construction shall
		May 15, 2012, and signed DCR	become subject to any new
		Director, David E. Johnson. The	technical criteria. Additionally, as
		IOA obtained coverage under both the 2000 and 2014 Regulations to	clarified in Guidance Memo 14-
		the 2009 and 2014 Regulations to provide a level of certainty to	2014 issued by the department on August 25, 2014, any land-
		-	
		developers desiring to have operations in Innsbrook as well as	disturbing activities served by an existing on-site or off-site
		current owners who will redevelop	stormwater management facility,
		their sites at some point in the	including a regional (watershed-
		future. By virtue of those permits,	wide) stormwater management
		Innsbrook had previously permitted	facility, designed and implemented
		status, with the assurance that	in accordance with the old Part II C
		Innsbrook could redevelop under	technical criteria remain subject to
		those regulations for two permit	the old Part II C technical criteria
		cycles until June 30, 2024. A	until July 1, 2024 as long as the
L	1	cycles unui Julie 30, 2024. A	unun Jury 1, 2024 as tolig as the

substantial amount of planning and	land-use assumptions upon which
capital has been expended with the	the stormwater management facility
understanding that Innsbrook could	was designed and implemented
be redeveloped using the Technical	have not changed (e.g., an
Criteria of Part II C of the	unanticipated increase in
stormwater	impervious cover).
regulations.Redevelopment of	
individual parcels within Innsbrook	Also, the 2014 Construction
have been developed under the	General Permit required operators
General Permit (VAR10E112). The	to update the required Stormwater
calculations in the ICSMP were	Pollution Prevention Plan within 60
utilized for this development and	days of receiving permit coverage.
were in accordance with the	A component of the SWPPP is an
technical criteria of Part II C of the	approved erosion and sediment
Regulations. These calculations of	control plan for the amount of land
phosphorus reductions by the	disturbance for which permit
Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized	coverage was authorized. The
in the preparation of Plans of	proposed permit retains the same
Development since the time the	requirement for the SWPPP to
ICSMP was deemed to be	contain an approved erosion and
consistent with the Stormwater	sediment control.
Regulations. Changes to the	Seament control.
method of calculating water quality	Additionally, it should be noted
requirements with the 2019 permit	that applicability of the Part II C
	technical criteria in accordance
cycle will have potentially dire	with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the
consequences for the re-	
development of Innsbrook.	Virginia Stormwater Management
Innshrook did not have an averall	Program regulation applies only to
Innsbrook did not have an overall	new land disturbing activities. Re-
Erosion & Sediment Control plan	development of parcels
for the entire office park. Instead	("development on prior developed
E&S plans were submitted for each	lands" as defined in 9VAC25-870-
parcel as it was redeveloped. This	10 of the Virginia Stormwater
has been accepted and approved by	Management Program regulation)
the VSMP Authority for the last	require a decrease in phosphorus
several years. In addition, no	load from the site as set forth in
overall SWPPP was required by the	9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly,
VSMP Authority and none was	compliance with the stormwater
prepared. Individual SWPPP's were	technical criteria of Part II B or Part
prepared for each site as it was	II C can only be achieved through
developed. This has been the case	the implementation of best
with several projects and has been	management practices approved for
accepted by the VSMP Authority.	use on Virginia BMP
It is our hope that this interpretation	Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-
of the Regulations will	65 or as allowed under the Off-Site
continue. Our intentions, at this	Compliance Options listed in
time, are to re-develop Innsbrook	9VAC25-870-69.
into a high level mixed use	
community by virtue of Urban	
Mixed Use (UMU) zoning	
standards. Henrico County officials	
- standards, richtico County Unividis	
are on board with us to create an	

design and will include innovative	
methods of treating stormwater	
runoff and utilizing new advanced	
technologies for reducing nutrient	
loads as they enter our Lakes. Some	
of these methods may not have	
been approved by the BMP	
Clearinghouse. We will work with	
the appropriate agencies in	
developing sampling protocols that	
can be used for assessing the	
efficiency of the Lakes in removing	
phosphorus and ultimately	
obtaining approval of the advanced	
technologies. The IOA proposes to	
continue to treat all of Innsbrook as	
a single complete project with	
numerous phases to be developed	
over the next couple of decades. As	
each of the $110\pm$ parcels within	
Innsbrook is re-developed and	
exceeds the impervious area	
allotment as determined by the	
ICSMP, that parcel must provide	
additional on-site treatment	
(pollutant reduction) or purchase	
nutrient offset credits from an	
authorized Nutrient Trading Bank.	
Innsbrook proposes to monitor each	
of the five lakes to determine	
whether that lake is exceeding the	
nutrient removal efficiency as	
currently allowed by the BMP	
Clearinghouse. When the removal	
e	
efficiency exceeds that allowed by	
current guidelines for a specified	
length of time, Innsbrook would get	
credit for the additional nutrient	
removal. The Innsbrook Owners	
Association wants assurances,	
either from Henrico County, DEQ,	
or through clarifications for	
Chapter 880 of the Virginia	
Stormwater Regulations, that the	
re-development of Innsbrook can	
continue based on the technical	
criteria in Part II C. The VSMP,	
which is currently valid, must be	
extended and remain in effect. If	
there are requirements that must be	
met, such as, E&S plans for	
individual sites, we need to discuss	
that immediately so that we have	
sufficient time for the preparation	

of said requirements.	

Bruce Kay	Part II C	Representatives of the Innsbrook	Thank you for comment. Language
(President,	Technical	Owners Association have been	in the proposed permit was not
Innsbrook	Criteria	reviewing the draft changes to	intended to change applicability of
Owners	Cinterna	Chapter 880 of the Virginia	the Part II C criteria as authorized
Association)		Stormwater Regulations. I	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
Association		represent the Innsbrook Owners	Virginia Stormwater Management
		Association which obtained	regulation. The language proposed
		General Permit coverage	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		(VAR10E112) for the entire 630	provide further clarification
		acres of the Innsbrook Office Park.	regarding the applicability of the
		The Innsbrook Owners Association	stormwater technical criteria
		(operator) obtained Coverage under	contained in the Virginia
		the 2009 VPDES on June 6, 2014	Stormwater Management Program
		(VAR10E112). Subsequently, the	
			regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		IOA obtained Coverage under the 2014 VPDES General Construction	receiving numerous comments
			during the comment period, the
		Permit (VAR10E112) on August	department has determined that the
		22, 2014. Henrico County, as the	language has caused more
		VSMP Authority, deemed, via a	confusion than clarification.
		letter from Keith White dated July	Therefore, the language is being
		20, 2011, that the Innsbrook	removed from the proposed permit
		Comprehensive Stormwater	and a discussion of applicable
		Management Plan (ICSMP) was	technical criteria has been included
		consistent with the stormwater	in the fact sheet.
		management plan operated by	As such asised in OVA C25 870 47
		Henrico County. In doing so, the	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		County agreed that the ICSMP was	of the Virginia Stormwater
		a "document equivalent thereto" to	Management regulation, "land-
		a currently valid proffered or	disturbing activities that obtain an
		conditional zoning plan,	initial state permit or commence
		preliminary or final subdivision	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		plat, preliminary or final site plan,	2014, shall be conducted in
		or zoning with a plan of	accordance with the Part II C
		development. This was in	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		accordance with the "Guidance	criteria of this chapter." These
		Document on the implementation	projects remain subject to the Part
		of the Virginia Stormwater	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		Management Regulations	which time those portions of the
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	project not under construction shall
		May 15, 2012, and signed DCR	become subject to any new
		Director, David E. Johnson. The	technical criteria.
		IOA obtained coverage under both	
		the 2009 and 2014 Regulations to	Additionally, as clarified in
		provide a level of certainty to	Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
		developers desiring to have	the department on August 25, 2014,
		operations in Innsbrook as well as	any land-disturbing activities
		current owners who will redevelop	served by an existing on-site or off-
		their sites at some point in the	site stormwater management
		future. By virtue of those permits,	facility, including a regional
		Innsbrook had previously permitted	(watershed-wide) stormwater
		status, with the assurance that	management facility, designed and
		Innsbrook could redevelop under	implemented in accordance with
		those regulations for two permit	the old Part II C technical criteria
		cycles until June 30, 2024. A	remain subject to the old Part II C

substantial amount of planning and capital has been expended with the understanding that Imsbrook could be redeveloped using the Technical Criteria of Part II C of the accepted under the General Permit (VAR10E112). The calculations in the ICSMP were utilized for this development and were in accordance with the technical criteria of Part II C of the Regulations. These calculations of phosphorus reductions by the Imsbrook Lakes have been tuilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially drie consistent with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially drie consequences for the re- development of Imsbrook. Insbrook did not have an overall Errosion & Sediment Control plan for the entire office park. Instead E&S plans were submitted for each prepared. Individual SWPPP's were prepared in the interpertation of the Regulations. Changes to the versill SWPPP was required by the VSMP Authority and none was prepared. Individual SWPPP's were prepared for each site as it interpretation of the Regulations. This has been accepted and approved by the VSMP Authority and none was prepared. Individual SWPPP's were prepared for each site as it interpretation of the Regulations in interpretation of the Regulations will nectore the asset with several projects and has been accepted by the VSMP Authority. It is our hope that this interpretation of the Regulations will content cannot best management program regulation aphiles only to new land disturbing accords with us to create an anagement practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Constinue. Our intentions, at this time, are to re-develop Instored accepted by the VSMP Authority. It is our hope that this interpretation of the Regulations will include mitting at anders in the interpretation of the Regulations will include mitting at anders in the interpretation of the Regulations will include mitting at anders in the interpretation of the Regulations will include mitting at anders i	 		
are on board with us to create an Innovation District that will include		capital has been expended with the understanding that Innsbrook could be redeveloped using the Technical Criteria of Part II C of the stormwater regulations. Redevelopment of individual barcels within Innsbrook have been developed under the General Permit (VAR10E112). The calculations in the ICSMP were utilized for this development and were in accordance with the technical criteria of Part II C of the Regulations. These calculations of phosphorus reductions by the Innsbrook Lakes have been utilized in the preparation of Plans of Development since the time the ICSMP was deemed to be consistent with the Stormwater Regulations. Changes to the method of calculating water quality requirements with the 2019 permit cycle will have potentially dire consequences for the re- development of Innsbrook. Innsbrook did not have an overall Erosion & Sediment Control plan for the entire office park. Instead E&S plans were submitted for each parcel as it was redeveloped. This has been accepted and approved by the VSMP Authority for the last several years. In addition, no overall SWPPP was required by the VSMP Authority and none was prepared for each site as it was developed. This has been the case with several projects and has been accepted by the VSMP Authority. It is our hope that this interpretation of the Regulations will continue.Our intentions, at this time, are to re-develop Innsbrook into a high level mixed use community by virtue of Urban Mixed Use (UMU) zoning	as long as the land-use assumptions upon which the stormwater management facility was designed and implemented have not changed (e.g., an unanticipated increase in impervious cover). Also, the 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control. It should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation applies only to new land disturbing activities. Re-development of parcels ("development on prior developed lands" as defined in 9VAC25-870-10 of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation) require a decrease in phosphorus load from the site as set forth in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2. Lastly, compliance with the stormwater technical criteria of Part II B or Part II C can only be achieved through the implementation of best management practices approved for use on Virginia BMP Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870- 65 or as allowed under the Off-Site Compliance Options listed in
Cilling edge methods of urban	2 1 2 2 1	community by virtue of Urban Mixed Use (UMU) zoning standards. Henrico County officials are on board with us to create an	9 V AC2J-0 / U-U7.

design and will include innovative	
methods of treating stormwater	
runoff and utilizing new advanced	
technologies for reducing nutrient	
loads as they enter our Lakes. Some	
of these methods may not have	
been approved by the BMP	
Clearinghouse. We will work with	
the appropriate agencies in	
developing sampling protocols that	
can be used for assessing the	
efficiency of the Lakes in removing	
phosphorus and ultimately	
obtaining approval of the advanced	
technologies. The IOA proposes to	
continue to treat all of Innsbrook as	
a single complete project with	
numerous phases to be developed	
over the next couple of decades. As	
each of the 110+ parcels within	
Innsbrook is re-developed and	
exceeds the impervious area	
allotment as determined by the	
ICSMP, that parcel must provide	
additional on-site treatment	
(pollutant reduction) or purchase	
nutrient offset credits from an	
authorized Nutrient Trading Bank.	
Innsbrook proposes to monitor each	
of the five lakes to determine	
whether that lake is exceeding the	
nutrient removal efficiency as	
currently allowed by the BMP	
Clearinghouse. When the removal	
efficiency exceeds that allowed by	
current guidelines for a specified	
length of time, Innsbrook would get	
credit for the additional nutrient	
removal. The Innsbrook Owners	
Association wants assurances,	
either from Henrico County, DEQ,	
or through clarifications for	
Chapter 880 of the Virginia	
Stormwater Regulations, that the	
re-development of Innsbrook can	
continue based on the technical	
criteria in Part II C. The VSMP,	
which is currently valid, must be	
extended and remain in effect. If	
there are requirements that must be	
met, such as, E&S plans for	
individual sites, we need to discuss	
that immediately so that we have	
sufficient time for the preparation	

of said requirements.	

Sidney	Part II C	Representatives of the Innsbrook	Thank you for comment. Language
Gunst	Technical	Owners Association have been	in the proposed permit was not
(Innsbrook	Criteria	reviewing the draft changes to	intended to change applicability of
Corporation)		Chapter 880 of the Virginia	the Part II C criteria as authorized
-		Stormwater Regulations. As the	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		owner of the Shoppes at Innsbrook,	Virginia Stormwater Management
		which are covered under the overall	regulation. The language proposed
		permit (VAR10E112). The	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		Shoppes also obtained separate	provide further clarification
		coverage for the 10.5 acres of the	regarding the applicability of the
		Shoppes (VAR10). I am	stormwater technical criteria
		specifically concerned that new	contained in the Virginia
		interpretations to my previously	Stormwater Management Program
		permitted status for the Shoppes	regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		may impede my ability to re-	receiving numerous comments
		develop the Shoppes into a state-of-	during the comment period, the
		the-art UMU development that both	department has determined that the
		the Commonwealth of Virginia and	language has caused more
		Henrico County could use as an	confusion than clarification.
		economic development tool in	Therefore, the language is being
		attracting new businesses to	removed from the proposed permit
		Virginia. The Innsbrook Owners	and a discussion of applicable
		Association (operator) obtained	technical criteria has been included
		Coverage under the 2009 VPDES	in the fact sheet.
		on June 6, 2014 (VAR10E112).	
		Subsequently, the IOA obtained	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		Coverage under the 2014 VPDES	of the Virginia Stormwater
		General Construction Permit	Management regulation, "land-
		(VAR10E112) on August 22, 2014.	disturbing activities that obtain an
		Henrico County, as the VSMP	initial state permit or commence land disturbance prior to July 1,
		Authority, deemed, via a letter from Keith White dated July 20, 2011,	2014, shall be conducted in
		that the Innsbrook Comprehensive	accordance with the Part II C
		Stormwater Management Plan	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		(ICSMP) was consistent with the	criteria of this chapter." These
		stormwater management plan being	projects remain subject to the Part
		administered by Henrico County. In	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		doing so, the County agreed that	which time those portions of the
		the ICSMP was a "document	project not under construction shall
		equivalent thereto" to a currently	become subject to any new
		valid proffered or conditional	technical criteria.
		zoning plan, preliminary or final	
		subdivision plat, preliminary or	Additionally, as clarified in
		final site plan, or zoning with a	Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
		plan of development. This was in	the department on August 25, 2014,
		accordance with the "Guidance	any land-disturbing activities
		Document on the implementation	served by an existing on-site or off-
		of the Virginia Stormwater	site stormwater management
		Management Regulations	facility, including a regional
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	(watershed-wide) stormwater
		May 15, 2012, and signed by DCR	management facility, designed and
		Director, David E. Johnson.By	implemented in accordance with
		virtue of VAR10E112, the entire	the old Part II C technical criteria
		Innsbrook Office Park (including	remain subject to the old Part II C
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1		
	the Shoppes) was previously	technical criteria until July 1, 2024
	permitted for two permit cycles. I	as long as the land-use assumptions
	have relied on this status to move	upon which the stormwater
	forward with plans to re-develop	management facility was designed
	the Shoppes under UMU zoning	and implemented have not changed
	standards. Henrico County is	(e.g., an unanticipated increase in
	excited about the possibility of	impervious cover).
	turning this Urban Development	
	Area (UDA) into a magnet for	Also, the 2014 Construction
	development with UMU zoning.It	General Permit required operators
	is my intention to redevelop the	to update the required Stormwater
	Shoppes into a high level mixed-	Pollution Prevention Plan within 60
	use community by virtue of UMU	days of receiving permit coverage.
	zoning. My development will be	A component of the SWPPP is an
	consistent with the intent of the	approved erosion and sediment
	Owners Association to create an	control plan for the amount of land
	Innovation District that will include	disturbance for which permit
	cutting edge methods of urban	coverage was authorized. The
	design and will include innovative	proposed permit retains the same
	methods of treating stormwater	requirement for the SWPPP to
	runoff and utilizing new	contain an approved erosion and
	technological advances for	sediment control.
	reducing nutrient loads, which have	
	not yet been approved by the	It should be noted that applicability
	Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is	of the Part II C technical criteria in
	critical for the development of the	accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47
	Urban Mixed Use community for	of the Virginia Stormwater
	all parcels to utilize the Lakes of	Management Program regulation
	Innsbrook, which provide a	applies only to new land disturbing
	Regional BMP, as the stormwater	activities. Re-development of
	management system as approved in	parcels ("development on prior
	the Innsbrook Comprehensive	developed lands" as defined in
	Stormwater Management Plan. I	9VAC25-870-10 of the Virginia
	desire assurances, either from	Stormwater Management Program
	Henrico County, DEQ, or through	regulation) require a decrease in
	clarifications for Chapter 880 of the	phosphorus load from the site as set
	Virginia Stormwater Regulations,	forth in 9VAC25-870-63 A.2.
	<b>e</b>	101th III 7 V AC23-0/0-03 A.2.
	that the Shoppes can be re-	Leathy compliance with the
	developed using the technical	Lastly, compliance with the
	criteria in Part II C. The VSMP,	stormwater technical criteria of Part
	which is currently valid, must be	II B or Part II C can only be
	extended and remain in effect. If	achieved through the
	there are requirements that must be	implementation of best
	met, such as, E&S plans for	management practices approved for
	individual sites, we need to discuss	use on Virginia BMP
	that immediately so that we have	Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-
	sufficient time for the preparation	65 or as allowed under the Off-Site
	of said requirements.	Compliance Options listed in
	1	9VAC25-870-69.

Jane	Part II C	Representatives of the Innsbrook	Thank you for comment. Language
DuFrane	Technical	Owners Association have been	in the proposed permit was not
(Highwoods	Criteria	reviewing the draft changes to	intended to change applicability of
Properties)		Chapter 880 of the Virginia	the Part II C criteria as authorized
110000000000000000000000000000000000000		Stormwater Regulations.	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		Highwoods Markel is the developer	Virginia Stormwater Management
		of the Innsbrook Central Business	regulation. The language proposed
		District in Innsbrook. This project	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		was covered under the Innsbrook	provide further clarification
		overall permit (VAR10E112). The	regarding the applicability of the
		ICBD also obtained separate	stormwater technical criteria
		coverage for the 39.5 acre project	contained in the Virginia
		(VAR10). I am specifically	Stormwater Management Program
		concerned that new interpretations	regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		to the previously permitted status	receiving numerous comments
		for the ICBD may impede our	during the comment period, the
		ability to re-develop this land into a	department has determined that the
		state of the art UMU development	language has caused more
		that both the Commonwealth of	confusion than clarification.
		Virginia and Henrico County could	Therefore, the language is being
		use as an economic development	removed from the proposed permit
		tool in attracting new businesses to	and a discussion of applicable
		Virginia. The Innsbrook Owners	technical criteria has been included
		Association (operator) obtained	in the fact sheet.
		Coverage under the 2009 VPDES	
		on June 6, 2014 (VAR10E112).	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		Subsequently, the IOA obtained	of the Virginia Stormwater
		Coverage under the 2014 VPDES	Management regulation, "land-
		General Construction Permit	disturbing activities that obtain an
		(VARIOE112) on August 22, 2014.	initial state permit or commence
		Henrico County, as the VSMP	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		Authority, deemed, via a letter from	2014, shall be conducted in
		Keith White dated July 20, 2011,	accordance with the Part II C
		that the Innsbrook Comprehensive	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		Stormwater Management Plan	criteria of this chapter." These
		(ICSMP) was consistent with the	projects remain subject to the Part
		stormwater management plan being	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		administered by Henrico County. In	which time those portions of the
		doing so, the County agreed that the ICSMP was a "document	project not under construction shall
			become subject to any new technical criteria.
		equivalent thereto" to a currently valid proffered or conditional	technical criteria.
		zoning plan, preliminary or final	Additionally, as clarified in
		subdivision plat, preliminary or	Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
		final site plan, or zoning with a	the department on August 25, 2014,
		plan of development. This was in	any land-disturbing activities
		accordance with the "Guidance	served by an existing on-site or off-
		Document on the implementation	site stormwater management
		of the Virginia Stormwater	facility, including a regional
		Management Regulations	(watershed-wide) stormwater
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	management facility, designed and
		May 15, 2012, and signed by DCR	implemented in accordance with
		Director, David E. Johnson.By	the old Part II C technical criteria
		virtue of VAR 10E112, the entire	remain subject to the old Part II C
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,

the Innsbrook Central Business District) was previously permitted for two permit cycles. We have relied on this status to move forward with plans to re-develop the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theas long as the land-use assumptions upon which the stormwater management facility was designed and implemented have not changed (e.g., an unanticipated increase in impervious cover).Also. the 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater to update the required Stormwater control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.	Innsbrook Office Park (including	technical criteria until July 1, 2024
District) was previously permitted for two permit cycles. We have relied on this status to move forward with plans to re-develop the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		-
for two permit cycles. We have relied on this status to move forward with plans to re-develop the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		e 1
relied on this status to move forward with plans to re-develop the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the	· • • •	-
forward with plans to re-develop the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel.It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		
the ICBD under UMU zoning standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel.It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		-
standards. Henrico County is excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		
excited about the possibilities for this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		impervious cover).
this parcel. It is our intention to redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theGeneral Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management	-	Also the 2014 Construction
redevelop the ICBD into a high level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the	-	
level mixed use community by virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thePollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management	-	
<ul> <li>virtue of UMU zoning. The development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the</li> <li>days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.</li> </ul>	· ·	
development will be consistent with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theA component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management		
with the intent of the Owners Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theapproved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the	-	
Association to create an Innovation District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the	-	-
District that will include cutting edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the		
edge methods of urban design and will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thecoverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management		
will include innovative methods of treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theproposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management	÷	
treating stormwater runoff and utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMPrequirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.Additionally, it should be noted Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as therequirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.		
utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thecontain an approved erosion and sediment control.utilizing new technological advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thecontain an approved erosion and sediment control.		
advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thesediment control.advances for reducing nutrient loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thesediment control.		
loads, which have not yet been approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theAdditionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management		
approved by the Virginia BMP Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as theAdditionally, it should be noted that applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management	÷	seument control.
Clearinghouse.It is critical for the development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thethat applicability of the Part II C technical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management	-	
development of the Urban Mixed Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as thetechnical criteria in accordance with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the Virginia Stormwater Management		
Use community for all parcels to utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the Virginia Stormwater Management	-	
utilize the lakes of Innsbrook as the Virginia Stormwater Management		
stormwater management evetem as Program regulation applies only to		÷ ÷
	stormwater management system as	Program regulation applies only to
approved in the Innsbrook new land disturbing activities. Re-	~ ~	÷
Comprehensive Stormwater development of parcels	-	
Management Plan. We desire ("development on prior developed	-	
assurances, either from Henrico lands" as defined in 9VAC25-870-		
County, DEQ, or through 10 of the Virginia Stormwater	· · ·	6
clarifications for Chapter 880 of the Management Program regulation)	1	8 8 8
Virginia Stormwater Regulations, require a decrease in phosphorus		
that the ICBD can be re-developed load from the site as set forth in	1	
using the technical criteria in Part II 9VAC25-870-63 A.2.		9VAC25-870-63 A.2.
C. The VSMP, which is currently		<b>.</b>
valid, must be extended and remain Lastly, compliance with the		
in effect. If there are requirements stormwater technical criteria of Part	-	
that must be met, such as, E&S II B or Part II C can only be		
plans for individual sites, we need achieved through the	-	
to discuss that immediately so that implementation of best		-
we have sufficient time for the management practices approved for	we have sufficient time for the	management practices approved for
preparation of said requirements. use on Virginia BMP	preparation of said requirements.	
Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-	_	Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-
65 or as allowed under the Off-Site		
Compliance Options listed in		Compliance Options listed in
9VAC25-870-69.		

Jane	Part II C	Representatives of the Innsbrook	Thank you for comment. Language
DuFrane	Technical	Owners Association have been	in the proposed permit was not
(Highwoods	Criteria	reviewing the draft changes to	intended to change applicability of
	Cintenia		the Part II C criteria as authorized
Markel)		Chapter 880 of the Virginia	
		Stormwater Regulations.	under 9VAC25-870-47 or 48 of the
		Highwoods Properties is the	Virginia Stormwater Management
		developer of the Innsbrook North	regulation. The language proposed
		project in the Innsbrook Office	in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to
		Park. This project was covered	provide further clarification
		under the Innsbrook overall permit	regarding the applicability of the
		(VAR10E112). Highwoods	stormwater technical criteria
		obtained separate coverage for the	contained in the Virginia
		project (VAR10). I am specifically	Stormwater Management Program
		concerned that new interpretations	regulation, 9VAC25-870. After
		to the previously permitted status	receiving numerous comments
		for Innsbrook North may impede	during after the comment period,
		our ability to complete the	the department has determined that
		development of this project. The	the language has caused more
		Innsbrook Owners Association	confusion than clarification.
		(operator) obtained Coverage under	Therefore, the language is being
		the 2009 VPDES on June 6, 2014	removed from the proposed permit
		(VARIOE112). Subsequently, the	and a discussion of applicable
		IOA obtained Coverage under the	technical criteria has been included
		2014 VPDES General Construction	in the fact sheet.
		Permit (VARIOE112) on August	
		22, 2014. Henrico County, as the	As authorized in 9VAC25-870-47
		VSMP Authority, deemed, via a	of the Virginia Stormwater
		letter from Keith White dated July	Management regulation, "land-
		20, 2011, that the Innsbrook	disturbing activities that obtain an
		Comprehensive Stormwater	initial state permit or commence
		Management Plan (ICSMP) was	land disturbance prior to July 1,
		consistent with the stormwater	2014, shall be conducted in
		management plan being	accordance with the Part II C
		administered by Henrico County. In	(9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) technical
		doing so, the County agreed that	criteria of this chapter." These
		the ICSMP was a "document	projects remain subject to the Part
		equivalent thereto" to a currently	II C criteria until July 1, 2024, at
		valid proffered or conditional	which time those portions of the
		zoning plan, preliminary or final	project not under construction shall
		subdivision plat, preliminary or	become subject to any new
		final site plan, or zoning with a	technical criteria.
		plan of development. This was in	
		accordance with the "Guidance	Additionally, as clarified in
		Document on the implementation	Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by
		of the Virginia Stormwater	the department on August 25, 2014,
		Management Regulations	any land-disturbing activities
		Grandfathering Provision" dated	served by an existing on-site or off-
		May 15, 2012, and signed by DCR	site stormwater management
		Director, David E. Johnson.By	facility, including a regional
		virtue of VARIOE112, the entire	(watershed-wide) stormwater
		Innsbrook Office Park (including	management facility, designed and
		the Innsbrook Central Business	implemented in accordance with
		District) was previously permitted	the old Part II C technical criteria
		for two permit cycles. We have	remain subject to the old Part II C

<b>1 1 1 1 1</b>	
relied on this status to move	technical criteria until July 1, 2024
forward with plans to re-develop	as long as the land-use assumptions
the ICBD under UMU zoning	upon which the stormwater
standards. Henrico County has	management facility was designed
approved two buildings on this	and implemented have not changed
parcel. It is imperative that the	(e.g., an unanticipated increase in
County, as the VSMP Authority,	impervious cover).
can approve additional buildings on	
this site under the same	Also, the 2014 Construction
interpretations of the Regulations	General Permit required operators
that have been used for the initial	to update the required Stormwater
phases of this development. It is the	Pollution Prevention Plan within 60
intention of Highwoods Properties	days of receiving permit coverage.
to complete the development of	A component of the SWPPP is an
Innsbrook North. The development	approved erosion and sediment
will be consistent with the intent of	control plan for the amount of land
the Owners Association to create an	disturbance for which permit
Innovation District that will include	coverage was authorized. The
cutting edge methods of urban	proposed permit retains the same
design and will include innovative	requirement for the SWPPP to
methods of treating stormwater	contain an approved erosion and
runoff and utilizing new	sediment control.
technological advances for	
reducing nutrient loads, which have	Additionally, it should be noted
not yet been approved by the	that applicability of the Part II C
Virginia BMP Clearinghouse. It is	technical criteria in accordance
critical for the development of the	with 9VAC 25-870-47 of the
Urban Mixed Use community for	Virginia Stormwater Management
all parcels to utilize the lakes of	Program regulation applies only to
Innsbrook as the stormwater	new land disturbing activities. Re-
management system as approved in	development of parcels
the Innsbrook Comprehensive	("development on prior developed
Stormwater Management Plan. We	lands" as defined in 9VAC25-870-
desire assurances, either from	10 of the Virginia Stormwater
Henrico County, DEQ, or through	Management Program regulation)
clarifications for Chapter 880 of the	require a decrease in phosphorus
Virginia Stormwater Regulations,	load from the site as set forth in
that the ICBD can be re-developed	9VAC25-870-63 A.2.
using the technical criteria in Part II	<i>5</i> ,11025 070-05 11.2.
C. The VSMP, which is currently	Lastly, compliance with the
valid, must be extended and remain	stormwater technical criteria of Part
in effect. If there are requirements	II B or Part II C can only be
that must be met, such as, E&S	achieved through the
plans for individual sites, we need	implementation of best
to discuss that immediately so that	management practices approved for
we have sufficient time for the	use on Virginia BMP
preparation of said requirements	Clearinghouse list in 9VAC25-870-
	65 or as allowed under the Off-Site
	Compliance Options listed in
	9VAC25-870-69.

Mark	Part II C	Based on conversations with	As you have stated, both the 2014
Williams	Technical	various VSMP authorities, there is	and proposed 2019 general permits
(Koontz	Criteria	uncertainty whether phased	require an approved erosion and
Bryant	Cinterna	projects, which were covered under	sediment control plans as part of
Johnson		the 2009 general permit and which	Stormwater Pollution Prevention
Williams)		continued permit coverage in 2014,	Plan prior to permit coverage being
vv mams)		will be renewed under the general	issued. Both permits also require
		÷	
		permit effective July 1, 2019 for	as part of the registration
		projects which have approval of	requirements that the operator
		ESC plans on initial phases,	indicate both the estimated area to be disturbed and the total
		however, do not have ESC plan	
		approval on all phases of a project.	development area. These areas
		This uncertainty applies for	may be the same or, in the case of a
		projects that have coverage for a	large planned development, the
		total land area of development	areas may be different. Regardless,
		which encompasses all phases of a	authorization for land disturbance
		project. In reviewing this issue, the	applies to the estimated area of
		following items were noted:a. The	disturbance for which an erosion
		upcoming general permit, effective	and sediment control has been
		July 2019, will be the first permit	approved. It is not the department's
		cycle in which localities (as the	intention to require approved
		authority) are responsible for	erosion and sediment control plans
		reviewing renewal applications and	for the entire development, unless
		determining if all requirements of	the operator is applying for
		the regulations have been met for	coverage to initiate land
		renewing coverage; b. 9VAC25-	disturbance on all phases of the
		880-30, Item A1 (Draft) requires	development. Therefore, an
		that the Operator submits a	erosion and sediment control plan
		complete and accurate registration	must only be developed for the
		statement prior to being given	estimated area of disturbance for
		"Authorization to Discharge"; c.	which the operator is requesting
		9VAC25-880-30, Item A4, sub-	coverage. Prior to land disturbance
		items a and b (Draft) requires that	in each additional phase, an erosion
		the Operator obtain approval of an	and sediment control for that phase
		ESC plan (per Chapter 840) and a	must be approved by the local
		SWM (per Chapter 870) prior to	Virginia Erosion and Sediment
		being given "Authorization to	Control Program authority, and a
		Discharge"; d. 9VAC25-880-45,	request to modify permit coverage
		Item B (Draft) states that operators	through a revised Construction
		having permit coverage under the	General Permit registration
		2009 and 2014 cycles, who obtain	statement must be submitted to the
		renewed coverage under the 2019	appropriate VSMP authority.
		cycle can conduct land disturbance	Alternatively, if the operator
		in accordance with Part IIC of the	indicates on the Construction
		VSMP regulations (Chapter 870);	General Permit registration
		e. 9VAC25-880-50, Item B, sub-	statement that the estimated area to
		items 1-18 (Draft) lists required	be disturbed is equal to the total
		items for a registration statement.	development area, then an
		Sub-item number 7 states "If the	approved erosion and sediment
		construction activity was	control plan for the entire
		÷	
		previously authorized to discharge	development must be obtained
		under the general permit effective	prior to permit coverage being
		July 1, 2014, the dates of ESC plan	issued. Demonstration of
	1	approval". The plural word "dates"	compliance with the Part II C

1	
would imply that multiple plans could be involved (i.e individual phases, with separately approved ESC plans for each section, within a larger common plan of development); f. Guidance Memo No. 14-2002 states: "For reissuance under the 2014 general permit erosion and sediment control plan approval is not required prior to submitting a registration statement for existing construction activities." This guidance document further noted that ESC plan approval was, however, required within 60 days after the date of coverage. It did not specify if the ESC plan had to include the entire larger common plan of development or if only an ESC plan for the first phase to be constructed was required. Further clarification discussing requirements for ongoing projects, in which ESC plans were already prepared for previous phases, was not included within the guidance memo; g. VAR 10, Part II, Item B, sub-item 2 outlines ESC plan requirements and sub-item 3 outlines SWM requirements to be included within the SWPPP. The regulations require that the SWPPP be prepared prior to submitting a registration statement; Therefore, the requirement of an ESC and SWM plan are required for permit coverage. That said, no mention is made regarding sections of a phased project that are part of a larger common area of development and which are not yet designed at the time the registration statement is submitted. As noted within item "a" above, this is the first general permit cycle in which localities are the acting authority responsible for renewing permits (the DEQ approved renewals for the 2014 cycle). As	technical criteria must be documented for the entire project through a stormwater management plan or by way of a description of, and necessary calculations supporting, all post-construction stormwater management measures that will be installed prior to the completion of the construction process. Additionally, as clarified in Guidance Memo 14-2014 issued by the department on August 25, 2014, any land-disturbing activities served by an existing on-site or off- site stormwater management facility, including a regional (watershed-wide) stormwater management facility, designed and implemented in accordance with the old Part II C technical criteria remain subject to the old Part II C technical criteria until July 1, 2024 as long as the land-use assumptions upon which the stormwater management facility was designed and implemented have not changed (e.g., an unanticipated increase in impervious cover). Information regarding applicable post-development stormwater technical criteria has been added to the fact sheet.
this is the first general permit cycle in which localities are the acting authority responsible for renewing	

-		
	have different interpretations on	
	whether a given project meets the	
	requirements for renewal. For that	
	reason, it would seem prudent for	
	the DEQ to issue a Guidance	
	Document to clarify, for phased	
	projects having permit coverage for	
	a larger area of development,	
	whether: i. Approved ESC and	
	SWM plans, addressing all phases	
	of a project, which comprise the	
	total coverage area listed on a 2009	
	permit and which renewed	
	coverage in 2014, is required for	
	renewal of coverage under the	
	general permit effective July 1,	
	2019.; OR ii. An approved ESC	
	plan for at least one phase of a	
	multi-phase project, having	
	coverage for a larger development	
	area under the 2009 permit and	
	which renewed coverage in 2014, is	
	required for renewal of coverage	
	under the general permit effective	
	July 1, 2019. An approved SWM	
	plan, addressing all phases of a	
	project, which comprise the total	
	coverage area listed on a 2009	
	permit and which renewed	
	coverage in 2014, is required for	
	renewal of coverage under the	
	general permit effective July 1, 2010 OB (Braformad) iii Brainsta	
	2019. OR- (Preferred) iii. Projects	
	shall remain subject to Part IIC	
	requirements of chapter 870 so long	
	as the vested conditions outlined in	
	Virginia Code section § 15.2-2307,	
	paragraph A are met for those	
	projects subject to Part IIC	
	requirements of chapter 870 prior	
	to permit renewal for the 2018-	
	2024 CGP cycle.Notes: In option	
	ii, it would seem reasonable that a	
	SWM plan should be in place for	
	the overall project area. However,	
	the same does not seem reasonable	
	for ESC plans. It is our opinion that	
	a requirement to have an ESC	
	covering the entire overall area of	
	development has unintended	
	negative consequences.	
	The attached "Example A" sketch	
	was prepared to better address	

related concerns to question #1	
above. Using this "Example A"	
document, what SWM design	
criteria (i.e Part IIB or IIC) would	
be required if sections 4, 5 and 6	
were not yet designed and if the	
reviewing authority did not renew	
coverage under the 2019-2024	
permit cycle? In this scenario,	
assume the SWM pond as well as	
sections 1, 2, and 3 were designed	
using Part IIC criteria, had been	
approved by the authority, and had	
already been constructed during the	
2014-2019 permit cycle under an	
active general permit. Further	
assume that all storm related	
infrastructure within sections 1,2,	
and 3 as well as the downstream	
pond was designed/ sized, using	
Part IIC criteria, to accommodate	
future sections 4, 5, and 6 (under	
the assumption that the active	
permit would be renewed and	
sections 4, 5, and 6 would be	
completed or under construction	
during the 2019-2024 permit	
cycle). To reiterate, in this scenario,	
the pond shown on "Exhibit A"	
was built to accommodate the	
entire subdivision (i.e all 6	
proposed sections) using Part IIC	
criteria. Also, assume there is only	
an approved ESC plan for sections	
1, 2 and 3 and that all three non-	
approved sections (sections 4, 5	
and 6) were included in the total	
site acreage covered by the general	
permit, however, do not have	
approved ESC plans. Only the	
SWM plan (i.e not an ESC plan)	
exists that addresses the entire site	
area covered by the permit.Note:	
I'm not aware of any	
documentation provided by either	
the DEQ or by a locality (i.e the	
current reviewing authority) which	
indicates that, for phased projects,	
an approved ESC plan is required	
for sections not yet designed. The	
guidance document referenced in	
item "f" of question #1 above states	
that ESC plan approval is required	

(so enforcement of this requirement
would have been AFTER July 1,
2014 and was the responsibility of
those localities that were VSMP
reviewing authorities). I am not
aware of any notices or violations
being issued by a locality for
projects prepared by our office
which did not have ESC plan
approval for
"future" phases of a project within
the required 60 days; Therefore, it
stands
to reason that the "intent" was to
ensure an approved ESC plan was
in place for ONLY the phase of a
project to initially be constructed
and not the entire area covered by
the general permit. As required, and
pursuant to VAR-10, Part II,
Section B, the SWPPP would be
amended/ modified/updated as
future sections were approved (i.e
as approval of a future section
would constitute a "change in the
design, construction, operation, or
maintenance that has a significant
effect on the discharge of pollutants
to surface waters and that has not
been previously addressed in the
SWPPP" as noted in subsection 1)
In the scenario noted within this
question (question 3), future plans
would be extremely difficult for
localities to review. How would
upstream sections be designed to
Part IIB criteria that flow to
sections that were designed under
Part IIC criteria? The only practical
way to do this would be to isolate
the upstream sections, treating them
as a separate project with separate
SWM controls. Doing so would
result in the existing basin
(previously designed under Part
IIC) to be over designed. Further,
independently meeting SWM
requirements for the upstream
sections would have extreme
impacts to those sections. For
residential projects, numerous lots
would be lost in order to
accommodate entirely new SWM

John Woodburn (Goochland County)	Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits Conditions	substantial changes to the layout, which would require amendments to the previously approved tentative which would be required to go back through the governmental approval process. This would seem to conflict with State vesting laws. The number of projects that are currently being designed under Part IIC design criteria is finite and continues to dwindle over time. It is unclear why the regulations need to include excessive amounts information to account for what is a relatively small and finite quantity of projects. The ability for developers to finish multi-phased projects (having investing millions of dollars in some cases) under the same laws they were required to abide by at the time the projects started should be afforded to them (similar to state vesting laws). 9VAC25-880-70 – Part III.L – Duty to comply – Suggest that language should be added indicated the permit compliance requires compliance with Code of Virginia Chapter 3.1 – State Water Control Law and implementing regulations, as well as local ordinances adopted pursuant to the state code. Violations will be subject to enforcement and penalties as stated in these laws, regulations and ordinances.	The department believes the language as included in the proposed general permit provides operators with the appropriate notice regarding compliance with other applicable requirements. Additionally, the permit contains language as suggested. 9VAC 25- 880-30 G states that "approval for coverage under this general permit does not relieve any operator of the responsibility to comply with any other applicable federal, state or local statute, ordinance or regulation." No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment. The conditions in Part III
Woodburn (Goochland County)	Applicable to All VPDES Permits	<ul> <li>This section is written as to be used for discharge from a wastewater plant. Can this be rewritten to be more applicable to construction activity sites?</li> </ul>	Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits reflect the regulatory requirements from 9VAC25-870-430 that apply to all state permits. Typically, an upset is associated with a wastewater treatment plant; however, this language must be retained as contained in the VSMP regulation. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

John	Permit	There is no montion in the name it	The VSMD regulation converses of the
Woodburn		There is no mention in the permit	The VSMP regulation serves as the
	Suspension	or 9VAC25880 about a permit	basis for the Construction General
(Goochland		being suspended for noncompliance	Permit regulation. As you point
County)		(including failure to pay required	out, 9VAC25-870-750 authorizes
		fees). Is it possible to do so and	VSMP authorities to withhold
		would you consider such language	reissuance of permit coverage or
		in the permit.? (Note that there is	automatic permit continuance until
		language in 9VAC25-870-750 –	such time that annual permit
		Due dates for State permits under	maintenance fees are paid.
		B. that states "No state permit will	Automatic continuance of permit
		be reissued or automatically	coverage is authorized in situations
		continued without payment of the	in which the permit expires at no
		required fee." What is the meaning	fault of the permittee such as if the
		of automatically continued – is a	department fails to issue permit
		permit that is not automatically	coverage by the expiration because
		continued suspended?	of the number of coverage requests
		Terminated?)	being processed. Under automatic
			continuance, the permittee is
			authorized to continue operating
			under the expiring permit until the
			new permit coverage is processed.
			In order to qualify for automatic
			continuance a permittee must
			submit the registration statement
			for reissuance by the required due
			date and be current on any annual
			maintenance fees. The VSMP
			regulation does not authorize the
			department or local VSMPs to
			terminate permit coverage if annual
			maintenance fees are not paid. No
			changes to the permit are proposed
			in response to this comment.
John	Revoke	What is the purpose to revoking	Permit coverage under the general
Woodburn	and	and reissuing a permit, and why	permit can be revoked and reissued
(Goochland	Reissuance	would you do this rather than	under an individual permit if the
County)	of Permit	terminate a permit for non-	department determines that general
	Coverage	compliance?	permit coverage is not appropriate.
	_		No changes to the permit are
			proposed in response to this
			comment.
L		1	۱

Charlie	Enforceme	I also think that the enforcement	Thank you for your comment,
White	nt	process as it exists now is	however, it is outside of the scope
() Inte		extremely broken. There is	of this regulatory action. The
		somewhat of a conflict of interest	Virginia Erosion and Sediment
		with the county that is welcoming	Control Law and the Virginia
		development which will be	Stormwater Management Act, and
		providing them with a new tax base	associated regulations, establish the
		and monitoring the developer to	requirements for administration of
		make them comply with the	the programs by local governments
		regulations. You would think that	including enforcement of the
		the county would only want quality	programs. The department
		development in their county that	oversees these local programs and
		would result in long term quality	has the authority to take
		developments for a long term	enforcement actions and exercises
		quality tax base. That is not what	that authority as necessary. No
		has seemed to be the case with	changes to the permit are proposed
		what I have witnessed in the last	in response to this comment.
		year and a half in Franklin County.	
		I have been reporting the obvious	
		violations via pictures to DEQ,	
		Franklin County, and AEP. I have	
		asked in my emails for a response	
		to what was going to be done to	
		correct the violations. I received	
		many responses from the DEQ,	
		only once from Franklin County,	
		and none from AEP. I believe that	
		the DEQ should use their authority to step in and take over situations	
		like I have witnessed where the	
		local authority is either incapable or	
		unwilling to use the authority that	
		they have to force the developer to	
		comply with the environmental	
		regulations and laws.	
Rogard Ross	Miscellane	I wish to commend the agencies for	Thank you for your comment.
_	ous	several positive aspects of the new	
		permit including the continued	
		requirement for the developer to	
		meet all applicable water quality	
		standards, continuing to require the	
		SWPPP to be avaiable for public	
		review, and required the use of	
		pollution credits to be well	
a	A.C. 11	documented.	
Scott	Miscellane	I am writing in support of	Thank you for your comment.
Thomas	ous	reissuance of the proposed	
		regulation for general permit for	
		stormwater associated with	
		construction activities, including requirements for a stormwater	
		pollution prevention plan.	
		ponution prevention pian.	

Jimmy	Miscellane	Does DEQ plan to provide	Thank you for your question. The
Edmonds	ous	guidance regarding the processing	department has been and will
(Loudoun		of renewals in the State CGP	continue to communicate regularly
County)		system? For example, will permit	with VSMP authorities to provide
		numbers remain the same and will	guidance for the permit coverage
		data need to be reentered (based	reissuances through emails,
		upon amended Registration	webinars, and individually. No
		Statement) or will existing data	changes to the permit are proposed
		simply be brought forward.	in response to this comment.
Jimmy	Miscellane	Does DEQ plan to provide	Thank you for your question.
Edmonds	ous	guidance on how payment of the	Please note that as stated in
(Loudoun		annual VSMP maintenance fees	9VAC25-870-50 B, "no state
County)		could affect the July 1, 2019 permit	permit will be reissued or
		reissuance (e.g., should an Operator	automatically continued without
		fail to make the 2018 payment)?	payment of the required
			[maintenance] fee." No changes to
			the permit are proposed as a result
			of this comment.

Dean	Miscellane	I am writing to express my opinion	Discharges from land disturbing
Hawkins	ous	on your department's upcoming	activities that disturb one or more
(Landscape		public hearing on the above	acres, and discharges from smaller
Architects &		referenced matter. Specifically this	sites that are part of a larger
Land		will involve consideration by the	common plan of development or
Developmen		Commonwealth of Virginia	sale require permitting under EPA's
t Planners)		regarding the reissuance and	National Pollutant Discharge
		continuation of the regulation and	Elimination System (NPDES)
		permitting program contained	program. Virginia has been
		therein. The current program is set	delegated the authority from EPA
		to expire on June 30, 2019. If the	to implement the NPDES program
		program is continued it will be, as I	through the Virginia Pollutant
		undersatnd, for another four year	Discharge Elimination System
		permitting cycle until the same date	(VPDES) program. In accordance
		in 2023.	with the Virginia Stormwater
			Management Act and Virginia
		In my almost forty years now as a	Stormwater Management Program
		practicing Landscape Architect, I	regulation, certain local
		do not think that I have ever seen a	governments, such as Chesterfield
		regulation which is more redundant and unneccessary as this particular	County, are required to administer the state's stormwater program.
		one. The plans which I prepare	However, the department oversees
		have increased in complexity over	the local governments'
		the years in many ways. I do think	administration of the program and
		that the environment is better	retains authority to inspect
		served and protected than when I	permitted sites and implement
		started my career, but the VPDES	enforcement actions as necessary.
		permit from my perspective has had	Also for clarification, the term of
		no beneficial effect. I say this	the permit is 5 years and proposed
		because the locality in which I	permit is set to expire on June 30,
		practice to the greatest degree,	2024. No changes to the permit are
		Chesterfield County, is one of the	proposed as a result of this
		most intensely developed in the	comment.
		state and has a very good track	
		record of ensuring protections to	
		the environment. Why then must this additional layer of regulation	
		be imposed in the form of another	
		permit from the Commonwealth?	
		permit from the Commonwealth?	
		From the Public Notice-	
		Environmental Regulation, listed	
		changes include items which could	
		be reviewed and addressed, as they	
		are now, by local reviewers and	
		inspectors. I find that this is the	
		most reasonable and efficient	
		approach. The end result would be	
		the same. All of this regulation is	
		accompanied by a fee for the 4-year	
		permit term. What if the life of the	
		project straddles the permit	
		start/termination dateanother	
		separate permit fee is required. This	

Catherine	Miscellane	is costly and unneccessary. I had a project which was approved and inspected locally by the County of Chesterfield, but was then audited by your department. I was required to submit over 200 pages of plans and reports with no exceptions taken. This occupied almost a day of time with no compensation and to no avail. I say that the current VPDES regulations be reduced, or better yet eliminated, rather than expanded as proposed. I also fully support the new requirements of documentation on	Thank you for your comment.
Z		nutrient credits, list of water quality BMPs & waterways impacted by discharges, & maintenance agreement as well the requirement for professional certifications that stormwater management facilities have been constructed in accordance with approved plan. Documentation and public availability of such documents is vital for public accountability.	
Katlyn Schmitt (Waterkeepe rs Chesapeake) &Phillip Musegaas (Potomac Riverkeeper Network)	Miscellane ous	The permit should also include specific language around avoiding any disturbance to natural channels or vegetation along natural channels.	The proposed permit retains requirements for operators of land- disturbing activities to design and implement erosion and sediment control measures that meet the Minimum Standards of the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Program regulations (9VAC25- 840). Additionally, the permit retains requirements for natural buffers to be maintained around surface waters. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Miscellane ous	I like that the permits will be electronically available on the web.	The general VPDES permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities is a general permit regulation that is available at: <u>https://law.lis.virginia.gov/adminco</u> <u>de/title9/agency25/</u> . A list of construction activities covered under the permit is available on DEQ's Construction Stormwater website at: <u>https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Progr</u> <u>ams/Water/StormwaterManagemen</u> <u>t/VSMPPermits/ConstructionGener</u> <u>alPermit.aspx</u> . Permit coverage letters for each construction activity are not available online. Request for copies may be made to the department in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. No revisions to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Miscellane ous	I hope that the discharged water body is prominently displayed and shown preferably on the display board at the front of job sites.	Information regarding water bodies to which a regulated construction site discharges is available in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Operators are required to make the SWPPP available for review by interested parties in accordance with Part II E of the permit. No revisions to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Miscellane ous	I support the prohibition of discharges that will knowingly violate local water quality standards.	Thank you for your comment.
Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Miscellane ous	I support requirement of list of permanent water quality BMP's AND list of waterways receiving discharges.	Information regarding permanent water quality BMPs and receiving waters are available in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Operators are required to make the SWPPP available for review by interested parties in accordance with Part II E of the permit. No revisions to the permit are proposed as a result of this comment.

Logan Kendle (Superintend ent Commercial Contractor)	Miscellane ous	I support the requirement of professional certification and maintenance plans of permanent stormwater management facilities.	Thank you for your comment.
Randy Abbott	Pipelines	I met you at the Roanoke meeting last month and have decided to submit my main concern about the MVP project. Here in the valley and ridge region there are complicated relationships between the water and the land, like for instance when the pipeline workers dig into the water table, a new spring is created and the springs at a higher level may dry up, along with the branches fed by those springs. Those branches are the home for minnows, salamanders, box turtles, and other delicate creatures. I have many other concerns about the pipelines, but that is my main concern. I think running a pipeline through this region is a very poorly thought out scheme that should be aborted.	In accordance with section 402(1)(2) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) discharges of stormwater runoff from the construction of oil and gas transmission pipelines are exempt from National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting and Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permitting. Therefore, Virginia's Construction General Permit is not applicable to the natural gas transmission pipeline projects. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment. Please note, however, that Virginia regulates pipeline construction activities through the annual standards and specifications program in accordance with the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law and the Virginia Stormwater Management Act.

Katlyn	Pipelines	Pipeline construction covered under	In accordance with section
Schmitt	1 ipennes	the permit should require additional	402(1)(2) of the Clean Water Act
(Waterkeepe		protective measures. Echoing the	(CWA) discharges of stormwater
` 1		recommendations from the Choose	runoff from the construction of oil
rs Classicality)			
Chesapeake)		Clean Water Coalition, we urge	and gas transmission pipelines are
&		DEQ to build in specific	exempt from National Pollutant
Phillip		requirements for the construction of	Discharge Elimination System
Musegaas		pipelines. With inspectors finding	(NPDES) permitting and Virginia
(Potomac		more than 300 erosion and	Pollutant Discharge Elimination
Riverkeeper		stormwater control violations in	System (VPDES) permitting.
Network)		Virginia for the Mountain Valley	Therefore, Virginia's Construction
		Pipeline over a 6-month span	General Permit is not applicable to
		earlier this year, it's even more	the natural gas transmission
		imperative that the state address the	pipeline projects. No changes to
		runoff pollution associated with	the permit are proposed in response
		this type of activity. More	to this comment. Please note,
		specifically, the state should require	however, that Virginia regulates
		the use of filtering or settling of	pipeline construction activities
		sediment laden or turbid flows of	through the annual standards and
		stormwater to remove sediment	specifications program in
		prior to discharge, turbidity	accordance with the Virginia
		monitoring according to clear	Erosion and Sediment Control Law
		protocol (e.g., ambient conditions	and the Virginia Stormwater
		and at the time of discharge	Management Act.
		conditions) for projects discharging	Management Act.
		to waters impaired for sediment,	
		and delete the current provision	
		allowing "representative	
		inspections" for pipeline or other	
		linear activities.	

David and	Pipelines	As the following pictures show, we	In accordance with section
	ripennes	don't believe that our current	
Betty			402(1)(2) of the Clean Water Act
Werner		stormwater protections are	(CWA) discharges of stormwater
		adequate to stop sedimentation	runoff from the construction of oil
		runoff into our streams. Our farm is	and gas transmission pipelines are
		bordered by two protected streams	exempt from National Pollutant
		(Teels Creek and Little Creek) and	Discharge Elimination System
		Mountain Valley Pipeline is	(NPDES) permitting and Virginia
		building their pipeline on our	Pollutant Discharge Elimination
		pasture between these two creeks	System (VPDES) permitting.
		(eventually to cross them if/when	Therefore, Virginia's Construction
		they receive permits to do so).	General Permit is not applicable to
		Either MVP's BMP's are	the natural gas transmission
		insufficient, or they are violating	pipeline projects. No changes to
		the state's statutes, or the state's	the permit are proposed in response
		statute is insufficient to stop this	to this comment. Please note,
		erosion. (Pictures from MVP were	however, that Virginia regulates
		submitted)	pipeline construction activities
			through the annual standards and
			specifications program in
			accordance with the Virginia
			Erosion and Sediment Control Law
			and the Virginia Stormwater
			Management Act. The
			documentation that was provided
			with this comment has been passed
			on to the department's stormwater
			compliance inspection staff. No
			changes to the permit are proposed
L			in response to this comment.

Sandy Collins (Friends of Accotink)	Pipelines	Given the recent demonstrated failure of pipeline construction contractors to meet the requirements of the SWPPPs and other components of the Construction Stormwater General Permit, and the potential for these failures to affect numerous watersheds over their length, we request that pipeline and other linear facility construction activities be required to: implement best management practices to remove suspended sediment from stormwater prior to discharge to the receiving water; be required to monitor for turbidity (ambient conditions in receiving water and in discharge) when discharging to a water impaired for sediment; and be required to conduct regular inspections in accordance with other construction activities covered under the General Permit and not be allowed to conduct "representative inspections.	In accordance with section 402(1)(2) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) discharges of stormwater runoff from the construction of oil and gas transmission pipelines are exempt from National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting and Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permitting. Therefore, Virginia's Construction General Permit is not applicable to the natural gas transmission pipeline projects. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment. Please note, however, that Virginia regulates pipeline construction activities through the annual standards and specifications program in accordance with the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law and the Virginia Stormwater Management Act.
Barbara Brumbaugh (City of Chesapeake)	Typograph ical Error	Section 9VAC25-880-70 Part II.B.3.a appears to reference itself in the first sentence. The suggested revision is to delete "and 3 a" in the first sentence.	Thank you for your comment. The error in numbering has been corrected.
Home Builders Association of Virginia	Typograph ical Error	9VAC25-880-60 Subparts C and D at the end of this Section should be numbered D and E (a new subpart C was added earlier)	Thank you for your comment. The error in numbering has been corrected.
Home Builders Association of Virginia	Typograph ical Error	9VAC25-880-70 Part II, B (SWPPP amendments) should be numbered C (a new subpart B – SWPPP Contents, was added earlier). This will require renumbering all subparts B-G in this Part.	Thank you for your comment. The error in numbering has been corrected.
Home Builders Association of Virginia	Typograph ical Error	Part II.F.2.c – I believe the reference here – "the inspection frequency as described in subdivision b and c" should actually be "subdivision a and b".	Thank you for your comment. The error in numbering has been corrected.
Home Builders Association of Virginia	Typograph ical Error	Part II.F.2.c – the subpart that begins "Except as prohibited in Part II.F.2.a.(2)" should actually be "d" instead of "c"	Thank you for your comment. The error in numbering has been corrected.

Home	Typograph	Several other references will also	Thank you for your comment. The
Builders	ical Error	need to be renumbered. A thorough	error in numbering has been
Association		check is needed.	corrected.
of Virginia			
Home	Typograph	9VAC25-880-50 B.7 There are two	Thank you for your comment. The
Builders	ical Error	item No. 7 in section 9VAC25-880-	error in numbering has been
Association		50 B. of Proposed Chapter 880:	corrected.
of Virginia			
		"7. If stormwater management	
		plans for the construction activity	
		have been approved by an entity	
		with department approved annual	
		standards and specifications, the	
		name of the entity with the	
		department approved annual	
		standards and specifications. A copy of the annual standard and	
		specification entity form shall be	
		submitted with the registration	
		statement." "7. If the construction	
		activity was previously authorized	
		to discharge under the general	
		permit effective July 1, 2014, the	
		dates of erosion and sediment	
		control plan approval;"	
		Comment: It is recommended that	
		DEQ renumber the remaining items	
		in 9VAC25-880-50 B. of Proposed Chapter 880 after the first item No.	
		7.	
Hampton	Typograph	Section 9VAC25-880-70 Part	Thank you for your comment. The
Roads	ical Error	II.B.3.a appears to reference itself	error in numbering has been
Planning		in the first sentence. The suggested	corrected.
District		revision is to delete "and 3 a" in the	
Commission		first sentence.	
Kristin	Typograph	b. Part II, bullet B.3.a – There were	Thank you for your comment. The
Carter	ical Error	extra words in the marked up copy	error in numbering has been
(University		posted in the Virginia Register that	corrected.
of Virginia)		should be deleted: "Except for	
		those projects identified in Part II B	
		3 b and 3, a stormwater management plan"	
Jimmy	Typograph	9VAC25-880-50.B.7 The	Thank you for your comment. The
Edmonds	ical Error	numbering for this section is	error in numbering has been
(Loudoun	Line Line	inadvertently repeated in the	corrected.
County)		subsequent section. Amend the	
		repeated section to read 9VAC-	
		880-50.B.8 and similarly amend the	
		subsequent 11 subsections	
		(resulting in a total of 19	
		subsections under 9VAC-880-50.B	
		vs. 18)	

Mark	Typograph	Section 9VAC25-880-50, Item B	Thank you for your comment. The
Williams	ical Error	(Draft); sub-item 7 there are two	error in numbering has been
(Koontz		#7's listed, which should be	corrected.
Bryant		corrected. Doing so will increase	
Johnson		subsequent numbers by a value of	
Williams)		1. For the purpose of this	
		document, the numbers currently	
		shown within the draft regulations	
		will be referenced.	
Kristin	Typograph	d. Part II, bullet G.2.a – For	Thank you for your comment. The
Carter	ic error	consistency, should this bullet read	error in this reference has been
(University		"For construction activities that	corrected
of Virginia)		discharge to a surface water	
		identified in Part II B 5 and B 6 as	
		impaired or having an approved	
		TMDL or Part <del> I B 5</del> II B 7 as	
		exceptional"?	

Commente	Торіс	Comment	Department Response
r	•		• •
Keith Oster (Sullivan Donahoe, Ingalls)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Expressed concerns regarding inconsistencies with Virginia Code 15.2 that grandfathers certain development plans due to the housing crisis.	The provisions of 9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow certain projects to use the post development stormwater technical criteria in effect prior to July 1, 2014 criteria apply specifically to stormwater management associated with land- disturbing activities. The vesting requirements set out in the Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1 have no relationship to the stormwater provisions and the technical criteria that are applicable to a given project as stated in the VSMP regulatory development documents from 2011. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Keith Oster (Sullivan Donahoe, Ingalls)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Expressed concerns regarding applicable technical criteria and relationship to having an approved erosion and sediment control plan.	The 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Keith Oster (Sullivan Donahoe, Ingalls)	9VAC25- 880-45 "Portions of a project not under constructio n"	Expressed question on what is considered a project and a portion of a project.	Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870- 47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
Keith Oster (Sullivan Donahoe, Ingalls)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Expressed concerns regarding new registration statement requirement to provide date of approved erosion and sediment control plan. Registration statement includes two items: area of development and area of disturbance. Is area of development the project area. If you don't have ESC plans, it does not to qualify under VPDES.	The 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.
Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Express concerns about being able to renew permits for phased projects based on the proposed permit language where there are master stormwater plans, but do not have approved ESC plans.	The 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control.

Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Section 30: Authorizati on to Discharge	Asked what does that it mean for coverages to be automatically continued for operators who submit complete registration statement?	Item H in section 30 of 9VAC25- 880 allows that in the circumstance that the general permit expires and the permittee has submitted a complete registration statement in accordance with the requirements of 9VAC25-880-50, the permittee may continue to operate under the 2014 permit until such time that the department approves coverage under the new general permit. This "administrative continuance" is authorized under the Clean Water Act, federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System regulations, and the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System regulations. This proposed updated language provides consistency with other VPDES
			general permit regulations. No changes to the permit are proposed
			in response to this comment.
Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	"Portions of a project not under constructio n"	Asked what is the definition of a portion of a project not under construction? <i>Note: written comments also submitted.</i>	The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification as it pertains to "portions of a project not under construction" regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.

Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Registratio n Statement	Asked question about new requirement for site map to be submitted with the registration statement and include LOD. Is that the LOD for the entire project or a phase of the project? Expressed concerns with practicality of showing construction entrance on site map	Registration statement requirements for a site map were added at the recommendation of the technical advisory committee. The map is meant to demonstrate the land disturbing activity for the proposed project that includes the estimated area to be disturbed under the permit coverage being sought as well as denote and distinguish future phases of land disturbance. Detailed information for future phases is not necessary until such time that the operator registers for permit coverage for the future phase, but the map should outline the estimated limits of disturbance for future phases. The permit condition has been revised to provide further clarification.
Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Registratio n Statement	Asked when a BMP maintenance agreement would not be required.	A BMP (or stormwater management facility) maintenance agreement is only required if the operator is proposing stormwater management facilities in order to demonstrate compliance with the post-development water quality and/or quantity technical criteria. There are occasions that stormwater management facilities are not required to demonstrate and therefore no maintenance agreement would be required. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Notice of Terminatio n	Requested more clarity to the level of details are necessary on the as- builts (construction record drawings). Specifically asked what are the level of tolerances and stated that the required engineering certification doesn't allow for tolerances.	As specified in 9VAC 25-870-55 D of the VSMP regulation, the construction records drawing must include the as-built plans of the actual permanent stormwater management facilities constructed and the seal and signature of a professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, certifying that the stormwater management facilities have been constructed in accordance with the approved plan. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Mark Williams (Koontz Bryant Johnson Williams)	Registratio n Statement Part II C	Requested clarity on the required information for estimated area of land disturbance and total development. Experienced a situation for small retail development that had associated road improvements. Listed area that for retail development as well as the offsite road improvements in the area of estimated disturbance area, but the registration statement was returned because area of disturbance was greater than total development. Expressed concerns regarding	The estimated area to be disturbed as reported by the operator on the registration statement is the area for which the operator is applying for coverage. It should not include areas of offsite land disturbance if the operator does not have operational control of those activities. No charges to the permit are proposed in response to this comment. Additional information regarding registration statement requirements is available on the registration statement instructions.
Street (Spotsylva nia County)	Technical Criteria	Expressed concerns regarding inconsistencies with Virginia Code 15.2 that grandfathers certain development plans due to the housing crisis.	The provisions of 9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow certain projects to use the post-development stormwater technical criteria in effect prior to July 1, 2014 criteria apply specifically to stormwater management associated with land- disturbing activities. The vesting requirements set out in the Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1 have no relationship to the stormwater provisions and the technical criteria that are applicable to a given project as stated in the VSMP regulatory development documents from 2011. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Richard Street (Spotsylva nia County)	SWPPP Inspections	Requested clarification regarding SWPPP inspection frequency. Is the requirement calendar days or business days?	As stated in the 2014 general permit and retained in the 2019 proposed permit, SWPPP inspection frequencies are based on business days. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.
Richard Street (Spotsylva nia County)	Notice of Terminatio n	Expressed question if as-builts (construction record drawings) are required for all stormwater structures or BMPs.	As specified in 9VAC 25-870-55 D of the VSMP regulation, the construction records drawing are required to be submitted to the VSMP authority for any permanent stormwater management facility. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this comment.

Spud Mistr (representi ng Innsbrook)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Permits under 2009 and 2014 cycle are eligible for Part IIC technical criteria. Locality could determine it was a plan or approved or equal to lieu of a plan. Plan accepted. ESC and 2014 regulations. You have to have approved ESC under 2014 permit or AILP. Doesn't say you have to submit a plan, just accept the requirements of the state.Lakes that are the BMP designed and calculated under Part IIC.Requested clarification on the previously permitted status.	The 2014 Construction General Permit required operators to update the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan within 60 days of receiving permit coverage. A component of the SWPPP is an approved erosion and sediment control plan for the amount of land disturbance for which permit coverage was authorized. The proposed permit retains the same requirement for the SWPPP to contain an approved erosion and sediment control. Information regarding the post-development technical criteria and requirements for an approved erosion and sediment control plan have been included in the fact sheet.
Elizabeth Wright (citizen, City of Alexandria )	Miscellane ous	Expressed concerns efficiency and communication of VSMP authorities regarding citizen complaints. Would like to see online database to document citizen complaints and agency responses.	This comment is outside of the scope of this regulatory action.
Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	Expressed support the requirement of documentation of nutrient credits.	Thank you for your comment.
Logan Kendell	Monitoring	Recommended the addition of required settling or filtering of sediment laden or Turbid stormwater prior to discharge. & Monitoring of said settling or filtering prior to discharge. I recommend the addition of public posting of those results in a log attached to the electronically available SWPPP permit.	The proposed general permit is consistent with the requirements for protection of water quality contained in EPA's 2017 Construction General permit effective February 16, 2017. EPA established effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) and new source performance standards (NSPS) to control the discharge of pollutants from construction activities in 40 CFR Part 450 referred to as the "Construction and Development Rule" or "C&D Rule". These requirements were published in the Federal Register on December 1, 2009 (74 FR 62996) and became effective on February 1, 2010 and contained numeric limitation on the allowable level of turbidity in discharges from certain construction sites. On November 5, 2010, EPA finalized a stay (75 FR 68215), effective January 4, 2011, for 40 CFR Parts 450.22 (a)

and (b) that contained the numeric
turbidity limitations as the result of
a petition. EPA published
amendments to the C&D Rule (79
FR 12661) on March 6, 2014 and
May 4, 2014 (80 FR 25235) with an
effective date of May 5, 2014. The
amendments lifted the indefinite
stay, withdrew the numeric
discharge standards. As a result,
numeric turbidity limitation and
monitoring requirements are not
required to be incorporated in to
NPDES permits.
The general permit requires
construction activity operators to
develop an erosion and sediment
control plan consistent with the
requirements of the Virginia
Erosion and Sediment Control
Program regulations, which require
filtering and infiltration practices.
The permit also incorporates the narrative technology-based effluent
limitations contained in 40 CFR
Part 450. In addition, the general
permit requires operators to select,
install, implement, and maintain
control measures at the construction
site that minimize (i.e., reduce or
eliminate) pollutants in the
discharge as necessary to ensure
that the operator's discharge does
not cause or contribute to an
excursion above any applicable
water quality standard. Also,
9VAC25-870-460.I of the Virginia
Stormwater Management Program
regulation allows for the use of best
management practices to control or
abate the discharge of pollutants from stormwater discharges and
when numeric effluent limitations
are infeasible. The department
believes that the proposed general
permit establishes the requirements
necessary to protect water quality
standards. No changes to the permit
are proposed in response to this
comment.

Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	I like that the permits will be electronically available on the web.	The general VPDES permit for the discharge of stormwater from construction activities is a general permit regulation that is available at:
			https://law.lis.virginia.gov/adminco de/title9/agency25/. A list of construction activities covered under the permit is available on DEQ's Construction Stormwater website at:
			<u>https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/StormwaterManagement/VSMPPermits/ConstructionGeneralPermit.aspx</u> . Permit coverage letters for each construction activity
			are not available online. Request for copies may be made to the department in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. No revision to the permit is proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	I hope that the discharged water body is prominently displayed and shown preferably on the display board at the front of job sites.	Information regarding water bodies to which a regulated construction site discharge is available in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention
			Plan. Operators are required to make the SWPPP available for review by interested parties in accordance with Part II E of the permit. No revision to the permit is proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	I support the prohibition of discharges that will knowingly violate local water quality standards.	No revision to the permit is proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	I support requirement of list of permanent water quality BMP's AND list of waterways receiving discharges.	Information regarding permanent water quality BMPs and receiving waters are available in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Operators are required to make the SWPPP available for review by interested parties in accordance with Part II E of the permit. No revision to the permit is proposed as a result of this comment.
Logan Kendell	Miscellane ous	I support the requirement of professional certification and maintenance plans of permanent stormwater management facilities.	No revision to the permit is proposed as a result of this comment.

Keith Oster (Sullivan, Donahoe, Ingalls)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Requested more clarity for post development stormwater technical criteria to prevent different interpretations by the Department and local VSMPs, specifically as it pertains to project that have commenced land disturbance related to the approved ESC plan requirements.	Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870- 47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
Greg Koontz (Koontz, Bryant, Johnson, Williams)	Part II C Technical Criteria	Reiterated comments from other commenters on post development stormwater technical criteria. Expressed concern with how regulators look at portions of projects differently than engineers. Stakeholders believe grandfathering under 15.2 of the Virginia Code to address the housing crisis need to align with grandfathering under the stormwater requirements. Stated that erosion and sediment plans are not developed for an entire permitted are and further clarity is needed to recognize the construction sequencing of phased projects.	Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870- 47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet. Additionally, the provisions of 9VAC25-870-47 and 48 that allow certain projects to use the post development stormwater technical criteria in effect prior to July 1,

			2014 criteria apply specifically to stormwater management associated with land-disturbing activities. The vesting requirements set out in the Code of Virginia in § 15.2-2209.1 have no relationship to the stormwater provisions and the technical criteria that are applicable to a given project as stated in the VSMP regulatory development documents from 2011.
Kay Cabe (3E Consultant s)	Registratio n Statement	Expressed concerns regarding triggers that could require the redesign of plans. Stated that for erosion and sediment control plans and stormwater management plans, the implications of requiring revisions are more far reaching than just redesigning plans. Could result in changes to conditional use, zoning, and other local approvals because requirements for previous approvals may have changed.	Language in the proposed permit was not intended to change applicability of the Part II C criteria as authorized under 9VAC25-870- 47 or 48 of the Virginia Stormwater Management regulation. The language originally proposed in 9VAC 25-880-45 was added to provide further clarification regarding the applicability of the stormwater technical criteria contained in the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation, 9VAC25-870. After receiving numerous comments during the comment period, it is clear to the department that the language did not provide clarification and introduced confusion. Therefore, the language is being removed from the proposed permit and a discussion of applicable technical criteria has been included in the fact sheet.
Monte Lewis (ED	Miscellane ous	Stated that the proposed permit is not clear enough and requirements need clarification.	Revisions to the proposed permit and fact sheet have been introduced

Lewis and Associates)			to provide clarify regarding permit requirements.
Monte Lewis (ED Lewis and Associates)	Registratio n Statement	Expressed concerns on why registration statement requires reporting of estimated disturbed area and total development in 100th of an acre.	This requirement is retained from the 2014 general permit. This level of specificity for purposes of post- development stormwater calculations.
Chris Workman (Chesterfie ld County)	Registratio n Statement	Expressed concerns on why registration statement requires reporting of estimated disturbed area and total development in 100th of an acre.	This requirement is retained from the 2014 general permit. This level of specificity for purposes of post- development stormwater calculations.
Chris Workman (Chesterfie ld County)	SWPPP Inspections	Stated that SWPPP inspection frequency for impaired waters should be revised to once every 5 days instead of once every 4 days for consistency in inspections from week to week.	During the 2014 general permit development, an analysis was performed regarding frequency of rainfall events. The results indicated that inspections conducted at a frequency of every 4 days results in approximately the same number of inspections as if they were conducted every 5 days and 24 hours after a rainfall event. The option to conduct inspections at a frequency of every 4 days was provided to operators as an alternative to tracking measurable precipitation events. No changes are proposed in response to this comment.
Dave Levy (Citizen, City of Alexandria	Technical Criteria	Expressed that BMPs should be applied based on phased construction planning.	This comment is outside of the scope of this regulatory action.
Ruth Sherman (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	In accordance with section 402(l)(2) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) discharges of stormwater runoff
Betty Werner (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	from the construction of oil and gas transmission pipelines are exempt from National Pollutant Discharge
David Werner (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	Elimination System (NPDES) permitting and Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
Lynda Majors (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	(VPDES) permitting. Therefore, Virginia's Construction General Permit is not applicable to the
Tina Badger (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	natural gas transmission pipeline projects. No changes to the permit are proposed in response to this
Freeda Carhcat (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	comment. Please note, however, that Virginia regulates pipeline construction activities through the

Mara Robbins	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	annual standards and specifications program in accordance with the
(Citizen) Christy Renee	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law and the Virginia Stormwater Management Act.
(Citizen) Elizabeth Conners	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
(Citizen) Anne Lusby Denham (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
David Denham (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
Crystal Mello (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
Fred Donaher (Citizen)	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
Joshua ? (Citizen) Dennis	MVP Pipeline MVP	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	-
Royer (Citizen)	Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
Tammy Belinsky	MVP Pipeline	Expressed opposition to MVP Pipeline	
Nadean Carson (Parker Design Group)	Registratio n Statement	Site Map: What is the format? Will there be more definitions of what is to be provided?	A street map, topographic map, or aerial map provided in an 8.5 x 11 inch format as part of the registration statement will satisfy the requirement. Please note that the site map should not be submitted as a plan-sized sheet. Additionally, a VSMP authority may allow a vicinity map included with the stormwater management plan to satisfy this requirement. The registration statement requirements will behave been updated for clarity.
Nadean Carson (Parker Design Group)	SWPPP	<ul> <li>Pollution Prevention Plan – prevention of "excess concrete" is that concrete or concrete washout</li> </ul>	This requirement applies to the discharge of waste concrete that is excess to the needs of the project. Please note that the permit language has been revised from "excess concrete" to "waste concrete" for clarity.

Nadean	SWPPP	SWPPP needs to identify if	The department will be identifying
Carson		discharge is to PCB impaired	discharges to waters impaired for
(Parker		waters. Is there a way for SWPPP	PCB or for which a TMDL has
Design		preparers to identify that	been approved. Operators will be
Group)		information ahead of RS submittal?	notified of additional requirements
			through permit coverage letters like
			was done for nutrient and sediment
			impairments and TMDLs.
			Additionally, prior to receiving the
			permit coverage letter, interested
			parties can use the Virginia
			Environmental GIS on DEQ's
			website
			(https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Conn
			ectWithDEQ/VEGIS.aspx) to
			identify surface water impairments
			and other information.

Substantive changes to the existing regulation are:

- Updating permit effective and expiration dates and Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report date;
- Revising the authorization for the discharge of potable water as a nonstormwater discharge only when managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;
- Requiring the submittal of site map with the registration to identify the area where land disturbance will occur;
- Requiring information with the registration regarding an entity with department-approved annual standards and specifications if a project is being conducted under the annual standards and specifications program;
- Requiring in the registration the erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan approval date to ensure requirements to obtain ESC plan approval prior to general permit coverage have been met;
- Requiring with the registration the date land-disturbing activities commenced, if applicable;
- Requiring with the registration a letter of availability of nutrient credits if the project will meet post development stormwater requirements through the use of the nonpoint source nutrient trading program;
- Clarifying that stormwater management maintenance agreements are required prior to termination for best management practices used to meet post-development water quality and/or water quantity technical criteria;
- Clarifying that a notice of termination is not required for single-family residential structures that are not required to submit a registration statement;
- Requiring construction record drawings be submitted with the notice of termination in accordance with requirements of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulation (9VAC25-870-55);
- Adding a requirement that for individual lots in residential construction only, operators are to provide homeowners with written information about the importance of final stabilization and requiring signed documentation that the homeowner has been notified as part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) documents that are to be maintained for 3 years after the completion of the project;
- Including SWPPP requirements for discharges to waters impaired for Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) where the construction activity includes the demolition of a building with an area of 10,000 square feet or greater and that was originally constructed or renovated prior to January 1, 1980;
- Including requirements that waste containers be covered or similar actions taken to minimize the exposure of waste materials to precipitation;
- Revising frequency in which an operator must conduct a SWPPP inspection from 48 hours after a measurable storm event to 24 hours after a measurable storm event in addition to once every 10 days, or once every 5 days if the site discharges to an impaired surface water;
- Including a provision that allows an operator to delay a SWPPP inspection during adverse weather conditions if it is unsafe to conduct the inspection;

- Including a requirement that SWPPP inspection reports be included with the SWPPP no later than 4 days following the inspection; and
- Where appropriate, changing language to match other VPDES general permits for consistency.

Regulatory text:

Items highlighted in green indicate changes to the proposed permit since the September 20, 2019 State Water Control Board meeting when the Board authorized staff to proceed with the public participation portion of the regulatory process.

## STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD

## Amend and Reissue the Construction Stormwater General Permit

#### 9VAC25-880-1. Definitions.

The words and terms used in this chapter shall have the meanings defined in the Virginia Stormwater Management Act (Article 2.3 (§ 62.1-44.15:24 et seq.) of Chapter 3.1 of Title 62.1 of the Code of Virginia), this chapter, and 9VAC25-870 unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, except as otherwise specified in this section. Terms not defined in the Act, this chapter, or 9VAC25-870 shall have the meaning attributed to them in the federal Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 et seq.) (CWA). For the purposes of this chapter:

"Business day" means Monday through Friday excluding state holidays.

"Commencement of land disturbance" means the initial disturbance of soils associated with clearing, grading, or excavating activities or other construction activities (e.g., stockpiling of fill material).

"Construction site" means the land where any land-disturbing activity is physically located or conducted, including any adjacent land used or preserved in connection with the land-disturbing activity.

"Final stabilization" means that one of the following situations has occurred:

1. All soil disturbing activities at the site have been completed and a permanent vegetative cover has been established on denuded areas not otherwise permanently stabilized. Permanent vegetation shall not be considered established until a ground cover is achieved that is uniform (e.g., evenly distributed), mature enough to survive, and will inhibit erosion.

2. For individual lots in residential construction, final stabilization can occur by either:

a. The homebuilder completing final stabilization as specified in subdivision 1 of this definition; or

b. The homebuilder establishing temporary soil stabilization, including perimeter controls for an individual lot prior to occupation of the home by the homeowner, and <u>[informing providing written notification to]</u> the homeowner of the need for, and benefits of, final stabilization. <u>[The homebuilder shall maintain a copy of the written notification and a signed statement certifying that the information was provided to the homeowner in accordance with the stormwater pollution prevention plan recordkeeping requirements as specified in Part II G 6 ]</u>

3. For construction projects on land used for agricultural purposes, final stabilization may be accomplished by returning the disturbed land to its preconstruction agricultural use. Areas disturbed that were not previously used for agricultural activities, such as buffer strips immediately adjacent to surface waters, and areas that are not being returned to their preconstruction agricultural use <u>must shall</u> meet the final stabilization criteria specified in subdivision 1 or 2 of this definition.

"Immediately" means as soon as practicable, but no later than the end of the next business day, following the day when the land-disturbing activities have temporarily or permanently ceased. In the context of this general permit, "immediately" is used to define the deadline for initiating stabilization measures.

"Impaired waters" means surface waters identified as impaired on the  $\frac{2012}{2016}$  § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report.

"Infeasible" means not technologically possible or not economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practices.

"Initiation of stabilization activities" means:

1. Prepping the soil for vegetative or nonvegetative stabilization;

2. Applying mulch or other nonvegetative product to the exposed area;

3. Seeding or planting the exposed area;

4. Starting any of the above activities on a portion of the area to be stabilized, but not on the entire area; or

5. Finalizing arrangements to have the stabilization product fully installed in compliance with the applicable deadline for completing stabilization.

This list is not exhaustive.

"Measurable storm event" means a rainfall event producing 0.25 inches of rain or greater over 24 hours.

"Stabilized" means land that has been treated to withstand normal exposure to natural forces without incurring erosion damage.

## 9VAC25-880-10. Purpose.

This general permit regulation governs stormwater discharges from regulated construction activities. For the purposes of this chapter, these discharges are defined as stormwater discharges associated with large construction activity, and stormwater discharges associated with small construction activity. Stormwater discharges associated with other types of industrial activity shall not have coverage under this general permit. This general permit covers only discharges through a point source to surface waters or through a municipal or nonmunicipal separate storm sewer system to surface waters. Stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity that originate from construction activities that have been completed and the site has undergone final stabilization are not authorized by this general permit.

# 9VAC25-880-15. Applicability of incorporated references based on the dates that they became effective.

Except as noted, when a regulation of the United States set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations is referenced and incorporated herein, that regulation shall be as it exists and has been published in the July 1, 2013 2018, update.

#### 9VAC25-880-20. Effective date of general permit.

This general permit is effective on July 1, 2014 2019. The general permit will expire on June 30, 2019 2024. This general permit is effective for any covered operator upon compliance with all provisions of 9VAC25-880-30.

#### 9VAC25-880-30. Authorization to discharge.

A. Any operator governed by this general permit is authorized to discharge to surface waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia provided that:

1. The operator submits a complete and accurate registration statement<del>, if required to do so,</del> in accordance with 9VAC25-880-50<u>, unless not required</u>, and receives acceptance of the registration by the board;

2. The operator submits any permit fees, if required to do so <u>unless not required</u>, in accordance with 9VAC25-870-700 et seq.;

3. The operator complies with the applicable requirements of 9VAC25-880-70;

4. The operator obtains approval of:

a. An erosion and sediment control plan from the appropriate <u>Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control</u> <u>Program (VESCP)</u> authority as authorized under the Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations (9VAC25-840), unless the operator receives from the VESCP authority an "agreement in lieu of a plan" as defined in 9VAC25-840-10 or prepares the erosion and sediment control plan in accordance with annual standards and specifications approved by the department. The operator of any land disturbing activity that is not required to obtain erosion and sediment control plan approval from a VESCP authority or is not required to adopt department approved annual standards and specifications shall submit the erosion and sediment control plan to the department for review and approval; and

b. [Except as specified in 9VAC25-880-70 Part II B 3 b, A a] stormwater management plan from the appropriate VSMP authority as authorized under the Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) authority as authorized under the VSMP Regulation (9VAC25-870), unless the operator receives from the VSMP authority an "agreement in lieu of a stormwater management plan" as defined in 9VAC25-870-10 or prepares the stormwater management plan in accordance with annual standards and specifications approved by the department. The operator of any land disturbing activity that is not required to obtain stormwater management plan approved from a VSMP authority or is not required to adopt department approved annual

standards and specifications shall submit the stormwater management plan to the department for review and approval; and

5. The board has not notified the operator that the discharge is not eligible for coverage in accordance with subsection B of this section.

B. The board will notify an operator that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit in the event of any of the following:

1. The operator is required to obtain an individual permit in accordance with 9VAC25-870-410 B;

2. The operator is proposing discharges to surface waters specifically named in other board regulations that prohibit such discharges;

3. The discharge causes, may reasonably be expected to cause, or contributes to a violation of water quality standards (9VAC25-260);

4. The discharge violates or would violate the antidegradation policy in the Water Quality Standards (9VAC25-260-30); or

5. The discharge is not consistent with the assumptions and requirements of an applicable TMDL approved prior to the term of this general permit.

C. This general permit also authorizes stormwater discharges from support activities (e.g., concrete or asphalt batch plants, equipment staging yards, material storage areas, excavated material disposal areas, borrow areas) located on-site or off-site provided that:

1. The support activity is directly related to a construction activity that is required to have general permit coverage for discharges of stormwater from construction activities;

2. The support activity is not a commercial operation, nor does it serve multiple unrelated construction activities by different operators;

3. The support activity does not operate beyond the completion of the last construction activity it supports;

4. The support activity is identified in the registration statement at the time of general permit coverage;

5. Appropriate control measures are identified in a stormwater pollution prevention plan and implemented to address the discharges from the support activity areas; and

6. All applicable, state, federal, and local approvals are obtained for the support activity.

D. Support activities located off-site are not required to be covered under this general permit. Discharges of stormwater from off-site support activities may be authorized under another state or VPDES permit. Where stormwater discharges from off-site support activities are not authorized under this general permit, the land area of the off-site support activity need not be included in determining the total land disturbance acreage of the construction activity seeking general permit coverage.

E. Discharges authorized by this general permit may be commingled with other sources of stormwater that are not required to be covered under a state permit, so long as the commingled discharge is in compliance with this general permit. Discharges authorized by a separate state or VPDES permit may be commingled with discharges authorized by this general permit so long as all such discharges comply with all applicable state and VPDES permit requirements.

F. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. The following nonstormwater discharges from construction activities are authorized by this general permit:

1. Discharges from firefighting activities;

2. Fire hydrant flushings;

3. Water used to wash vehicles or equipment where soaps, solvents, or detergents have not been used and the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

4. Water used to control dust that has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

5. Potable water source, including uncontaminated waterline [flushings flushings, ] managed in a manner to avoid an instream impact;

6. Routine external building wash down where soaps, solvents, or detergents have not been used and the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

7. Pavement wash water where spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have not occurred (or where all spilled or leaked material has been removed prior to washing); where soaps, solvents, or detergents have not been used; and where the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

8. Uncontaminated air conditioning or compressor condensate;

9. Uncontaminated groundwater or spring water;

10. Foundation or footing drains where flows are not contaminated with process materials such as solvents;

11. Uncontaminated, excavation dewatering, including dewatering of trenches and excavations that have been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge; and

12. Landscape irrigations.

G. Approval for coverage under this general permit does not relieve any operator of the responsibility to comply with any other applicable federal, state or local statute, ordinance or regulation.

H. Continuation of general permit coverage.

1. Any operator that was authorized to discharge under the general permit issued in 2009 and that submits <u>Permit</u> coverage shall expire at the end of its term. However, expiring permit coverages are automatically continued if the owner has submitted a complete and accurate registration statement on or before June 30, 2014 at least 60 days prior to the expiration date of the permit, or a later submittal date established by the board, which cannot extend beyond the expiration date of the permit. The permittee is authorized to continue to discharge under the terms of the 2009 general permit until such time as the board either:

a. Issues coverage to the operator under this general permit; or

b. Notifies the operator that the discharge is not eligible for coverage under this general permit.

2. When the operator is not in compliance with the conditions of that was covered under the expiring or expired general permit has violated the conditions of that permit, the board may choose to do any or all of the following:

a. Initiate enforcement action based upon the 2009 general permit coverage that has been continued;

b. Issue a notice of intent to deny <u>coverage under</u> the <u>new reissued</u> general permit. If the general permit <u>coverage</u> is denied, the <del>owner or</del> operator would then be required to cease <del>the activities</del> <u>discharges</u> authorized by the continued general permit <u>coverage</u> or be subject to enforcement action for operating without a state permit;

c. Issue a new state an individual permit with appropriate conditions; or

d. Take other actions authorized by the VSMP Regulation (9VAC25-870).

## 9VAC25-880-40. Delegation of authorities to state and local programs.

A board-approved VSMP authority is authorized to administer requirements of this general permit, including but not limited to: (i) registration statement acceptance, (ii) fee collection, and (iii) stormwater management plan review and approval dependent upon conditions established as part of the board approval.

# [ 9VAC25-880-45. Applicability of technical design criteria for land-disturbing activities.

Any operator seeking coverage under this general permit shall comply with the technical design criteria of the VSMP Regulation (9VAC25-870) as described in this section:

1. New construction activities. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge from construction activities and obtaining initial permit coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2019, shall be subject to the technical design criteria requirements of Part II B (9VAC25-870-62 et seq.) of the VSMP regulations. The operator shall continue to be subject to the requirements of Part II B of the VSMP Regulation for two additional permit cycles. After such time, portions of the project not under construction shall become subject to any new technical criteria adopted by the board.

2. Existing construction activities.

a. Time limits on applicability of approved technical design criteria. Any operator that obtained authorization to discharge under the general permits effective July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2014, for projects meeting the requirements of 9VAC25-870-47 B, has maintained continuous permit coverage since initial permit coverage was approved, and obtains coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2019, shall conduct land disturbance in accordance with the requirements of Part II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the VSMP Regulation or to more stringent standards at the operator's discretion. Portions of the project not under <del>construction as of June 30, 2024, shall no longer be eligible to use the technical design criteria in Part II C of the VSMP Regulation.</del>

#### b. Grandfathering.

(1) Any operator that obtained initial permit authorization to discharge under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, for projects meeting the requirements of 9VAC25-870-48 A, has maintained continuous permit coverage since initial permit coverage was approved, and obtains coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2019, shall conduct land disturbance in accordance with Part II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the VSMP Regulation or more stringent standards at the operator's discretion. Portions of the project not under construction as of June 30, 2019, shall no longer be eligible to use the technical design criteria in Part II C of the VSMP Regulation.

(2) For locality, state, and federal projects, any operator that obtained initial permit authorization to discharge under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, for projects meeting the requirements of 9VAC25-870-48 B, has maintained continuous permit coverage since initial permit coverage was approved, and obtains coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, for projects meeting the requirements of 9VAC25-870-48 B, has maintained continuous permit coverage since initial permit coverage was approved, and obtains coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2019, shall conduct land disturbance in accordance with Part II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the VSMP Regulation or more stringent standards at the operator's discretion. Portions of the project not under construction as of June 30, 2019, shall no longer be eligible to use the technical design criteria in Part II C of the VSMP Regulation.

(3) Projects in which government bonding or public debt financing has been issued prior to July 1, 2012, shall be subject to the technical design criteria of Part II C (9VAC25-870-93 et seq.) of the VSMP Regulation or a more stringent standards at its discretion.

c. Any operator that obtained authorization to discharge under the general permit effective on July 1, 2014, and obtained stormwater management plan approval consistent with Part II B (9VAC25-870-62 et seq.) of the VSMP Regulation shall continue to be subject to the requirements of Part II B of the VSMP Regulation for two additional permit cycles. After such time, portions of the project not under construction shall become subject to any new technical criteria adopted by the board.

d. For purposes of subdivision 2 of this section, "portions of a project not under construction" means:

(1) Any construction activity permitted as described in subdivisions 2 a and 2 b of this section and included on an approved stormwater management plan for which land disturbance has not commenced for any activities on the approved stormwater management plan; or

(2) For locality, state, and federal projects permitted as described in subdivision 2 b (2) of this section, those projects that obtained initial state permit coverage under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, and for which a contract award for construction is not issued by December 31, 2020.

#### 9VAC25-880-50. General permit application (registration statement) Registration statement.

A. Deadlines for submitting registration statement. Any operator seeking coverage under this general permit, and that is required to submit a registration statement, shall submit a complete and accurate general VPDES permit registration statement in accordance with this section, which shall serve as a notice of intent for coverage under the general VPDES permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities.

1. New construction activities.

a. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge from construction activities shall submit a complete and accurate registration statement to the VSMP authority prior to the commencement of land disturbance.

b. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge from construction activities in response to a public emergency where the related work requires immediate authorization to avoid imminent endangerment to human health or the environment is authorized to discharge under this general permit, provided that:

(1) The operator submits a complete and accurate registration statement to the VSMP authority no later than 30 days after commencing land disturbance; and

(2) Documentation to substantiate the occurrence of the public emergency is provided with the registration statement.

c. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge associated with the construction of a single-family detached residential structure, within or outside a common plan of development or sale, is authorized to

discharge under this general permit and is not required to submit a registration statement or the department portion of the permit fee.

2. Existing construction activities.

a. Any operator that who was authorized to discharge under the expiring or expired general permit issued in 2009 and that who intends to continue coverage under this general permit shall:

(1) Submit a complete and accurate registration statement to the VSMP authority on or before June 1, 2014 at least 60 days prior to the expiration date of the existing permit or a later submittal date established by the board; and

(2) Update its stormwater pollution prevention plan to comply with the requirements of this general permit no later than 60 days after the date of coverage under this general permit.

b. Any operator with an existing stormwater discharge associated with the construction of a single-family detached residential structure, within or outside a common plan of development or sale that intends to continue coverage under this general permit, is authorized to discharge under this general permit and is not required to submit a registration statement or the department portion of the permit fee, provided that the operator updates its stormwater pollution prevention plan to comply with the requirements of this general permit no later than 60 days after the date of coverage under this general permit.

3. For stormwater discharges from construction activities where the operator changes, the new operator must shall submit a complete and accurate registration statement or transfer agreement form and any other documents deemed necessary by the VSMP authority to the VSMP authority to demonstrate transfer of ownership and long-term maintenance responsibilities for stormwater management facilities, as required, has occurred prior to assuming operational control over site specifications or commencing work on-site.

4. Late notifications. Operators are not prohibited from submitting registration statements after commencing land disturbance. When a late registration statement is submitted, authorization for discharges shall not occur until coverage under the general permit is issued. The VSMP authority, department, board, and the EPA reserve the right to take enforcement action for any unpermitted discharges that occur between the commencement of land disturbance and discharge authorization.

5. Late registration statements. Registration statements for existing facilities covered under subdivision A 2 a of this section will be accepted after the expiration date of this permit, but authorization to discharge will not be retroactive. The VSMP authority, department, board, and the EPA reserve the right to take enforcement action for any unpermitted discharges that occur after existing permit coverage expires and prior to coverage under this permit is approved.]

B. Registration statement. The operator shall submit a registration statement to the VSMP authority that shall contain <u>contains</u> the following information:

1. Name, contact, mailing address, telephone number, and email address if available of the construction activity operator. No more than one operator may receive coverage under each registration statement;

NOTE: General permit coverage will be issued to this operator, and the certification in subdivision  $\frac{11}{1917}$  of this subsection must shall be signed by the appropriate person associated with this operator as described in Part III K of 9VAC25-880-70.

2. Name and <u>physical</u> location if available <u>address</u> of the construction <del>activity and all off site support activities</del> <u>activity, when available</u>, to be covered under this general permit, including city or county, and latitude and longitude in decimal degrees (six digits - ten-thousandths place);

3. <u>A site map [in a format specified by the VSMP authority (in a 8.5 inch by 11 inch format)]</u> showing the location of the existing or proposed land-disturbing [activities, activities for which the operator is seeking permit coverage,] the limits of land disturbance, construction entrances, [on-site support activities] and all water bodies receiving stormwater discharges from the site;

4. If offsite support activities will be used, the name and physical location address, when available, of those offsite support activities, including city or county; latitude and longitude in decimal degrees (six digits - ten-thousandths place); and whether or not the offsite support activity will be covered under this general permit or a separate VPDES permit;

5. Status of the construction activity: federal, state, public, or private;

4. 6. Nature of the construction activity (e.g., commercial, industrial, residential, agricultural, oil and gas, etc.);

7. If stormwater management plans for the construction activity have been approved by an entity with department approved annual standards and specifications, the name of the entity with the department approved annual standards and specifications. A copy of the annual standard and specification entity form shall be submitted with the registration statement;

8. If the construction activity was previously authorized to discharge under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, the [ dates date ] of erosion and sediment control plan [ approval; approval for the estimated area to be disturbed by the construction activity during this permit term; ]

9. If the construction activity was previously authorized to discharge under the general permit effective July 1, 2014, whether land disturbance has commenced;

5. <u>10.</u> Name of the receiving water(s) waters and sixth order Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC);

6. <u>11.</u> If the discharge is through a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4), the name of the municipal separate storm sewer system MS4 operator;

7. <u>12.</u> Estimated project start date and completion date;

8. <u>13.</u> Total land area of development and estimated area to be disturbed by the construction activity [<u>during</u> this permit term] (to the nearest one-hundredth of an acre);

9. <u>14.</u> Whether the area to be disturbed by the construction activity is part of a larger common plan of development or sale;

[ <u>15. For cases of development on prior developed lands, whether the area disturbed by the construction activity</u> results in the demolition of structures equal to or greater than 10,000 square feet of floor space built or renovated prior to January 1, 1980; ]

[ <del>16. Where applicable, a stormwater management maintenance agreement in accordance with 9VAC25-870-112 A;</del> ]

**17.15.** If nutrient credits are to be used to demonstrate compliance with the water quality technical criteria as allowed in 9VAC25-870-65 F, a letter of availability from an appropriate nutrient bank that nonpoint source nutrient credits are **available**. Prior to issuance of state permit coverage, an affidavit of sale documenting that nonpoint source nutrient credits have been obtained shall be submitted; available;

10. 18. 16. A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) must shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the General VPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities prior to submitting the registration statement. By signing the registration statement the operator certifies that the SWPPP has been prepared; and

11. 19. 17. The following certification: "I certify under penalty of law that I have read and understand this registration statement and that this document and all attachments were prepared in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is to the best of my knowledge and belief true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

C. The registration statement shall be signed in accordance with 9VAC25-880-70, Part III K.

# 9VAC25-880-60. Termination of general permit coverage.

A. Requirements. The operator of the construction activity shall submit a <u>complete and accurate</u> notice of [ <u>termination</u> termination, unless a registration statement was not required to be submitted in accordance with 9VAC25-880-50 A 1.c or A 2 b for single-family detached residential structures,] to the VSMP authority after one or more of the following conditions have been met:

1. Necessary permanent control measures included in the SWPPP for the site are in place and functioning effectively and final stabilization has been achieved on all portions of the site for which the operator is responsible has operational control. When applicable, long-term responsibility and maintenance requirements for permanent control measures shall be recorded in the local land records prior to the submission of a <u>complete</u> and accurate notice of [termination; termination and the construction record drawing prepared; ]

2. Another operator has assumed control over all areas of the site that have not been finally stabilized and obtained coverage for the ongoing discharge;

3. Coverage under an alternative VPDES or state permit has been obtained; or

4. For <u>individual lots in</u> residential construction only, temporary soil <u>final</u> stabilization <u>as defined in 9VAC25-880-1</u> has been completed <u>including providing written notification to the homeowner and incorporating a copy</u> of the notification and signed certification statement into the <u>SWPPP</u>, ] and the residence has been transferred to the homeowner.

B. Notice of termination due date and effective date.

<u>1.</u> The notice of termination should shall be submitted no later than 30 days after one of the above conditions in subsection A of this section is met.

2. Termination of [authorizations authorization] to discharge for the conditions set forth in subdivision A 1 of this section shall become effective upon notification from the department that the provisions of subdivision A 1 of this section have been met or 60 days after submittal of a complete and accurate notice of termination, whichever occurs first.

<u>3.</u> Authorization to discharge terminates at midnight on the date that the notice of termination is submitted for the conditions set forth in subdivisions <u>A</u> 2 through <u>A</u> 4 of this subsection section unless otherwise notified by the VSMP authority or the department. Termination of authorizations to discharge for the conditions set forth in subdivision 1 of this subsection shall be effective upon notification from the department that the provisions of subdivision 1 of this subsection have been met or 60 days after submittal of the notice of terminations, whichever occurs first.

B. C. Notice of termination. The <u>complete</u> notice of termination shall contain the following information:

1. Name, contact, mailing address, telephone number, and email address, if available, of the construction activity operator-:

2. Name and <u>physical</u> location <u>if available</u> <u>address</u> of the construction activity, <u>when available</u>, covered under this general permit, including city or county, and latitude and longitude in decimal degrees- <u>(six digits - ten-thousandths place)</u>;

3. The general permit registration number-;

4. The basis for submission of the notice of termination, pursuant to subsection A of this section-;

5. Where applicable, a list of the on-site and off-site permanent control measures (both structural and nonstructural) that were installed to comply with the stormwater management <u>water quality and water quantity</u> technical criteria. For each permanent control measure that was installed, the following information shall be included:

a. The type of permanent control measure installed and the date that it became functional as a permanent control measure;

b. The location if available of the permanent control measure, including city or county, and latitude and longitude in decimal degrees;

c. The receiving water of to which the permanent control measures discharge; and

d. The number of total and impervious acres treated by the permanent control  $\frac{\text{measure }}{\text{measures}}$  to the nearest  $\frac{\text{one-hundredth}}{\text{of an acre}}$ .

6. Where applicable, the following information related to participation in a regional stormwater management plan. For each regional stormwater management facility, the following information shall be included:

a. The type of regional facility to which the site contributes;

b. The location if available of the regional facility, including city or county, and latitude and longitude in decimal degrees; and

c. The number of total and impervious site acres treated by the regional facility (to the nearest one-tenth <u>one-hundredth</u> of an acre).

[7. Where applicable, the following information related to perpetual nutrient credits that were acquired in accordance with § 62.1-44.15:35 of the Code of Virginia:

a. The name of the nonpoint nutrient credit generating entity from which perpetual nutrient credits were acquired; and

## b. The number of perpetual nutrient credits acquired (lbs. per acre per year). ]

**7.8.** A construction record drawing in a format as specified by the VSMP authority for permanent stormwater management facilities in accordance with 9VAC25-870-55 D appropriately sealed and signed by a professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, certifying that the stormwater management facilities have been constructed in accordance with the approved plan:

[8.9.] Where applicable, evidence that the signed Stormwater Management Maintenance Agreement has been recorded [in an instrument within the local land records];

[9.10.] For individual lots in residential construction [only, only when the homebuilder established temporary soil stabilization,] a signed statement from the permittee that the new owner, if not the same as the permittee, has been notified of the final stabilization requirements; and

8. 10.11. The following certification: "I certify under penalty of law that I have read and understand this notice of termination and that this document and all attachments were prepared in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is to the best of my knowledge and belief true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

C. D. The notice of termination shall be signed in accordance with 9VAC25-880-70 Part III K.

D. <u>E.</u> Termination by the board. The board may terminate coverage under this general permit during its term and require application for an individual permit or deny a general permit renewal application on its own initiative in accordance with the Act, this chapter, and the VSMP Regulation, 9VAC25-870.

#### 9VAC25-880-70. General permit.

Any operator whose registration statement is accepted by the board will receive the following general permit and shall comply with the requirements contained therein and be subject to all requirements of 9VAC25-870.

#### General Permit No.: VAR10

#### Effective Date: July 1, 2014 2019

#### Expiration Date: June 30, 2019 2024

# GENERAL VPDES PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES OF STORMWATER FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE VIRGINIA STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND THE VIRGINIA STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ACT

In compliance with the provisions of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and pursuant to the Virginia Stormwater Management Act and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, operators of construction activities are authorized to discharge to surface waters within the boundaries of the Commonwealth of Virginia, except those specifically named in State Water Control Board regulations that prohibit such discharges.

The authorized discharge shall be in accordance with <u>the registration statement filed with the Department of</u> <u>Environmental Quality</u>, this cover page, Part I - Discharge Authorization and Special Conditions, Part II - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Part III - Conditions Applicable to All VPDES Permits as set forth <u>herein</u> in this general <u>permit</u>.

## PART I

#### DISCHARGE AUTHORIZATION AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS

A. Coverage under this general permit.

1. During the period beginning with the date of coverage under this general permit and lasting until the general permit's expiration date, the operator is authorized to discharge stormwater from construction activities.

2. This general permit also authorizes stormwater discharges from support activities (e.g., concrete or asphalt batch plants, equipment staging yards, material storage areas, excavated material disposal areas, borrow areas) located on-site or off-site provided that:

a. The support activity is directly related to the construction activity that is required to have general permit coverage for discharges of stormwater from construction activities;

b. The support activity is not a commercial operation, nor does it serve multiple unrelated construction activities by different operators;

c. The support activity does not operate beyond the completion of the last construction activity it supports;

d. The support activity is identified in the registration statement at the time of general permit coverage;

e. Appropriate control measures are identified in a stormwater pollution prevention plan and implemented to address the discharges from the support activity areas; and

f. All applicable state, federal, and local approvals are obtained for the support activity.

B. Limitations on coverage.

1. Post-construction discharges. This general permit does not authorize stormwater discharges that originate from the site after construction activities have been completed and the site, including any support activity sites covered under the general permit registration, has undergone final stabilization. Post-construction industrial stormwater discharges may need to be covered by a separate VPDES permit.

2. Discharges mixed with nonstormwater. This general permit does not authorize discharges that are mixed with sources of nonstormwater, other than those discharges that are identified in Part I E (Authorized nonstormwater discharges) and are in compliance with this general permit.

3. Discharges covered by another state permit. This general permit does not authorize discharges of stormwater from construction activities that have been covered under an individual permit or required to obtain coverage under an alternative general permit.

4. Impaired waters and TMDL total maximum daily load (TMDL) limitation.

<u>a. Nutrient and sediment impaired waters.</u> Discharges of stormwater from construction activities to surface waters identified as impaired in the 2012 2016 § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report or for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has been established and approved prior to the term of this general permit for (i) sediment or a sediment-related parameter (i.e., total suspended solids or turbidity) or (ii) nutrients (i.e., nitrogen or phosphorus) are not eligible for coverage under this general permit unless the operator develops, implements, and maintains a SWPPP stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) in accordance with Part II B 5 of this permit that minimizes the pollutants of concern and, when applicable, is consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the approved TMDL wasteload allocations. In addition, the operator shall implement the following items: allocations and implements an inspection frequency consistent with Part II G 2 a.

a. The impaired water(s), approved TMDL(s), and pollutant(s) of concern, when applicable, shall be identified in the SWPPP;

b. Permanent or temporary soil stabilization shall be applied to denuded areas within seven days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site;

c. Nutrients shall be applied in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations or an approved nutrient management plan and shall not be applied during rainfall events; and

d. The applicable SWPPP inspection requirements specified in Part II F 2 shall be amended as follows:

(1) Inspections shall be conducted at a frequency of (i) at least once every four business days or (ii) at least once every five business days and no later than 48 hours following a measurable storm event. In the event that a measurable storm event occurs when there are more than 48 hours between business days, the inspection shall be conducted on the next business day; and

(2) Representative inspections used by utility line installation, pipeline construction, or other similar linear construction activities shall inspect all outfalls discharging to surface waters identified as impaired or for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has been established and approved prior to the term of this general permit.

b. Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) impaired waters. Discharges of stormwater from construction activities that include the demolition of any structure with at least 10,000 square feet of floor space built or renovated before January 1, 1980, to surface waters identified as impaired in the 2016 § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report or for which a TMDL wasteload allocation has been established and approved

prior to the term of this general permit for PCB are not eligible for coverage under this general permit unless the operator develops, implements, and maintains a SWPPP in accordance with Part II B 6 of this permit that minimizes the pollutants of concern and, when applicable, is consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the approved TMDL wasteload allocations, and implements an inspection frequency consistent with Part II G 2 a.

5. Exceptional waters limitation. Discharges of stormwater from construction activities not previously covered under the general permit issued in 2009 effective on July 1, 2014, to exceptional waters identified in 9VAC25-260-30 A 3 c are not eligible for coverage under this general permit unless the operator implements the following: develops, implements, and maintains a SWPPP in accordance with Part II B 7 of this permit and implements an inspection frequency consistent with Part II G 2 a.

a. The exceptional water(s) shall be identified in the SWPPP;

b. Permanent or temporary soil stabilization shall be applied to denuded areas within seven days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site;

c. Nutrients shall be applied in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations or an approved nutrient management plan and shall not be applied during rainfall events; and

d. The applicable SWPPP inspection requirements specified in Part II F 2 shall be amended as follows:

(1) Inspections shall be conducted at a frequency of (i) at least once every four business days or (ii) at least once every five business days and no later than 48 hours following a measurable storm event. In the event that a measurable storm event occurs when there are more than 48 hours between business days, the inspection shall be conducted on the next business day; and

(2) Representative inspections used by utility line installation, pipeline construction, or other similar linear construction activities shall inspect all outfalls discharging to exceptional waters.

6. There shall be no discharge of floating solids or visible foam in other than trace amounts.

C. Commingled discharges. Discharges authorized by this general permit may be commingled with other sources of stormwater that are not required to be covered under a state permit, so long as the commingled discharge is in compliance with this general permit. Discharges authorized by a separate state or VPDES permit may be commingled with discharges authorized by this general permit so long as all such discharges comply with all applicable state and VPDES permit requirements.

D. Prohibition of nonstormwater discharges. Except as provided in Parts I A 2, I C, and I E, all discharges covered by this general permit shall be composed entirely of stormwater associated with construction activities. All other discharges including the following are prohibited:

1. Wastewater from washout of concrete;

2. Wastewater from the washout and cleanout of stucco, paint, form release oils, curing compounds, and other construction materials;

3. Fuels, oils, or other pollutants used in vehicle and equipment operation and maintenance;

4. Oils, toxic substances, or hazardous substances from spills or other releases; and

5. Soaps, solvents, or detergents used in equipment and vehicle washing.

E. Authorized nonstormwater discharges. The following nonstormwater discharges from construction activities are authorized by this general permit when discharged in compliance with this general permit:

1. Discharges from firefighting activities;

2. Fire hydrant flushings;

3. Waters used to wash vehicles or equipment where soaps, solvents, or detergents have not been used and the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

4. Water used to control dust that has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

5. Potable water sources, including uncontaminated waterline [<u>flushings flushings</u>] <u>managed in a manner</u> to avoid an instream impact;

6. Routine external building wash down where soaps, solvents or detergents have not been used and the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

7. Pavement wash waters where spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have not occurred (or where all spilled or leaked material has been removed prior to washing); where soaps, solvents, or detergents have not been used; and where the wash water has been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge;

8. Uncontaminated air conditioning or compressor condensate;

9. Uncontaminated ground water or spring water;

10. Foundation or footing drains where flows are not contaminated with process materials such as solvents;

11. Uncontaminated excavation dewatering, including dewatering of trenches and excavations that have been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge; and

12. Landscape irrigation.

F. Termination of general permit coverage.

1. The operator of the construction activity shall submit a notice of termination in accordance with [ 9VAC25-880-60 9VAC25-880-60, unless a registration statement was not required to be submitted in accordance with 9VAC25-880-50 A 1.c or A 2 b for single-family detached residential structures, ] to the VSMP authority after one or more of the following conditions have been met:

a. Necessary permanent control measures included in the SWPPP for the site are in place and functioning effectively and final stabilization has been achieved on all portions of the site for which the operator is responsible has operational control. When applicable, long term responsibility and maintenance requirements for permanent control measures shall be recorded in the local land records prior to the submission of a complete and accurate notice of termination and the construction record drawing prepared;

b. Another operator has assumed control over all areas of the site that have not been finally stabilized and obtained coverage for the ongoing discharge;

c. Coverage under an alternative VPDES or state permit has been obtained; or

d. For <u>individual lots in</u> residential construction only, <u>temporary soil final</u> stabilization <u>as defined in</u> <u>9VAC25-880-1</u> has been completed <u>including providing written notification to the homeowner and</u> <u>incorporating a copy of the notification and signed certification statement into the SWPPP</u>, ] and the residence has been transferred to the homeowner.

2. The notice of termination should shall be submitted no later than 30 days after one of the above conditions in subdivision 1 of this subsection is met. Authorization to discharge terminates at midnight on the date that the notice of termination is submitted for the conditions set forth in subdivisions 1 b through 1 d of this subsection.

<u>3.</u> Termination of [ authorizations authorization ] to discharge for the conditions set forth in subdivision 1 a of this subsection shall be effective upon notification from the department that the provisions of subdivision 1 a of this subsection have been met or 60 days after submittal of the <u>a complete and accurate</u> notice of termination in <u>accordance with 9VAC25-880-60 C</u>, whichever occurs first.

<u>4. Authorization to discharge terminates at midnight on the date that the notice of termination is submitted for the conditions set forth in subdivisions 1 b through 1 d of this subsection unless otherwise notified by the VSMP authority or department.</u>

3. 5. The notice of termination shall be signed in accordance with Part III K of this general permit.

G. Water quality protection.

1. The operator must shall select, install, [ implement implement, ] and maintain control measures as identified in the SWPPP at the construction site that minimize pollutants in the discharge as necessary to ensure that the operator's discharge does not cause or contribute to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard.

2. If it is determined by the department that the operator's discharges are causing, have reasonable potential to cause, or are contributing to an excursion above any applicable water quality standard, the department, in consultation with the VSMP authority, may take appropriate enforcement action and require the operator to:

a. Modify or implement additional control measures in accordance with Part II  $\mathbb{B}$  <u>C</u> to adequately address the identified water quality concerns;

b. Submit valid and verifiable data and information that are representative of ambient conditions and indicate that the receiving water is attaining water quality standards; or

c. Submit an individual permit application in accordance with 9VAC25-870-410 B 3.

All written responses required under this chapter must shall include a signed certification consistent with Part III K.

## PART II STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

#### A. Stormwater pollution prevent plan.

<u>1.</u> A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) shall be developed prior to the submission of a registration statement and implemented for the construction activity, including any support activity, covered by this general permit. SWPPPs shall be prepared in accordance with good engineering practices. Construction activities that are part of a larger common plan of development or sale and disturb less than one acre may utilize a SWPPP template provided by the department and need not provide a separate stormwater management plan if one has been prepared and implemented for the larger common plan of development or sale.

<u>2.</u> The SWPPP requirements of this general permit may be fulfilled by incorporating by reference other plans such as a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan developed for the site under § 311 of the federal Clean Water Act or best management practices (BMP) programs otherwise required for the facility provided that the incorporated plan meets or exceeds the SWPPP requirements of Part II A <u>B</u>. All plans incorporated by reference into the SWPPP become enforceable under this general permit. If a plan incorporated by reference does not contain all of the required elements of the SWPPP, the operator must shall develop the missing elements and include them in the SWPPP.

<u>3.</u> Any operator that was authorized to discharge under the general permit issued in 2009 <u>effective July 1, 2014</u>, and that intends to continue coverage under this general permit, shall update its stormwater pollution prevention plan to comply with the requirements of this general permit no later than 60 days after the date of coverage under this general permit.

#### A. Stormwater pollution prevention plan contents <u>B. Contents</u>. The SWPPP shall include the following items:

1. General information.

a. A signed copy of the registration statement, if required, for coverage under the general VPDES permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities;

b. Upon receipt, a copy of the notice of coverage under the general VPDES permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities (i.e., notice of coverage letter);

c. Upon receipt, a copy of the general VPDES permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities;

d. A narrative description of the nature of the construction activity, including the function of the project (e.g., low density residential, shopping mall, highway, etc.);

e. A legible site plan identifying:

(1) Directions of stormwater flow and approximate slopes anticipated after major grading activities;

(2) Limits of land disturbance including steep slopes and natural buffers around surface waters that will not be disturbed;

(3) Locations of major structural and nonstructural control measures, including sediment basins and traps, perimeter dikes, sediment barriers, and other measures intended to filter, settle, or similarly treat sediment, that will be installed between disturbed areas and the undisturbed vegetated areas in order to increase sediment removal and maximize stormwater infiltration;

(4) Locations of surface waters;

(5) Locations where concentrated stormwater is discharged;

(6) Locations of <u>any</u> support activities, <del>when applicable and when required by the VSMP authority,</del> including <del>but not limited to</del> (i) areas where equipment and vehicle washing, wheel wash water, and other wash water is to occur; (ii) storage areas for chemicals such as acids, fuels, fertilizers, and other lawn care chemicals; (iii) concrete wash out areas; (iv) vehicle fueling and maintenance areas; (v) sanitary waste facilities, including those temporarily placed on the construction site; and (vi) construction waste storage; and

(7) When applicable, the location of the on-site rain gauge or the methodology established in consultation with the VSMP authority used to identify measurable storm events for inspection purposes as allowed by [Part II G 2 a (1)(ii) or ] Part II [  $\mathbf{F-G}$  ] 2 b (2).

## 2. Erosion and sediment control plan.

a. An erosion and sediment control plan <u>designed and</u> approved by the VESCP authority as authorized under in accordance with the <u>Virginia</u> Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations (9VAC25-840), an "agreement in lieu of a plan" as defined in 9VAC25-840-10 from the VESCP authority, or an erosion and sediment control plan prepared in accordance with annual standards and specifications approved by the department. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge from construction activities that is not required to obtain erosion and sediment control plan approval from a VESCP authority or does not adopt department approved annual standards and specifications shall submit the erosion and sediment control plan to the department for review and approval.

b. All erosion and sediment control plans shall include a statement describing the maintenance responsibilities required for the erosion and sediment controls used.

c. A properly implemented <u>An</u> approved erosion and sediment control plan, "agreement in lieu of a plan," or erosion and sediment control plan prepared in accordance with department-approved annual standards and specifications, <del>adequately</del> <u>implemented to</u>:

(1) Controls Control the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff within the site to minimize soil erosion;

(2) <u>Controls Control</u> stormwater discharges, including peak flow rates and total stormwater volume, to minimize erosion at outlets and to minimize downstream channel and stream bank erosion;

(3) Minimizes Minimize the amount of soil exposed during the construction activity;

(4) Minimizes Minimize the disturbance of steep slopes;

(5) <u>Minimizes Minimize</u> sediment discharges from the site in a manner that addresses (i) the amount, frequency, intensity, and duration of precipitation; (ii) the nature of resulting stormwater runoff; and (iii) soil characteristics, including the range of soil particle sizes present on the site;

(6) <u>Provides Provide</u> and <u>maintains maintain</u> natural buffers around surface waters, <u>[ directs direct ]</u> stormwater to vegetated areas to increase sediment removal, and [ <u>maximizes maximize</u> ] stormwater infiltration, unless infeasible;

(7) Minimizes Minimize soil compaction and, unless infeasible, [preserves preserve] topsoil;

(8) Ensures that Ensure initiation of stabilization activities, as defined in 9VAC25-880-1, of disturbed areas will be initiated immediately whenever any clearing, grading, excavating, or other land-disturbing activities have permanently ceased on any portion of the site, or temporarily ceased on any portion of the site and will not resume for a period exceeding 14 days; and

(9) <u>Utilizes</u> <u>Utilize</u> outlet structures that withdraw stormwater from the surface (i.e., above the permanent pool or wet storage water surface elevation), unless infeasible, when discharging from sediment basins or sediment traps.

3. Stormwater management plan.

a. New construction activities. A Except for those projects identified in Part II B 3 b and 3 a ] stormwater management plan approved by the VSMP authority as authorized under the Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) Regulation (9VAC25-870), or an "agreement in lieu of a stormwater management plan" as defined in 9VAC25-870-10 from the VSMP authority, or a stormwater management plan prepared in accordance with annual standards and specifications approved by the department. Any operator proposing a new stormwater discharge from construction activities that is not required to obtain stormwater management plan approval from a VSMP authority or does not adopt department approved annual standards and specifications shall submit the stormwater management plan to the department for review and approval.

b. Existing construction activities. Any For any operator [that was authorized to discharge under the general permit issued in 2009, and that intends to continue coverage under this general permit, shall ensure compliance with [permits effective July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2014, for projects.] meeting the [requirements conditions] of 9VAC25-870-93 through 9VAC25-870-99 of the VSMP Regulation, including but not limited to the water quality and quantity requirements The 9VAC25-870-47 [B, B of the VSMP regulation,] an approved stormwater management plan is not required. In lieu of an approved stormwater management plan, the SWPPP shall include a description of, and all necessary calculations supporting, all post-construction stormwater management measures that will be installed prior to the completion of the

construction process to control pollutants in stormwater discharges after construction operations have been completed. Structural measures should be placed on upland soils to the degree possible. Such measures must be designed and installed in accordance with applicable VESCP authority, VSMP authority, state, and federal requirements, and any necessary permits must be obtained.

4. Pollution prevention plan. A pollution prevention plan that addresses potential pollutant-generating activities that may reasonably be expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges from the construction activity, including any support activity. The pollution prevention plan shall:

a. Identify the potential pollutant-generating activities and the pollutant that is expected to be exposed to stormwater;

b. Describe the location where the potential pollutant-generating activities will occur, or if identified on the site plan, reference the site plan;

c. Identify all nonstormwater discharges, as authorized in Part I E of this general permit, that are or will be commingled with stormwater discharges from the construction activity, including any applicable support activity;

d. Identify the person responsible for implementing the pollution prevention practice or practices for each pollutant-generating activity (if other than the person listed as the qualified personnel);

e. Describe the pollution prevention practices and procedures that will be implemented to:

(1) Prevent and respond to leaks, spills, and other releases including (i) procedures for expeditiously stopping, containing, and cleaning up spills, leaks, and other releases; and (ii) procedures for reporting leaks, spills, and other releases in accordance with Part III G;

(2) Prevent the discharge of spilled and leaked fuels and chemicals from vehicle fueling and maintenance activities (e.g., providing secondary containment such as spill berms, decks, spill containment pallets, providing cover where appropriate, and having spill kits readily available);

(3) Prevent the discharge of soaps, solvents, detergents, and wash water from construction materials, including the clean-up of stucco, paint, form release oils, and curing compounds (e.g., providing (i) cover (e.g., plastic sheeting or temporary roofs) to prevent contact with stormwater; (ii) collection and proper disposal in a manner to prevent contact with stormwater; and (iii) a similarly effective means designed to prevent discharge of these pollutants);

(4) Minimize the discharge of pollutants from vehicle and equipment washing, wheel wash water, and other types of washing (e.g., locating activities away from surface waters and stormwater inlets or conveyance and directing wash waters to sediment basins or traps, using filtration devices such as filter bags or sand filters, or using similarly effective controls);

(5) Direct concrete wash water into a leak-proof container or leak-proof settling basin. The container or basin shall be designed so that no overflows can occur due to inadequate sizing or precipitation. Hardened concrete wastes shall be removed and disposed of in a manner consistent with the handling of other construction wastes. Liquid concrete wastes shall be removed and disposed of in a manner consistent with the handling of other construction wash waters and shall not be discharged to surface waters;

(6) Minimize the discharge of pollutants from storage, handling, and disposal of construction products, materials, and wastes including (i) building products such as asphalt sealants, copper flashing, roofing materials, adhesives, and concrete admixtures; (ii) pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fertilizers, and landscape materials; and (iii) construction and domestic wastes such as packaging materials, scrap construction materials, masonry products, timber, pipe and electrical cuttings, plastics, Styrofoam, concrete, and other trash or building materials;

(7) Prevent the discharge of fuels, oils, and other petroleum products, hazardous or toxic wastes, [ excess waste ] concrete, and sanitary wastes; and

(8) Address any other discharge from the potential pollutant-generating activities not addressed above; [ and

(9) Minimize the exposure of waste materials to precipitation by closing or covering waste containers during precipitation events and at the end of the business day, or implementing other similarly effective practices. Minimization of exposure is not required in cases where the exposure to precipitation will not result in a discharge of pollutants; and

f. Describe procedures for providing pollution prevention awareness of all applicable wastes, including any wash water, disposal practices, and applicable disposal locations of such wastes, to personnel in order to comply with the conditions of this general permit. The operator shall implement the procedures described in the SWPPP.

5. SWPPP requirements for discharges to impaired waters, surface waters with an applicable TMDL wasteload allocation established and approved prior to the term of this general permit, and exceptional waters. The SWPPP shall: nutrient and sediment impaired waters. For discharges to surface waters (i) identified as impaired in the 2016 § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report or (ii) with an applicable TMDL wasteload allocation established and approved prior to the term of this general permit for sediment for a sediment-related parameter (i.e., total suspended solids or turbidity) or nutrients (i.e., nitrogen or phosphorus), the operator shall:

a. Identify the impaired water(s) waters, approved TMDL(s) TMDLs, pollutant(s) and pollutants of concern, and exceptional waters identified in 9VAC25-260-30 A 3 c, when applicable; in the SWPPP; and

b. Provide clear direction in the SWPPP that:

(1) Permanent or temporary soil stabilization shall be applied to denuded areas within seven days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site;

(2) Nutrients shall be applied in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations or an approved nutrient management plan and shall not be applied during rainfall events; and

(3) A modified inspection schedule shall be implemented in accordance with Part I B 4 or Part I B 5 II G 2  $\underline{a}$ .

6. SWPPP requirements for discharges to polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) impaired waters. For discharges from construction activities that include the demolition of any structure with at least 10,000 square feet of floor space built or renovated before January 1, 1980, to surface waters (i) identified as impaired in the 2016 § 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report or (ii) with an applicable TMDL wasteload allocation established and approved prior to the term of this general permit for **PCBs PCB** ], the operator shall:

a. Identify the impaired waters, approved TMDLs, and pollutant of concern in the SWPPP; [ and ]

b. [ Include procedures in the SWPPP for:

(1) Implementation of controls to minimize the exposure of PCB-containing building materials, including paint, caulk, and pre-1980 fluorescent lighting fixtures, to precipitation and to stormwater such as separating work areas from nonwork areas and selecting appropriate personal protective equipment and tools, constructing a containment area so that all dust or debris generated by the work remains within the protected area, using tools that minimize dust and heat (<212°F); Implement the approved erosion and sediment control plan in accordance with Part II B 2; ]

[ (2). Disposal c. Dispose ] of [ such waste] materials [ is performed ] in compliance with applicable state, federal, and local requirements; and

[ (3) <u>A</u> d. Implement a ] modified inspection schedule [ shall be implemented ] in accordance with Part II G 2 a.

7. SWPPP requirements for discharges to exceptional waters. For discharges to surface waters identified in 9VAC25-260-30 A 3 c as an exceptional water, the operator shall:

a. Identify the exceptional surface waters in the SWPPP; and

b. Provide clear direction in the SWPPP that:

(1) Permanent or temporary soil stabilization shall be applied to denuded areas within seven days after final grade is reached on any portion of the site;

(2) Nutrients shall be applied in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations or an approved nutrient management plan and shall not be applied during rainfall events; and

(3) A modified inspection schedule shall be implemented in accordance with Part II G 2 a.

6. Qualified <u>8. Identification of qualified</u> personnel. The name, phone number, and qualifications of the qualified personnel conducting inspections required by this general permit.

7. <u>9.</u> Delegation of authority. The individuals or positions with delegated authority, in accordance with Part III K, to sign inspection reports or modify the SWPPP.

8. 10. SWPPP signature. The SWPPP shall be signed and dated in accordance with Part III K.

B. C. SWPPP amendments, modification, and updates.

1. The operator shall amend the SWPPP whenever there is a change in the design, construction, operation, or maintenance that has a significant effect on the discharge of pollutants to surface waters and that has not been previously addressed in the SWPPP.

2. The SWPPP must shall be amended if, during inspections or investigations by the operator's qualified personnel, or by local, state, or federal officials, it is determined that the existing control measures are ineffective in minimizing pollutants in discharges from the construction activity. Revisions to the SWPPP shall include additional or modified control measures designed and implemented to correct problems identified. If approval by the VESCP authority, VSMP authority, or department is necessary for the control measure, revisions to the SWPPP shall be completed no later than seven calendar days following approval. Implementation of these additional or modified control measures must shall be accomplished as described in Part II G  $\underline{H}$ .

3. The SWPPP must <u>shall</u> clearly identify the <u>contractor(s)</u> <u>contractors</u> that will implement and maintain each control measure identified in the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall be amended to identify any new contractor that will implement and maintain a control measure.

4. The operator shall update the SWPPP <u>as soon as possible but</u> no later than seven days following any modification to its implementation. All modifications or updates to the SWPPP shall be noted and shall include the following items:

a. A record of dates when:

(1) Major grading activities occur;

(2) Construction activities temporarily or permanently cease on a portion of the site; and

(3) Stabilization measures are initiated;

b. Documentation of replaced or modified controls where periodic inspections or other information have indicated that the controls have been used inappropriately or incorrectly and where were modified as soon as possible;

c. Areas that have reached final stabilization and where no further SWPPP or inspection requirements apply;

d. All properties that are no longer under the legal control of the operator and the dates on which the operator no longer had legal control over each property;

e. The date of any prohibited discharges, the discharge volume released, and what actions were taken to minimize the impact of the release;

f. Measures taken to prevent the reoccurrence of any prohibited discharge; and

g. Measures taken to address any evidence identified as a result of an inspection required under Part II F G.

5. Amendments, modifications, or updates to the SWPPP shall be signed in accordance with Part III K.

C. <u>D.</u> Public Notification <u>notification</u>. Upon commencement of land disturbance, the operator shall post conspicuously a copy of the notice of coverage letter near the main entrance of the construction activity. For linear projects, the operator shall post the notice of coverage letter at a publicly accessible location near an active part of the construction project (e.g., where a pipeline crosses a public road). The operator shall maintain the posted information until termination of general permit coverage as specified in Part I F.

D. E. SWPPP availability.

1. Operators with day-to-day operational control over SWPPP implementation shall have a copy of the SWPPP available at a central location on-site for use by those identified as having responsibilities under the SWPPP whenever they are on the construction site.

2. The operator shall make the SWPPP and all amendments, modifications, and updates available upon request to the department, the VSMP authority, the EPA, the VESCP authority, local government officials, or the operator of a municipal separate storm sewer system receiving discharges from the construction activity. If an on-site location is unavailable to store the SWPPP when no personnel are present, notice of the SWPPP's location must shall be posted near the main entrance of the construction site.

3. The operator shall make the SWPPP available for public review in an electronic format or in hard copy. Information for public access to the SWPPP shall be posted and maintained in accordance with Part II  $\in \underline{D}$ . If

not provided electronically, public access to the SWPPP may be arranged upon request at a time and at a publicly accessible location convenient to the operator or his designee but shall be no less than once per month and shall be during normal business hours. Information not required to be contained within the SWPPP by this general permit is not required to be released.

E. <u>F.</u> SWPPP implementation. The operator shall implement the SWPPP and subsequent amendments, modifications, and updates from commencement of land disturbance until termination of general permit coverage as specified in Part I F.

1. All control measures <u>must shall</u> be properly maintained in effective operating condition in accordance with good engineering practices and, where applicable, manufacturer specifications. If a site inspection required by Part II F  $\underline{G}$  identifies a control measure that is not operating effectively, corrective  $\frac{action(s)}{actions}$  shall be completed as soon as practicable, but no later than seven days after discovery or a longer period as established by the VSMP authority, to maintain the continued effectiveness of the control measures.

2. If site inspections required by Part II  $\mathbf{F}$  <u>G</u> identify an existing control measure that needs to be modified or if an additional <u>or alternative</u> control measure is necessary for any reason, implementation shall be completed prior to the next anticipated measurable storm event. If implementation prior to the next anticipated measurable storm event is impracticable, then <u>additional or</u> alternative control measures shall be implemented as soon as practicable, but no later than seven days after discovery or a longer period as established by the VSMP authority.

F. G. SWPPP Inspections.

1. Personnel responsible for on-site and off-site inspections. Inspections required by this general permit shall be conducted by the qualified personnel identified by the operator in the SWPPP. The operator is responsible for insuring ensuring that the qualified personnel conduct the inspection.

2. Inspection schedule.

a. Inspections shall be conducted at a frequency of For construction activities that discharge to a surface water identified in Part II B 5 and B 6 as impaired or having an approved TMDL or Part I B  $\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 7 \end{bmatrix}$  as exceptional, the following inspection schedule requirements apply:

(1) Inspections shall be conducted at a frequency of (i) at least once every four business days or (ii) at least once every five business days and no later than 24 hours following a measurable storm event. In the event that a measurable storm event occurs when there are more than 24 hours between business days, the inspection shall be conducted on the next business day; and

(2) Representative inspections as [ allowed authorized ] in Part II G 2 d shall not be allowed.

b. Except as specified in Part II G 2 a, inspections shall be conducted at a frequency of:

(1) At least once every five business days; or

(2) At least once every 10 business days and no later than  $48 \ \underline{24}$  hours following a measurable storm event. In the event that a measurable storm event occurs when there are more than  $48 \ \underline{24}$  hours between business days, the inspection shall be conducted no later than on the next business day.

**b.** <u>c.</u> Where areas have been temporarily stabilized or land-disturbing activities will be suspended due to continuous frozen ground conditions and stormwater discharges are unlikely, the inspection frequency <u>described in Part II G 2 [ b a ] and 2 [ e b ]</u> may be reduced to once per month. If weather conditions (such as above freezing temperatures or rain or snow events) make discharges likely, the operator shall immediately resume the regular inspection frequency.

e. Representative <u>d. Except as prohibited in Part II G 2 a (2)</u>, representative inspections may be utilized for utility line installation, pipeline construction, or other similar linear construction activities provided that:

(1) Temporary or permanent soil stabilization has been installed and vehicle access may compromise the temporary or permanent soil stabilization and potentially cause additional land disturbance increasing the potential for erosion;

(2) Inspections occur on the same frequency as other construction activities;

(3) Control measures are inspected along the construction site 0.25 miles above and below each access point (i.e., where a roadway, undisturbed right-of-way, or other similar feature intersects the construction activity and access does not compromise temporary or permanent soil stabilization); and

(4) Inspection locations are provided in the <u>inspection</u> report required by Part II  $\not = G$ .

e. If adverse weather causes the safety of the inspection personnel to be in jeopardy, the inspection may be delayed until the next business day on which it is safe to perform the inspection. Any time inspections are delayed due to adverse weather conditions, evidence of the adverse weather conditions shall be included in the SWPPP with the dates of occurrence.

3. Inspection requirements.

a. As part of the inspection, the qualified personnel shall:

(1) Record the date and time of the inspection [<u>and and</u>,] when [<u>applicable applicable</u>,] the date and rainfall amount of the last measurable storm event;

(2) Record the information and a description of any discharges occurring at the time of the inspection <u>or</u> evidence of discharges occurring prior to the inspection;

(3) Record any land-disturbing activities that have occurred outside of the approved erosion and sediment control plan;

(4) Inspect the following for installation in accordance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan, identification of any maintenance needs, and evaluation of effectiveness in minimizing sediment discharge, including whether the control has been inappropriately or incorrectly used:

(a) All perimeter erosion and sediment controls, such as silt fence;

(b) Soil stockpiles, when applicable, and borrow areas for stabilization or sediment trapping measures;

(c) Completed earthen structures, such as dams, dikes, ditches, and diversions for stabilization <u>and effective</u> <u>impoundment or flow control</u>;

(d) Cut and fill slopes;

(e) Sediment basins and traps, sediment barriers, and other measures installed to control sediment discharge from stormwater;

(f) Temporary or permanent <del>channel, flume, <u>channels</u>, flumes,</del> or other slope drain structures installed to convey concentrated runoff down cut and fill slopes;

(g) Storm inlets that have been made operational to ensure that sediment laden stormwater does not enter without first being filtered or similarly treated; and

(h) Construction vehicle access routes that intersect or access paved <u>or public</u> roads for minimizing sediment tracking;

(5) Inspect areas that have reached final grade or that will remain dormant for more than 14 days for initiation of stabilization activities; to ensure:

(a) Initiation of stabilization activities have occurred immediately, as defined in 9VAC25-880-1; and

(b) Stabilization activities have been completed within seven days of reaching grade or stopping work;

(6) Inspect areas that have reached final grade or that will remain dormant for more than 14 days for completion of stabilization activities within seven days of reaching grade or stopping work;

(7) (6) Inspect for evidence that the approved erosion and sediment control plan, "agreement in lieu of a plan," or erosion and sediment control plan prepared in accordance with department-approved annual standards and specifications has not been properly implemented. This includes but is not limited to:

(a) Concentrated flows of stormwater in conveyances such as rills, [<u>rivulets rivulets</u>,] or channels that have not been filtered, settled, or similarly treated prior to discharge, or evidence thereof;

(b) Sediment laden or turbid flows of stormwater that have not been filtered or settled to remove sediments prior to discharge;

(c) Sediment deposition in areas that drain to unprotected stormwater inlets or catch basins that discharge to surface waters. Inlets and catch basins with failing <u>sediments sediment</u> controls due to improper installation, lack of maintenance, or inadequate design are considered unprotected;

(d) Sediment deposition on any property (including public and private streets) outside of the construction activity covered by this general permit;

(e) Required stabilization has not been initiated or completed or is not effective on portions of the site;

(f) Sediment basins without adequate wet or dry storage volume or sediment basins that allow the discharge of stormwater from below the surface of the wet storage portion of the basin;

(g) Sediment traps without adequate wet or dry storage or sediment traps that allow the discharge of stormwater from below the surface of the wet storage portion of the trap; and

(h) Land disturbance or sediment deposition outside of the approved area to be disturbed;

(8) (7) Inspect pollutant generating activities identified in the pollution prevention plan for the proper implementation, [<u>maintenance maintenance</u>,] and effectiveness of the procedures and practices;

(9) (8) Identify any pollutant generating activities not identified in the pollution prevention plan; and

(10) (9) Identify and document the presence of any evidence of the discharge of pollutants prohibited by this general permit.

4. Inspection report. Each inspection report shall include the following items:

a. The date and time of the inspection [ and and, ] when applicable, the date and rainfall amount of the last measurable storm event;

b. Summarized findings of the inspection;

c. The location(s) locations of prohibited discharges;

d. The location(s) locations of control measures that require maintenance;

e. The location(s) locations of control measures that failed to operate as designed or proved inadequate or inappropriate for a particular location;

f. The location(s) locations where any evidence identified under Part II  $\neq G$  3 a [(7)(6)] exists;

g. The location(s) locations where any additional control measure is needed that did not exist at the time of inspection;

h. A list of corrective actions required (including any changes to the SWPPP that are necessary) as a result of the inspection or to maintain permit compliance;

i. Documentation of any corrective actions required from a previous inspection that have not been implemented; and

j. The date and signature of the qualified personnel and the operator or its duly authorized representative.

5. The inspection report shall be included into the SWPPP no later than four business days after the inspection is complete.

**6.** The inspection report and any actions taken in accordance with Part II must <u>shall</u> be retained by the operator as part of the SWPPP for at least three years from the date that general permit coverage expires or is terminated. The inspection report shall identify any incidents of noncompliance. Where an inspection report does not identify any incidents of noncompliance activity is in compliance with the SWPPP and this general permit. The report shall be signed in accordance with Part III K of this general permit.

G. <u>H.</u> Corrective actions.

1. The operator shall implement the corrective action(s) actions identified as a result of an inspection as soon as practicable but no later than seven days after discovery or a longer period as approved by the VSMP authority. If approval of a corrective action by a regulatory authority (e.g., VSMP authority, VESCP authority, or the department) is necessary, additional control measures shall be implemented to minimize pollutants in stormwater discharges until such approvals can be obtained.

2. The operator may be required to remove accumulated sediment deposits located outside of the construction activity covered by this general permit as soon as practicable in order to minimize environmental impacts. The operator shall notify the VSMP authority and the department as well as obtain all applicable federal, state, and local authorizations, approvals, and permits prior to the removal of sediments accumulated in surface waters including wetlands.

## PART III

# CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL VPDES PERMITS

NOTE: Discharge monitoring is not required for this general permit. If the operator chooses to monitor stormwater discharges or control measures, the operator must shall comply with the requirements of subsections A, B, and C, as appropriate.

A. Monitoring.

1. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitoring activity.

2. Monitoring shall be conducted according to procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or alternative methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, unless other procedures have been specified in this general permit. Analyses performed according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 shall be performed by an environmental laboratory certified under regulations adopted by the Department of General Services (1VAC30-45 or 1VAC30-46).

3. The operator shall periodically calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring and analytical instrumentation at intervals that will ensure accuracy of measurements.

## B. Records.

- 1. Monitoring records and reports shall include:
  - a. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
  - b. The individual(s) individuals who performed the sampling or measurements;
  - c. The date(s) dates and time(s) times analyses were performed;
  - d. The individual(s) individuals who performed the analyses;
  - e. The analytical techniques or methods used; and
  - f. The results of such analyses.

2. The operator shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this general permit, and records of all data used to complete the registration statement for this general permit, for a period of at least three years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or request for coverage. This period of retention shall be extended automatically during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding the regulated activity or regarding control standards applicable to the operator, or as requested by the board.

C. Reporting monitoring results.

1. The operator shall update the SWPPP to include the results of the monitoring as may be performed in accordance with this general permit, unless another reporting schedule is specified elsewhere in this general permit.

2. Monitoring results shall be reported on a discharge monitoring report (DMR); on forms provided, approved or specified by the department; or in any format provided that the date, location, parameter, method, and result of the monitoring activity are included.

3. If the operator monitors any pollutant specifically addressed by this general permit more frequently than required by this general permit using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or using other test procedures approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or using procedures specified in this general permit, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or reporting form specified by the department.

4. Calculations for all limitations which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this general permit.

D. Duty to provide information. The operator shall furnish, within a reasonable time, any information which the board may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this general permit <u>coverage</u> or to determine compliance with this general permit. The board, department, EPA, or VSMP authority may require the operator to furnish, upon request, such plans, specifications, and other pertinent information as may be necessary to determine the effect of the wastes from his discharge on the quality of surface waters, or such other

information as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the CWA and the Virginia Stormwater Management Act. The operator shall also furnish to the board, department, EPA, or VSMP authority, upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this general permit.

E. Compliance schedule reports. Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this general permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date.

F. Unauthorized stormwater discharges. Pursuant to § 62.1-44.5 of the Code of Virginia, except in compliance with a state permit issued by the department, it shall be unlawful to cause a stormwater discharge from a construction activity.

G. Reports of unauthorized discharges. Any operator who discharges or causes or allows a discharge of sewage, industrial waste, other wastes or any noxious or deleterious substance or a hazardous substance or oil in an amount equal to or in excess of a reportable quantity established under either 40 CFR Part 110, 40 CFR Part 117, 40 CFR Part 302, or § 62.1-44.34:19 of the Code of Virginia that occurs during a 24-hour period into or upon surface waters or who discharges or causes or allows a discharge that may reasonably be expected to enter surface waters, shall notify the Department of Environmental Quality of the discharge immediately upon discovery of the discharge, but in no case later than within 24 hours after said discovery. A written report of the unauthorized discharge shall be submitted to the department and the VSMP authority within five days of discovery of the discharge. The written report shall contain:

1. A description of the nature and location of the discharge;

2. The cause of the discharge;

3. The date on which the discharge occurred;

4. The length of time that the discharge continued;

5. The volume of the discharge;

6. If the discharge is continuing, how long it is expected to continue;

7. If the discharge is continuing, what the expected total volume of the discharge will be; and

8. Any steps planned or taken to reduce, eliminate and prevent a recurrence of the present discharge or any future discharges not authorized by this general permit.

Discharges reportable to the department and the VSMP authority under the immediate reporting requirements of other regulations are exempted from this requirement.

H. Reports of unusual or extraordinary discharges. If any unusual or extraordinary discharge including a "bypass" or "upset," as defined herein in this general permit, should occur from a facility and the discharge enters or could be expected to enter surface waters, the operator shall promptly notify, in no case later than within 24 hours, the department and the VSMP authority by telephone after the discovery of the discharge. This notification shall provide all available details of the incident, including any adverse effects on aquatic life and the known number of fish killed. The operator shall reduce the report to writing and shall submit it to the department and the VSMP authority within five days of discovery of the discharge in accordance with Part III I 2. Unusual and extraordinary discharges include but are not limited to any discharge resulting from:

1. Unusual spillage of materials resulting directly or indirectly from processing operations;

2. Breakdown of processing or accessory equipment;

3. Failure or taking out of service of some or all of the facilities; and

4. Flooding or other acts of nature.

I. Reports of noncompliance. The operator shall report any noncompliance which may adversely affect surface waters or may endanger public health.

1. An oral report to the department and the VSMP authority shall be provided within 24 hours from the time the operator becomes aware of the circumstances. The following shall be included as information that shall be reported within 24 hours under this subdivision:

a. Any unanticipated bypass; and

- b. Any upset that causes a discharge to surface waters.
- 2. A written report shall be submitted within five days and shall contain:

a. A description of the noncompliance and its cause;

b. The period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and

c. Steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.

The department may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis for reports of noncompliance under Part III I if the oral report has been received within 24 hours and no adverse impact on surface waters has been reported.

3. The operator shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Part III I 1 or 2 in writing as part of the SWPPP. The reports shall contain the information listed in Part III I 2.

NOTE: The reports required in Part III G, H and I shall be made to the department and the VSMP authority. Reports may be made by telephone, email, or by fax. For reports outside normal working hours, leaving a recorded message shall fulfill the immediate reporting requirement. For emergencies, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management maintains a 24-hour telephone service at 1-800-468-8892.

4. Where the operator becomes aware of a failure to submit any relevant facts, or submittal of incorrect information in any report, including a registration statement, to the department or the VSMP authority, the operator shall promptly submit such facts or correct information.

J. Notice of planned changes.

1. The operator shall give notice to the department and the VSMP authority as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility or activity. Notice is required only when:

a. The operator plans an alteration or addition to any building, structure, facility, or installation that may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 9VAC25-870-420;

b. The operator plans an alteration or addition that would significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this general permit; or

2. The operator shall give advance notice to the department and VSMP authority of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity, which may result in noncompliance with state permit requirements.

- K. Signatory requirements.
  - 1. Registration statement. All registration statements shall be signed as follows:

a. For a corporation: by a responsible corporate officer. For the purpose of this chapter, a responsible corporate officer means: (i) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy-making or decision-making functions for the corporation; or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities, provided the manager is authorized to make management decisions that govern the operation of the regulated facility including having the explicit or implicit duty of making major capital investment recommendations, and initiating and directing other comprehensive measures to assure long-term compliance with environmental laws and regulations; the manager can ensure that the necessary systems are established or actions taken to gather complete and accurate information for state permit application requirements; and where authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures;

b. For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or

c. For a municipality, state, federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this chapter, a principal executive officer of a public agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency.

2. Reports<del>, etc</del> and other information. All reports required by this general permit, including SWPPPs, and other information requested by the board or the department shall be signed by a person described in Part III K 1 or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Part III K 1;

b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the operator. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position); and

c. The signed and dated written authorization is included in the SWPPP. A copy must <u>shall</u> be provided to the department and VSMP authority, if requested.

3. Changes to authorization. If an authorization under Part III K 2 is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the construction activity, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Part III K 2 shall be submitted to the VSMP authority as the administering entity for the board prior to or together with any reports or information to be signed by an authorized representative.

4. Certification. Any person signing a document under Part III K 1 or 2 shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that I have read and understand this document and that this document and all attachments were prepared in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

L. Duty to comply. The operator shall comply with all conditions of this general permit. Any state permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Virginia Stormwater Management Act and the Clean Water Act, except that noncompliance with certain provisions of this general permit may constitute a violation of the Virginia Stormwater Management Act but not the Clean Water Act. Permit noncompliance is grounds for enforcement action; for state permit coverage, termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a state permit renewal application.

The operator shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under § 307(a) of the Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions or standards for sewage sludge use or disposal, even if this general permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.

M. Duty to reapply. If the operator wishes to continue an activity regulated by this general permit after the expiration date of this general permit, the operator shall submit a new registration statement at least  $90 \frac{60}{00}$  days before the expiration date of the existing general permit, unless permission for a later date has been granted by the board. The board shall not grant permission for registration statements to be submitted later than the expiration date of the existing general permit.

N. Effect of a state permit. This general permit does not convey any property rights in either real or personal property or any exclusive privileges, nor does it authorize any injury to private property or invasion of personal rights, or any infringement of federal, state or local law or regulations.

O. State law. Nothing in this general permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action under, or relieve the operator from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties established pursuant to any other state law or regulation or under authority preserved by § 510 of the Clean Water Act. Except as provided in general permit conditions on "bypassing" (Part III U) and "upset" (Part III V), nothing in this general permit shall be construed to relieve the operator from civil and criminal penalties for noncompliance.

P. Oil and hazardous substance liability. Nothing in this general permit shall be construed to preclude the institution of any legal action or relieve the operator from any responsibilities, liabilities, or penalties to which the operator is or may be subject under §§ 62.1-44.34:14 through 62.1-44.34:23 of the State Water Control Law or § 311 of the Clean Water Act.

Q. Proper operation and maintenance. The operator shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances), which are installed or used by the operator to achieve compliance with the conditions of this general permit. Proper operation and maintenance also includes effective plant performance, adequate funding, adequate staffing, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems, which are installed by the operator only when the operation is necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this general permit.

R. Disposal of solids or sludges. Solids, sludges or other pollutants removed in the course of treatment or management of pollutants shall be disposed of in a manner so as to prevent any pollutant from such materials from entering surface waters and in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

S. Duty to mitigate. The operator shall take all steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of this general permit that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

T. Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense. It shall not be a defense for an operator in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this general permit.

U. Bypass.

1. "Bypass," as defined in 9VAC25-870-10, means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. The operator may allow any bypass to occur that does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded, but only if it also is for essential maintenance to ensure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions of Part III U 2 and 3.

2. Notice.

a. Anticipated bypass. If the operator knows in advance of the need for a bypass, the operator shall submit prior notice to the department, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass.

b. Unanticipated bypass. The operator shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Part III I.

3. Prohibition of bypass.

a. Except as provided in Part III U 1, bypass is prohibited, and the board or department may take enforcement action against an operator for bypass unless:

(1) Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. Severe property damage means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities that causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production;

(2) There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance; and

(3) The operator submitted notices as required under Part III U 2.

b. The department may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the department determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Part III U 3 a.

## V. Upset.

1. An "upset," as defined in 9VAC25-870-10, means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology-based state permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the operator. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation.

2. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with technology-based state permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Part III V 4 are met. A determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is not a final administrative action subject to judicial review.

3. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventative maintenance, or careless or improper operation.

4. An operator who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that:

- a. An upset occurred and that the operator can identify the cause(s) cause of the upset;
- b. The permitted facility was at the time being properly operated;
- c. The operator submitted notice of the upset as required in Part III I; and
- d. The operator complied with any remedial measures required under Part III S.

5. In any enforcement proceeding, the operator seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof.

W. Inspection and entry. The operator shall allow the department as the board's designee, the VSMP authority, EPA, or an authorized representative of either entity (including an authorized contractor), upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law to:

1. Enter upon the operator's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must shall be kept under the conditions of this general permit;

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must shall be kept under the conditions of this general permit;

3. Inspect and photograph at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this general permit; and

4. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of ensuring state permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the Clean Water Act or the Virginia Stormwater Management Act, any substances or parameters at any location.

For purposes of this section, the time for inspection shall be deemed reasonable during regular business hours, and whenever the facility is discharging. Nothing contained herein shall make an inspection unreasonable during an emergency.

X. State permit actions. State <u>permits permit coverage</u> may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the operator for a state permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any state permit condition.

Y. Transfer of state permits permit coverage.

1. State permits are not transferable to any person except after notice to the department. Except as provided in Part III Y 2, a state permit may be transferred by the operator to a new operator only if the state permit has been modified or revoked and reissued, or a minor modification made, to identify the new operator and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the Virginia Stormwater Management Act and the Clean Water Act.

2. As an alternative to transfers under Part III Y 1, this state permit may be automatically transferred to a new operator if:

a. The current operator notifies the department at least 30 days in advance of the proposed transfer of the title to the facility or property;

b. The notice includes a written agreement between the existing and new operators containing a specific date for transfer of state permit responsibility, coverage, and liability between them; and

c. The department does not notify the existing operator and the proposed new operator of its intent to modify or revoke and reissue the state permit. If this notice is not received, the transfer is effective on the date specified in the agreement mentioned in Part III Y 2 b.

3. For ongoing construction activity involving a change of operator, the new operator shall accept and maintain the existing SWPPP, or prepare and implement a new SWPPP prior to taking over operations at the site.

Z. Severability. The provisions of this general permit are severable, and if any provision of this general permit or the application of any provision of this state permit to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances and the remainder of this general permit shall not be affected thereby.

# 9VAC25-880-100. Delegation of authority.

The director, or his designee, may perform any act of the board provided under this chapter, except as limited by § 62.1-44.14 of the Code of Virginia.

**<u>REPORT ON FACILITIES IN SIGNIFICANT NONCOMPLIANCE:</u>** One new permittee was reported to EPA on the Quarterly Noncompliance Report as being in significant noncompliance (SNC) for the quarter ending September 30, 2018. The permittee, the facility and the reported instances of noncompliance are as follows:

1. Permittee/Facility: Western Virginia Water Authority/WVWA WPCP

Type of Noncompliance:	Failure to Meet Permit Effluent Limits (5-day Biochemical Oxygen Demand- BOD5)
City/County	Roanoke, Virginia
Receiving Water:	Roanoke River
Impaired Water:	The Roanoke River is listed as impaired for fish consumption, recreation and aquatic life uses. The causes of the fish consumption impairment are PCBs and Mercury, the aquatic life use is impaired for benthics and the recreational use is impaired for bacteria.
River Basin:	Roanoke River Basin
Dates of Noncompliance:	August and September 2018
Requirements Contained In:	VPDES Permit
DEQ Region:	Blue Ridge Regional Office

The Authority analyzed its plant, changed vendors and called in experts to identify the cause of the exceedances. The Authority attributes the exceedances to a septic hauler whose disposal inhibited the treatment process at the plant. The Authority has taken action to prevent future disposal from that hauler and source. DEQ's Blue Ridge Regional Office has issued two Warning Letters and a Notice of Violation to the Authority. DEQ BRRO staff are in discussions with the Authority to resolve the enforcement action.

## <u>TYSON FARMS, INC., TEMPERANCEVILLE, VIRGINIA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION</u> <u>SYSTEM (VPDES) PERMIT PROGRAM, CONSENT ORDER WITH CIVIL CHARGE AND CORRECTIVE</u>

**ACTION PLAN** Tyson Farms, Inc. ("Tyson") is a manufacturing operation located in Temperanceville. The manufacturing operation consists of a poultry hatchery, which supplies chicks to contract growers, and poultry processing ("Facility"). Poultry processing including the slaughtering, defeathering, eviscerating, chilling, packaging, and shipping of poultry products for human consumption to an offsite destination.

DEQ re-issued VPDES Permit No. VA0004049 ("Permit") to Tyson on January 1, 2016 (expires on December 31, 2020). The Permit authorizes Tyson to discharge stormwater and wastewater resulting from poultry processing and rendering operations. The Permit requires Tyson to monitor and report compliance with effluent limits for biological oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>), ammonia, fecal coliform, *E.coli*, and total suspended solids (TSS).

In submitting Discharge Monitoring Reports ("DMRs"), as required by the Permit, Tyson listed that it exceeded discharge limits contained in Part I.A.1 of the Permit for ammonia for the March 2015, August 2015, and August 2016 reporting periods, TSS, *E. coli*, and fecal coliform for the March 2015 reporting period, and BOD5 for the September 2015 reporting period. Tyson also failed to provide a letter of explanation for non-compliance with its Permit limits.

DEQ issued to Tyson a Notice of Violation ("NOV") No. W2015-09-T-0003 on October 27, 2015 for the aforementioned violations. Tyson signed a proposed consent order to resolve the NOV on December 16, 2016 ("proposed December 2016 Order"), and then again on June 20, 2017 ("proposed June 2017 Order") following changes made to the proposed December 2016 Order in response to public comments (increased civil charge and enhanced CAP). On July 19, 2017, the proposed June 2017 Order was presented to the State Water Control Board ("SWCB") for approval. SWCB did not approve the Order, but advised DEQ to seek a higher civil penalty and more defined goals and dates for each CAP corrective action. Tyson signed a revised Order ("July 2018 Order") on July 25, 2018 that contained an additional increased civil charge. Tyson signed a revised Order ("proposed January 2019 Order") on January 16, 2019 that contained the CAP as Appendix A and added Appendix B with conditions for solids handling and water conservation.

On October 12, 2017, Tyson submitted a CAP, under which it is currently in compliance. The CAP and schedule require that Tyson fully examine the cause(s) of ammonia, TSS, E. coli, fecal coliform, and BOD5 exceedances at the Facility and describe actions that Tyson had taken or planned to take to comply consistently with the discharge limits established in the Permit. The CAP also includes a plan to address excess solids in the anaerobic lagoon on a continuous basis, water conservation goals, and plans for a third-party engineering process review for improved solids handling.

The land application of solids from Facility lagoons is a reoccurring operation and began again in spring 2019. A lagoon refurbishment is scheduled to begin in the fall of 2019 with completion no later than January 1, 2020 as listed in the proposed January 2019 Order.

Tyson has continued to evaluate its water consumption. During 2018, Tyson recognized a 6.7% reduction in groundwater use and 9.09% reduction in wastewater discharge compared to 2017. Tyson has updated its internal water conservation plan dated March 8, 2019.

Tyson submitted a third-party evaluation of its wastewater treatment operations on December 18, 2017. In addition to the audit of its wastewater treatment operations, Tyson also conducted a multi-media audit that was completed the week of July 16, 2018.

In addition to the CAP requirements set forth in the October 2017 CAP, Tyson has also submitted a revised solids disposal plan, O&M Manual, wastewater process control document, and updated wastewater flow diagram.

To date, Tyson has not had additional violations of the VPDES permit.

Civil Charge: \$30,160.