

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY DIVISION OF WATER QUALITY

P.O. Box 10009

Richmond, VA 23240-0009

SUBJECT: General VPDES Permit for Seafood Processing Facilities, Amendment of 9 VAC 25-115 - June 16, 2004 Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee

TO: Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Mike Gregory

DATE: June 24, 2004

COPIES: Cindy Berndt

On June 16, 2004, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the reissuance amendment of the General VPDES Permit for Seafood Processing Facilities convened in Richmond. The purpose of this meeting was to identify changes considered necessary to the existing general permit prior to drafting a reissuance to become effective July 25, 2006. Attending the meeting were Deborah Morgan from the Piedmont regional Office, Carl Thomas from the Tidewater Regional Office and Mike Gregory from the Central Office. Lake Cowart of Cowart Seafood Corporation and Bill Gaidos of Friends of the North Fork of the Shenandoah were unable to attend but called in to provide input.

No major changes to the regulation establishing the general permit are considered necessary. Minor editorial changes and regulatory language updates were discussed and comments were solicited on any other changes considered appropriate.

The committee discussed, or comments were provided by phone, on the following issues:

- No specific changes to the general permit are desired.
- Due to the failing oyster and crab industries in Virginia there are fewer facilities now covered by the general permit (from around 300 in the past to around 77 now). Of these, some are not operating but wish to retain general permit coverage in hopes of better seasons to come.
- The issue of nutrient discharges (phosphorus or nitrogen) to Chesapeake Bay must be looked at again, considering ongoing efforts with nutrient standards and other new regulations and policies. Nutrient data was gathered and considered in a discharge study that was conducted when this general permit was first issued, and impacts were considered negligible. The number of facilities covered by the permit now are fewer, with in most cases smaller or no discharges, and none of the facilities now covered by the general permit are on the

Chesapeake Bay Significant Dischargers of Nutrients list. Also to be considered is that high nutrient discharges are only small portions of total plant flow (e.g., 10 gallons/day of retort discharge from a crab steaming operation). However, I will review data with respect to nutrient discharges in order to determine if the original assumption of low impact is still valid. At the least, nutrients must be addressed further in the fact sheet.

- TMDLs and how they relate to general permits are under study at this time, so consideration will be given to TMDL issues in this permit reissuance.
- Disposal of cleaning materials should be considered.
- A question was raised as to why the standard EPA reopener was part of the current general permit (Part I.B.5.).
- Current federal effluent guidelines for this industry will be reviewed for any changes that will be necessary, since the existing permit is based on these.
- Reopeners (EPA, Nutrient, TMDL), and their appropriateness in a general permit, will be further investigated and discussed with Central Office management and EPA.
- The storm water section needs to be reviewed to see if it is sufficient to cover updates to the federal industrial sector storm water requirements.
- The current set up in CEDS (agency database) does not allow for the correct printing out of DMRs and they have to be produced manually. A service order needs to be sent to OIS to see if this problem can be fixed. (Note similar problem with the industrial storm water general permit.)
- The standard special condition for Quantification Levels (of sample analysis) and Compliance Reporting should be added.
- Oil and Grease as a testing parameter should be checked vs TPH or other similar test parameter.

Further communication with the TAC will be by phone and email (or mail) in this next phase of the reissuance while data is being reviewed and a first draft is being prepared. The need for another meeting in the future will be decided after that.

I will keep the committee informed of any other changes that become necessary after further review and as I draft any revisions. Once a first draft is prepared I will forward it to the committee and ask for comments before proceeding with processing.