

Department of Public Works

WILLIAM J. LEE MEMORIAL TOWN HALL
ONE LAFAYETTE STREET
WAKEFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01880

Tel. (781) 246-6301
Fax (781) 246-6266

RICHARD F. STINSON
Director of Public Works



March 31, 2010

EPA – Region 1
Attn: Thelma Murphy
Office of Ecosystem Protection
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code: OEP06-4
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Subject: Comments on the Draft Massachusetts North Coastal
Small MS4 General Permit for Stormwater Management

Dear Ms. Murphy,

The Town of Wakefield appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Small Municipal Storm Sewer System (MS4) General Permit for North Coastal Massachusetts. As with other communities, Wakefield shares in the responsibility to protect water resources from pollution generated via municipal stormwater runoff. As a Public Works Director, I am also very concerned with the operation and maintenance of the Town's infrastructure as well as budgetary constraints.

To echo comments made by other communities at the past and most recent public hearing, this unfunded mandate in its current form is an enormous financial burden to cities and towns.

Therefore, I offer the following comments from people "in the field" responsible for implementing this permit in the hope of shaping it to be a workable, effective and financially responsible plan for local communities.

General Comments

The "paper burden" associated with the implementation of this permit is staggering; the Notice of Intent (NOI), Stormwater Management Program (SWMP), Spill Prevention plans, in addition to reporting requirements. We should be streamlining, generic, preformatted templates generated by one agency instead of many individual communities working independently.

Some items which would be beneficial include:

- Flow chart or other graphical means to guide the average layperson through the permit process.
- Preformatted GIS resources to support NOI submission: Endangered Species, Historic Properties, impaired water body limits, etc.
- Streamlined forms or online submission for NOI, Stormwater Management Program (SWMP), reporting, etc.
- Technical Assistance help, via phone or web based.
- Improved training resources and available classes to meet the training requirements for in-house personnel – live classes, webinar training programs, or pre-recorded video.
- **The key piece to this entire permit is the funding and we ask that the EPA find ways to provide these funding opportunities for municipalities to comply with the requirements.**

Geographical Data

The Draft Permit requires an enormous quantity of data to be gathered and mapped in a very short time frame in order to meet all of the permit requirements. The logistics of developing a project of this magnitude in 2 years would be difficult, if not impossible, and very expensive.

As an alternative approach, we recommend developing detailed mapping of a specific drainage area once a “hot spot” is found. In this way the mapping can be developed overtime concurrent with testing focusing resources in locations where potential pollution sources have been identified instead of undertaking all mapping at one time.

Specific Comments

Section 2.4.2 Public education and outreach

*Assistance from EPA and/or DEP with education and outreach would be very helpful; brochures, mailers, door hangers, generic presentation, etc. should be provided to municipalities for the education and outreach within the community. **Further, the materials should be made available at no cost to communities.** The community would be responsible for the distribution. This would ensure that the program is a success.*

Section 2.4.4.8 d Systematic Procedure for Locating and Removing Illicit Connections

The requirement for Dry-weather monitoring at manholes is very time-consuming and costly and in our opinion it does not provide any information that cannot be collected from dry-weather outfall inspections. Additionally, the requirement of partially damming inlets for a 48-hour period at manholes where no flow is observed is extremely costly **and also extremely dangerous**. To do this work will require special care in entering the structures as it is considered a confined space entry. Also, if a storm event happens during this damming it will likely result in flooding and blockages of pipes with the damming materials in an inaccessible location. This approach will result in infrastructure damage, personal property damage, and injury to citizens

and staff. Further, the flooding damage, liability issues and replacement cost burden, associated with this unsound approach, would be staggering.

We urge EPA to remove this requirement and recommend that outfall inspections for dry-weather flow be the determining factor for further catchment investigations.

Section 2.4.7.1.d.vi. Catch basin inventory program (CBIP)

Data collection for individual catch basin inspection and maintenance is very time-consuming and costly. Funds would be better spent on good housekeeping and pollution prevention within the MS4.

We recommend that this monitoring requirement be eliminated, or at a minimum the requirement be modified to document in qualitative manner catch basins that have higher sediment levels. In that way areas or specific basins with higher sediment load can be cleaned at a higher frequency.

Section 2.4.6.9.c Retrofitting of BMPs

The inventory of all MS4 property and Right-of-Way (ROW) for the potential of BMP installation is daunting. The logistics of developing a project of that magnitude in 2 years would be impossible and very expensive. In Wakefield's case the Town maintains over 100 miles of ROW and developing this inventory would be overwhelming not to mention that the inventory report will become obsolete in a short period of time.

As an alternative we recommend evaluating properties or ROW at the time they undergo major renovation or reconstruction for the potential of retrofitting with BMP.

Section 2.4.7.2.b.4. Quarterly inspections of the listed facilities.

*We recommend that **this be changed to an every two (2) year inspection** as quarterly is impossible and it is unlikely to provide any measurable difference in performance.*

Section 3.0 Outfall Monitoring Program

For Wakefield and other similar communities having hundreds of outfalls, the implementation of an Outfall Monitoring Program is logistically difficult and very expensive.

We recommend that the EPA allow MS4s to substitute end of pipe sampling with strategic in-stream sampling to more efficiently indentify problem areas and further allow the focus to be on improvements to problem catchments as opposed to bulk sampling which competes with funding for other important programs, such as: finding and removing illicit discharges.

Section 3.2 discusses dry-weather screening and analytical monitoring and includes an extensive list of items to be monitored including ammonia, conductivity, E. Coli, pH, potassium, surfactants, temperature, and turbidity.

We recommend the reduction of the list to those samples that provide the most significant results. Items such as pH give very little relevant data that can be used for discovering or

resolving major issues. A limited suite will provide more relevant data at a lower cost allowing for more efficient tracking and removal of illicit discharges.

Section 3.3 Wet-weather sampling of all the MS4 outfalls.

Wet-weather sampling results are extremely variable and are effected by any number of factors such as; what point in a storm a sample is taken and when the previous storm event occurred. The numerous variables and inconsistent results amount to significant data that cannot readily be correlated to any known sources or results. Duplicating wet-weather sample results from a particular outfall is nearly impossible. This sampling is extremely costly and there is essentially no practical benefit. Further, this type of sampling can be extremely dangerous to staff and others.

*We **recommend that this requirement be removed** from the permit and the focus remain on dry-weather and in-stream sampling.*

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide public comments on the draft small Municipal Storm Sewer System (MS4) general permit for North Coastal Massachusetts.

Very truly yours,



Richard F. Stinson
Director of Public Works