

<p>Notes from EPA's meeting with JBLM staff July 19, 2011</p> <p>Participants: John Palmer, Dino Marshalonis, Misha Vakoc (EPA) Martin Buress, Jennifer Smith, Phil Crawford, Paul Steuke (JBLM)</p>	
General concerns	<p>Why isn't this permit more like the 2009 Fort Carson MS4 Permit? This permit is twice the size of Ft Carson's</p> <p>Why not use a general permit? General perception is that this permit requires JBLM to do more than anyone else does</p> <p>Training, maintenance requirements should look more like the Ft Carson permit instead of being so prescriptive that it puts JBLM in a box (see egg comment below) too prescriptive limits innovation</p> <p>Why does the permit apply to the entire JBLM? What could possibly be located within the training area that would be subject to the SWMP? Don't include entire training area – suggest scaling back the mapping requirement to only define what is, what is not, a MS4, & update only that assessment as necessary – the military will not build in training areas</p> <p>Draft Permit requirements for Non-stormwater discharges are quite stringent, don't match the MSGP or CGP, (which are what JBLM is accustomed to using) – issues like waterline flushing, groundwater used as contact cooling water, snow management provisions of the permit are confusing to JBLM right now. Would like exemptions or at least for these requirements to be more like the MSGP</p> <p>5,000 sq ft threshold trigger for new/redevelopment & construction requirements creates more work for less bang for the buck – JBLM will suggest going back to 1 acre minimum requirement, or perhaps 10,000 sq ft threshold instead</p> <p>JBLM is ok with prohibition of residential car washing – forces folks on base to use the centralized wash racks.</p> <p>General concern about compliance with the permit/ enforcement liability</p>
Retrofit provisions	<p>Massive Capital Costs of retrofitting are too high – retrofitting 15% of existing drainage on base is too big a target – the Ft Carson permit only “suggests” a retrofit evaluation but doesn't require/prescribe it – no existing JBLM retrofit program exists at this time- they can get at the low hanging fruit via planning efforts, but cannot commit/be liable through the permit to implementing retrofits; establishing the baseline will be difficult enough - suggest using a different end point instead of defining it by % of existing discharge</p>
Sequalitchew Lake/ Creek	<p>Is totally impounded by beaver dams & ponds, such that the creek doesn't necessarily exist – managing the beaver population will restore flow in the creek, but there are other concerned groups (save the beavers, etc) which do</p>

	<p>not want any eradication program to be done. Nearby gravel mine also affects the goal of restoring the creek to its natural flows. Extensive creek & lake management has been done over the years – complex wetland condition – what is the natural condition? creek& lake are adjacent to the spring which provides drinking water for the entire base- when the water level backs up into spring, water is released over a weir through the diversion canal to Puget Sound</p> <p>JBLM will suggest eliminating the reqmt for WQ monitoring in the Creek/Lake – instead, perhaps “do not discharge SW to Creek” – JBLM already conducting visual monitoring</p>
General environmental regulation on the base	<p>Referred to as AR-200-1 which contains the general env rules that apply to JBLM; this could be revised, but JBLM is discussing internally whether it may be best to enact a completely standalone SW regulation</p> <p>Chapter 6 Guidance has been updated to include LID – are updated annually, and are implemented nationally by the Army Corps of Engineers Centers for Expertise are the “designers” of new construction projects – they need to be convinced to do things differently – they are often receptive to base regulations dictating certain local design standards, characteristics/requirements, but otherwise will follow DoD standard design provisions Chapter 6 is just guidance!!</p> <p>What about requirements for the maintenance of cisterns, &/or the use of reclaimed water?</p>
Philosophical	<p>In military jargon, “please don’t use this permit to tell us how to suck the egg”</p> <p>DoD higher-ups do not believe EISA Sec 438 should appear in any form within the MS4 permits, as it is not a CWA issue – EPA will hear comments to this effect</p> <p>DoD considers “predevelopment” to refer to <i>structures/drainage which existed on site immediately prior to construction</i> – predevelopment, in their minds, does not refer to pre-human natural hydrology</p> <p>JBLM has a goal by 2020 to be Zero Discharge</p>
Existing SW program at JBLM	<p>This permit will cost a lot to implement – JBLM is capital & FTE limited, is concerned about the resources necessary to do everything the draft permit requires. The Base is facing downsizing, and wonders where \$\$ for staff and capital improvements will come from. The standalone program is currently funded by 1FTE (Martin Burress) and one contract employee (Jennifer Smith); Maintenance is conducted separately (partial FTE)- Public Works works closely with Lyle (X) who is under a different supervisor/command(??) Phil Crawford is Martin’s boss</p>
Appropriate timing for requirements to develop regulations or asking for capital expenditures	<p>2 years is a minimum timeframe for developing and adopting a base-level regulation – 2 years is the absolute minimum for base to request new capital improvement funding – there is a question about JBLM’s legal liability under the permit if the funding is not allocated by the DoD command</p>

Public Private Partnerships on JBLM	Equity LLC has a 50 year ground lease for all residential housing areas and therefore are not directly under the control of JBLM command – there is a question of authority, however JBLM is certain that Equity can operate as a cooperative entity via the permit – if in the future there is any problem, Equity could be told to seek their own separate MS4 stormwater permit from EPA – there is an environmental section to the ground lease document which can be modified to accommodate the requirements of the MS4 permit – EPA should expect to receive comments from Equity on the draft permit
Timing & Funding for new construction projects	Ex: If program funds in July 2011 for military construction (milcon) projects costing more than \$750 million, it takes approx. 1 yr for funding to get approved, one year for design & construction therefore JBLM will reasonably need at least 2 years as a timeline within the permit
Enforcement authorities	A JBLM –level ordinance or regulation is enforced through the military justice system = binding on base, but not necessarily to/over anyone else. If requirements are within statute or code, even better.
ESA	Any prior consultations with Services regarding the JBLM comprehensive plan, etc? Mr. David Clouse (253-967-3474) is familiar with past ESA consultations on JBLM.