

Additional Comments on the Monitoring and Reporting Section:

After two full MS4 permit terms and nearly 13 years of conducting storm water monitoring, the Port has collected an extensive amount of storm water data. The Port's monitoring program has been reviewed and scrutinized several times during this time period by the Regional Water Board and, in 2008, by an extensive USEPA audit.

As a result, the Port has made continuing improvements to the storm water monitoring program helping to assure collected samples and analytical results are representative and reliable. Immediately after the 2008 audit, the Port implemented the recommended monitoring program changes identified in the audit which, among other things, primarily involved the method of collection and analysis for oil and grease and volatile organic compounds. Subsequently, data collected during the 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 storm seasons did not show any significant difference from the data of samples collected prior to the audit. Had pre-audit methodology been skewing the analytical results, the Port would have expected to have seen a difference in the results when the methodology was changed. But, because this was not the case, the Port believes the entire previous data set is defensible, reliable, and representative. In light of this, the Port is very concerned to see the aggressive monitoring program proposed in this tentative permit; especially given the following as reported to the Regional Water Board in the previous annual reports and the Report of Waste Discharge:

- Since the USEPA audit, two complete rounds (8 sampling events over two wet seasons) of toxicity testing of receiving water and the retention basin and west complex direct discharges were conducted in accordance with suggestions and recommendations made by the USEPA. No toxicity was observed in any of these sample events and, therefore, increased toxicity monitoring is not justified.
- During the 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 storm water seasons, the Port's receiving water monitoring results showed no exceedances of receiving water quality objectives attributable to the Port's discharges. This should be cause for reducing the monitoring instead of requiring additional monitoring.
- A review of data collected since 2001 shows that the following compounds have never been detected in any of the direct discharge sampling: carbaryl compounds, chlorinated herbicides, organochlorine pesticides, semi-volatile organics, oil and grease, chlorpyrifos, and mercury. Thus, the monitoring for these compounds should be reduced, if not eliminated.
- A review of data collected since 2001 shows that the following compounds have seldom been detected in any of the direct discharge sampling and never above water quality objectives: poly aromatic hydrocarbons, nitrites, phosphorous, and

sulfide. Thus, the monitoring for these compounds should be reduced, if not eliminated.

- Although benchmarks are not directly applicable to an MS4 discharge, the Port's monitoring program has in the past compared its data to benchmarks to demonstrate a reduction in benchmark exceedances.

The Port would like to obtain clarification from the Regional Water Board on the justification of proposing such an aggressive monitoring program, especially when all data indicates that a reduction in monitoring requirements would be justified. We are completely opposed to the concept of "confirmation sampling" as proposed in the Tentative Permit. More than sufficient data has been collected over the past decade. It is now time to reduce the monitoring program to only sample and test for the likely potential pollutants based on the past sampling history.

In addition to dropping analyses that have never been detected at significant levels, the Port also requests the Regional Water Board to consider dropping analytical tests that are either redundant or have never served a significant purpose in evaluating the Port's storm water program. Specifically, we would like to see the following addressed:

- We do not see value in monitoring both BOD and COD; historically these tests have provided basically the same information to the Port. We propose to drop COD and continue to monitor BOD.
- We do not see the value of monitoring both turbidity and TSS. We believe these two tests indicate the same pollutant. Therefore, we propose that the Regional Board drop turbidity.
- We do not see the value of monitoring for specific conductivity and total dissolved solids. We believe these two tests indicate the same pollutant. We propose that the Regional Board drop TDS.
- We do not see the value of testing for TKN and believe it should be dropped. We believe ammonia and nitrates are appropriate analyses for the potential nitrogen containing pollutants and they can be compared to applicable water quality objectives; where TKN cannot be easily evaluated to such a numeric reference.