

Response to Comments
AK-000039-6
Cook Inlet Pipeline, Drift River Terminal

EPA prepared a draft permit and fact sheet for the reissuance of this permit. Those documents were public noticed on October 28, 2003. The comment period closed on November 28, 2003.

In a letter dated November 26, 2003, the National Marine Fisheries Service stated that they had no objection to the proposed re-authorization of the permit with regard to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) or Endangered Species.

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation provided their final certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act on December 10, 2003.

EPA received one comment letter from the Cook Inlet Regional Citizens Advisory Council (RCAC) which was dated November 25, 2003.

1. Comment: Cook Inlet RCAC notes that there is not a limit in the permit for Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) understanding that limited data has been collected. They encourage the company and EPA to follow up on this requirement during the permit cycle.

Response: The permit requires that the facility conduct 2 series of WET testing annually during different parts of the year if they have a discharge. With so few discharge events occurring during the last permit cycle, only 2 series of tests were conducted. With so few data points, EPA did not feel comfortable setting a permit limit. The permit does, however, contain a trigger level which acts like a limit in that, if it is exceeded, inventories and accelerated monitoring are required.

2. Comment: Cook Inlet RCAC recommends the ballast water treatment plant be upgraded to best available technology if operations change at the facility such that ballast water is regularly processed. They also encourage the facility to continue to explore ways to minimize the environmental impact of the discharges such as changing the point of discharge so that the effluent flows directly into Cook Inlet instead of the drainage ditch.

Response: EPA encourages practices that minimize the environmental impacts of any project and would support upgrades to the facility. However, as long as the facility is meeting its permit limits, EPA does not see the need to require an upgrade at this

time.

EPA notes that the table in Permit Part I.A.3. contained the term "30 day average" while the definitions contained the term "average monthly." EPA has changed the table to include the defined term of "average monthly."