

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
MAR - 7 2002

ENVIRONMENTAL
HEARINGS OFFICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

AIRPORT COMMUNITIES
COALITION,

Appellant,

CITIZENS AGAINST SEA-TAC
EXPANSION,

Intervenor/Appellant,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY; and
PORT OF SEATTLE,

Respondents.

PCHB No. 01-160

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KEVIN
FITZPATRICK SUBMITTED ON
BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY

AR 002881

1 Kevin Fitzpatrick declares as follows:

2 **I. My Experience**

3 1. I am employed by the Department of Ecology (Ecology) in the Water Quality
4 Program in the Northwest Regional Office. I am a Section Manager of the Northwest Regional
5 Office Water Quality Section with responsibility for managing the activities of over 38
6 professional staff, including environmental engineers, environmental specialists, and
7 hydrogeologists. This section is tasked with meeting goals and objectives of the Water Quality
8 Program which include the regulation of municipal and industrial points sources and the
9 discharges of process or stormwater discharges from these sources, implementation of
10 Washington State's non-point source control action plan, development and implementation of
11 Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) or Water Cleanup Plans on those state waters that have
12 been listed as impaired for not meeting the state's water quality standards, as well as provide
13 technical expertise to other Ecology programs on water quality issues. I have been directly
14 involved with the Third Runway Project Clean Water Act § 401 Certification (401
15 Certification) since September 1999. I have most recently provided technical assistance on
16 water quality issues to the principal author of the 401 Certification, Ann Kenny. I am familiar
17 with the water quality aspects of the 401 Certification, with the Port's National Pollutant
18 Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and the acceptable fill criteria developed in the
19 401 Certification.

20 2. I have been employed by the Department of Ecology since September 1986.
21 During that time I have held the following positions: Environmental Crime Investigator, Water
22 Quality Inspector, and Supervisor of the Industrial Permit Unit. My educational background
23 includes the following: BS in Biology from Loyola University of Chicago 1975, MA in
24 Zoology from Southern Illinois University 1981, completion of United States Coast Guard
25 Officer Candidate School and commission in February 1981, as well as a variety of in-service
26 professional courses on oil spill response, hydrogeology, hydrology, NPDES permit

1 writing/management, environmental chemistry, geochemistry and wetland ecology. My
2 resume is attached hereto as Attachment A.

3 II. The NPDES Permit

4 3. Stormwater discharges from Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (STIA) have
5 been regulated under a NPDES permit since 1995. Ecology issued the current version of the
6 permit in February 1998. Ecology issued a major modification to the permit in 2001 to include
7 new discharges from construction activities to receiving waters that had not been previously
8 listed. Also included in this most recent modification are stricter monitoring and reporting
9 requirements for these new discharges. The permit will be revised and reissued in June 2002
10 and will build upon and complement many of the water quality requirements found in the 401
11 Certification.

12 4. The Port's STIA NPDES permit requires the Port to comply with best
13 management practices (BMPs) for the control and treatment of stormwater. The BMPs are set
14 forth in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) required by Condition S2 of the
15 permit. The SWPPP includes both source control BMPs and treatment BMPs. Source control
16 BMPs include measures such as spill containment and control, elimination of environmentally
17 harmful materials from an industrial operation such as runway de-icing, or re-routing of
18 stormwater run-off from an industrial operation from the stormwater drainage system to the
19 Industrial Wastewater System. These management practices prevent pollution from entering
20 stormwater. Treatment BMPs include facilities such as filter strips, compost/peat filters, sand
21 filters, activated media filters and wet ponds which filter and remove pollutants from
22 stormwater prior to discharge to area streams.

23 5. The use of treatment and source control BMPs in the permit to treat stormwater
24 is consistent with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance regarding
25 stormwater NPDES permits and is consistent with Ecology's water quality standards. WAC
26 173-201A-160(3)(a) states that "the primary means to be used for requiring compliance with

1 the standards” for non-point source and stormwater pollution “shall be through best
2 management practices.” EPA’s guidance states, similarly:

3 Due to the nature of storm water discharges, and the typical lack of information
4 on which to base numeric water quality-based effluent limitations (expressed as
5 concentration and mass), EPA will use an interim permitting approach for
6 NPDES storm water permits.

7 The interim permitting approach uses best management practices (BMPs) in
8 first-round storm water permits, and expanded or better-tailored BMPs in
9 subsequent permits, where necessary, to provide for the attainment of water
10 quality standards. In cases where adequate information exists to develop more
11 specific conditions or limitations to meet standards, these conditions or
12 limitations are to be incorporated into storm water permits, as necessary and
13 appropriate.

14 EPA Memorandum from Robert Percisepe regarding Interim Permitting Approach for Water
15 Quality Based Effluent Limitations in Stormwater Permits, p. 2. Pursuant to EPA’s guidance,
16 BMPs may be used in NPDES stormwater permits as a substitute for numeric effluent
17 limitations because numeric limits “can be very difficult to develop at this time because of the
18 existing state of knowledge about the intermittent and variable nature of these types of
19 discharges and their effects on receiving waters.” *Id.*

20 6. The Port’s NPDES permit also regulates discharges from the Port’s Industrial
21 Wastewater System (IWS). The IWS collects stormwater from certain areas of the airport as
22 well as wastewater from industrial operations. The IWS discharges via lagoons directly to
23 Puget Sound. The NPDES permit includes numeric effluent limitations for pH, flow, oil and
24 grease, and total suspended solids (TSS) for the IWS discharge. The NPDES permit also
25 required that lagoon 3 of the IWS be lined to prevent discharges to groundwater.

26 7. The NPDES permit contains numerous monitoring requirements. Special
Condition S2 requires the Port to monitor effluent from the IWS, non-construction stormwater,
and construction stormwater. For non-construction stormwater, the Port is required to monitor
for TPH, TSS, turbidity, fecal coliform, BOD, glycols, and total recoverable copper, lead, and
zinc. The Port is required to submit monitoring results to Ecology in an annual monitoring
summary report. The NPDES permit does not currently require the Port to monitor upstream

1 or downstream of its stormwater outfalls nor does the permit require the Port to monitor for the
2 dissolved fractions of copper, lead, or zinc. The NPDES permit also does not currently require
3 the Port to monitor the hardness of the receiving water. Hardness data of the receiving water
4 and the stormwater effluent would make comparisons between total recoverable metal
5 concentrations in the stormwater effluent with acute and chronic criteria for metals easier;
6 however, these comparisons are still possible to make by relying upon historic seasonal values
7 for hardness in these same receiving waters.

8 8. The NPDES permit requires acute toxicity testing for stormwater. Condition
9 S10. This testing, referred to as whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, involves determining
10 the toxicity of the Port's stormwater to certain sensitive marine organisms. The Port conducted
11 this testing pursuant to Condition S10. Those test results indicated acute toxicity in the
12 stormwater whole effluent at the Port's SDN 1 outfall. This acute toxicity was caused by
13 elevated concentrations of zinc. The Port traced the source of the zinc to certain metal covered
14 roofs in that area and it has proposed to paint or cover those roofs to eliminate that toxicity.

15 III. The Variable Nature Of Stormwater

16 9. Stormwater is inherently variable in both quantity and pollutant concentrations.
17 It is variable in quantity because rain falls at different rates and different times and may
18 infiltrate into the ground or runoff at different rates depending on the type of surface upon
19 which it falls. Pollutant concentrations in stormwater also depend on the surfaces over which
20 the water passes. Runoff from high traffic impervious surfaces such as roads often contain
21 hydrocarbons and metals that were deposited on the surface by automobiles. Runoff from
22 landscaped areas may, on the other hand, contain pesticides or herbicides applied to those areas
23 for weed or pest control. The concentrations of pollutants within stormwater typically vary
24 within a single rainfall event, with the highest level of pollutants occurring in the first part of
25 the storm, as pollutants are washed off in the storm's first flush, and then tapering downward
26 over time.

AR 002885

1 10. Because of this variability, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to apply
2 the numeric water quality standards in WAC 173-201A to stormwater discharges. The water
3 quality standards assume a steady-state industrial discharge that does not have the variability of
4 stormwater. The water quality standards for copper, lead, and zinc, for example, require
5 showing an exceedence of the numeric criteria on an average basis over time. The acute
6 criteria for copper, lead, and zinc are expressed as a one-hour average concentration not to be
7 exceeded more than once every three years on the average. The chronic criteria are expressed
8 as a four-day average concentration not to be exceeded more than once every three years on
9 average. Because of the variability of pollutant concentrations in stormwater, it is difficult to
10 determine an average concentration sustained over the necessary period of time. It is also
11 extremely difficult to attribute an exceedence in a particular stream with any particular outfall.

12 11. In their testimony, the ACC relies on the Port's annual monitoring reports to
13 claim that STIA stormwater discharges violate water quality criteria. These statements are
14 incorrect for two reasons. First, the Port's samples show instantaneous exceedences of the
15 numeric criteria but they do not show that the criteria were exceeded for the necessary length
16 of time. Second, the Port's monitoring reports refer only to concentrations in the Port's
17 discharges, not to concentrations in the receiving waters. Ecology's water quality standards
18 apply only to the receiving waters. To establish a violation of water quality standards for
19 metals in the receiving waters, it would be necessary for the Port to sample both upstream and
20 downstream of its discharges. Such sampling is difficult if not impossible in the case of STIA
21 because the Port's discharges pass through pipes, ponds, ditches, and other detention facilities
22 before reaching the streams. The Port's discharges from outfall SDS 3, for example, flow into
23 the northwest ponds, which form the headwaters of the west branch of Des Moines Creek.
24 Even if the Port took upstream and downstream samples, it would be difficult to determine the
25 one-hour average concentration in the stream because of fluctuations in stream volume and
26

AR 002886

1 chemical composition. There is considerable debate within the field regarding the proper
2 sampling method to accurately characterize pollutant concentrations in stormwater.

3 12. Ecology also believes that ACC is in error in its reading of Port of Seattle
4 "STIA Construction Site Stormwater Monitoring" reports and its conclusion that turbidity
5 violations of the state's water quality standards occurred. Greg Wingard, consultant to ACC,
6 erroneously concluded that upstream and downstream monitoring results in these reports was a
7 reference to upstream and downstream locations in the surrounding receiving waters. The
8 upstream and downstream monitoring locations are, in fact, upstream and downstream
9 locations within the STIA stormwater collection system. These locations were set up by
10 environmental staff with the Port of Seattle to determine the effectiveness of on-site sediment
11 and erosion control measures in place at construction sites on Port of Seattle property. These
12 monitoring locations are not located in the surrounding receiving waters or waters of the state
13 and are confined to the STIA stormwater conveyance systems. The reported results for
14 turbidity in no way reflect actual conditions for turbidity of the receiving waters on the
15 monitoring dates in question.

16 IV. Water Effects Ratio Study

17 13. Metals in stormwater may exist in both dissolved and particulate form. The
18 dissolved fraction of the metal is of primary concern because it is bio-available and may be
19 toxic to marine organisms. The relationship between the dissolved fraction and the particulate
20 fraction of a metal in water is a complex one depending on a variety of the physical and
21 chemical characteristics of the water and the metal. For this reason, the toxicity of a metal may
22 vary from stream to stream and it may be inappropriate simply to apply the numeric water
23 quality standards stated in WAC 173-201A. A site specific analysis or Water Effects Ratio
24 (WER) study is necessary to accurately determine metal toxicity in particular receiving waters.
25 This fact is reflected in Ecology's water quality standards, which state that "the department
26 may revise the following criteria on a state wide or water body specific basis as needed to

1 protect aquatic life occurring in waters of the state and to increase the technical accuracy of the
2 criteria being applied.” WAC 173-201A-040(3).

3 14. WER studies are described in guidance established by the EPA. *Interim*
4 *Guidance on Determination and Use of Water-Effect Ratios for Metals*, EPA-823-B-94-001.
5 Ecology’s Water Quality Program *Permit Writer’s Manual* provides additional guidance and
6 documentation of Ecology’s decisions on WER studies where the process is different than that
7 described by EPA or where the EPA document has optional conditions for the permitting
8 authority to decide. In general, a WER study seeks to determine the seasonal partitioning of
9 the dissolved species of a metal in the ambient conditions of the receiving water in relation to
10 an effluent discharge. The effluent discharges in this case are the stormwater discharges from
11 STIA to the surrounding receiving waters which include Miller, Walker and Des Moines
12 Creeks.

13 15. The 401 Certification requires the Port to conduct such a site specific study to
14 determine the toxicity of metals in the STIA stormwater discharges in the receiving waters of
15 Miller, Walker, and Des Moines Creeks. Condition J2(a). The findings of the comprehensive
16 WER study will go directly to determining whether the Port’s STIA stormwater discharges
17 reported through the current monitoring requirements of its NPDES permit exceed or comply
18 with the acute and chronic criteria for these metals in the state’s water quality standards. The
19 results of this study also will contribute to establishing final effluent limitations for metals of
20 concern in the STIA stormwater discharges and a compliance schedule for the Port to meet
21 these limits in the Port’s revised NPDES permit to be issued this year.

22 16. The Port will be required to monitor its stormwater discharges to determine if
23 the established effluent limitations are met. If they are not met, the Port will be required to
24 install those necessary additional treatment BMPs to meet the established limits. The results of
25 the WER study and the ongoing monitoring will contribute greatly to Ecology’s and the Port’s
26 knowledge on selecting additional treatment BMPs that can address pollutants of concern. In

1 the meantime, the 401 Certification prohibits any stormwater discharges from new impervious
2 surfaces until the effluent limitations are established in the Port's revised NPDES permit.

3 17. The Port's Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan, reviewed by King
4 County, recognizes that additional water quality BMPs may be required. The plan states:
5 "NPDES Permit Compliance is continually executed via an adaptive management process by
6 which (1) BMPs are implemented, (2) monitoring and inspections demonstrate BMP
7 effectiveness, (3) BMP improvements are made when necessary, and (4) follow-up sampling
8 demonstrates the improvements are effective." Sec. 2.2.1. As explained above, this adaptive
9 management approach is consistent with Ecology's water quality standards and EPA guidance.
10 Dissolved metals are a significant problem in urban stormwater but are difficult to address
11 because of the lack of data regarding effective treatment techniques. Likely sources of metals
12 in urban stormwater are automobile tires and brake pads. At STIA, aircraft tires and brake
13 pads also are likely metal sources. The Port is addressing this problem through the WER
14 study, the WET testing, and through the retrofit of its existing stormwater facilities.

15 V. Retrofit

16 18. The Port is constructing new stormwater facilities and retrofitting its existing
17 stormwater facilities to meet flow control associated with a target flow regime of 75% forested,
18 15% till pasture, and 10% impervious surface pre-development condition. This flow condition
19 was determined to be the most beneficial for restoring highly disrupted urban streams in the
20 University of Washington basin study of Des Moines Creek. This level of flow control will
21 have the added effect of reducing pollutant concentrations in the Port's stormwater by slowing
22 down the Port's stormwater discharges and increasing opportunities for pollutants to settle out
23 in the stormwater detention facilities. The 401 Certification also requires that the Port retrofit
24 existing stormwater facilities with necessary treatment BMPs at a rate commensurate with the
25 addition of new impervious surface. This rate is for every 10% percent of new impervious
26 surface added the Port must demonstrate that 20% percent of retrofitting has occurred.

1 **VI. Reasonable Potential Analysis Not Done**

2 19. The ACC contends that Ecology conducted a reasonable potential analysis of
3 the Port's stormwater discharges and found that basic treatment BMPs were inadequate to
4 remove dissolved metals. This statement is not correct. Ecology has not conducted a
5 reasonable potential analysis of the Port's stormwater discharges. The NPDES permit fact
6 sheet refers to such an analysis conducted by the Port but, to my knowledge, that analysis has
7 not been submitted to Ecology for consideration in developing any past or current STIA
8 NPDES permit. The Port's analysis was attached as Appendix F to the 1998 Preliminary
9 Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. It concluded that "BMPs should produce
10 stormwater effluent that would meet Washington State water quality standards." p. 6-1.

11 20. A reasonable potential analysis, as described in Ecology's Water Quality
12 Program *Permit Writer's Manual*, is an analysis of whether a specific discharge with specific
13 constituents has a reasonable potential to cause a violation of water quality standards given a
14 particular set of treatments. Due to the variability inherent in stormwater, this type of analysis
15 cannot be easily done on stormwater discharges. The procedures established in the *Permit
16 Writer's Manual* for reasonable potential analysis are geared toward evaluating steady-state
17 industrial or municipal process wastewater discharges. Applying this analysis to stormwater
18 discharges is inappropriate and will only yield inconclusive and unintelligible results.

19 **VII. Glycols**

20 21. ACC also contends that glycols are likely to be a problem in STIA's
21 stormwater. In this regard, the Port already has re-routed areas of stormwater discharge
22 containing glycols to its IWS. Thus, I expect concentrations of glycols in the Port's STIA
23 discharges to decline. My review of the Port's annual monitoring reports confirms that such a
24 decline appears to be occurring. If future monitoring indicates a need for further treatment of
25 glycols, such treatment can be imposed pursuant to the NPDES permit.

26 **AR 002890**

VIII. The Cascade Pole NPDES Permit Is Irrelevant

1
2 22. Tom Luster in his Pre-Filed Testimony refers to a recent permit issued by the
3 Department of Ecology's Southwest Regional Office to Cascade Pole and Lumber to argue that
4 Ecology can set stormwater effluent limits in NPDES permits for industrial sources when
5 necessary. He concludes that the same should be done for the STIA NPDES permit. Cascade
6 Pole and Lumber is a wood-treating operation. This is a markedly different industry with
7 markedly different stormwater pollutant sources than those found at a major international
8 airport. It is also in an industry group that has been subject to intensive regulation and research
9 in controlling its major pollutant source, pentachlorophenol. This intensive effort by the
10 Department of Ecology on the wood-treating industry in Washington State began in 1992 with
11 the development of a model NPDES permit for wood-treaters.

12 23. All of the wood-treating industries in Washington State have been brought
13 under this model permit and the work of the last ten years with this industry has been to
14 develop final effluent limits for pentachlorophenol in each facility's stormwater discharges.
15 The industry has determined that they can often meet these effluent limits for
16 pentachlorophenol by putting in place effective and fairly standard source control BMPs (e.g.,
17 roofing and containment over process and storage areas, prevention of stormwater run-on to
18 process areas, immediate spill control and containment, etc.). The challenges of source control
19 on one specific industrial pollutant source, though significant, pale in comparison to the
20 challenges of source control at a major municipal airport. Also, a closer review of this wood-
21 treater permit will reveal that not all the pollutants from this industrial source have a final
22 effluent limit established for stormwater discharges from the facility. Pollutants from wood-
23 treaters which are the subject of continued and future study and do not as yet have final
24 effluent limits established are the dioxins and furans that are known to be generated from the
25 industrial operations of wood-treaters.

26
AR 002891

IX. 401 and 402

1
2 24. Mr. Luster contends in his testimony that it is inappropriate in the context of a
3 401 Certification to rely on an adaptive management approach under § 402 of the Act utilizing
4 an NPDES permit. I disagree. Issuance of an NPDES permit by Ecology is a determination
5 that water quality standards are met by a proposal, provided the conditions in the permit are
6 met. Because an NPDES permit must be reissued every five years, it may be updated with new
7 technology or water quality based effluent limitations. The mere fact that the permit may be
8 updated based on new monitoring results, new conditions, or new technology does not mean
9 that issuance of the permit now is a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Similarly, it is
10 not in my view a violation of the CWA to issue a 401 Certification that includes the possibility
11 of future, more stringent, requirements to be imposed under an NPDES permit. Reasonable
12 assurance that water quality standards will be met derives in such circumstances from the
13 establishment of a feedback loop that allows for continual upgrading of operational, source
14 control, and treatment BMPs.

15 25. In July 2001, Ecology adopted a policy addressing the relationship between 401
16 Certifications and NPDES permits. *WQP Policy 1-22, Adopting Supplemental Treatment as a*
17 *Best Management Practice and Defining Compliance with Water Quality Standards for*
18 *Stormwater Impacts for the Water Quality and SEA Programs.* To my knowledge, this policy
19 was not applied to the Port's proposal because it was not effective during the time the 401
20 Certification was in development. The policy calls for 401 and 402 to be applied in a "non-
21 duplicative and complementary manner." The policy also recognizes that a 401 Certification
22 may "require compliance with the Individual 402 Permit as adequate for compliance with the
23 water quality standards." In some cases, additional conditions may also be imposed. Here, not
24 only is the Port regulated under an NPDES permit, Ecology imposed additional conditions in
25 the 401 Certification to address water quality. These include the WER study and the
26 stormwater management system retrofit.

AR 002892

X. Mixing Zone Not Authorized

26. Contrary to the contentions of ACC, the 401 Certification does not authorize a “mixing zone” in violation of water quality standards. For instream and shoreline work only, the Certification allows temporary exceedences of water quality standards for turbidity pursuant to WAC 173-201A-110(3). Section 401 Certification, Condition A(1), p. 2. The Certification further states that any mixing zone established pursuant to that regulation must be minimized pursuant to WAC 173-201A-100. Condition A(2)(d), p. 3. These conditions do not authorize mixing zones for any work other than instream and shoreline work and for no other criteria than turbidity. The 401 Certification does not authorize mixing zones for stormwater discharges from the Port’s STIA industrial operations.

XI. Acceptable Fill Criteria

27. Ecology was presented with a considerable challenge in determining the appropriate conditions to include in a 401 Certification to screen fill materials to be used in the construction of the proposed Third Runway and related projects. Conditions for acceptable fill material have never been developed for projects receiving a 401 Certification from Ecology. However, as this project requires the importation of an enormous volume of fill material to the site (estimated at anywhere from 17 to 22 million cubic yards) Ecology developed conditions on the use of fill materials to ensure that water quality standards will not be violated. In light of this water quality concern, I participated in the development of the acceptable fill criteria and in drafting the terms of Condition E of the 401 Certification which establishes the protocols governing the Port’s use of fill material for its proposed project.

28. Because there is no national or state guidance on acceptable fill standards or criteria, Ecology elected to craft conditions for inclusion in the 401 Certification that place requirements on the Port to investigate its fill sources to ensure that fill material came from uncontaminated sources. The fill criteria also requires the Port to test and monitor its fill materials to ensure that over the life of the project the fill materials will not have "the potential

1 either singularly or cumulatively to adversely affect characteristic water uses," of Washington
2 State waters. WAC 173-201A-040(1).

3 29. The fill screening protocols, set forth in Condition E of the 401 Certification,
4 are designed to fulfill two separate but related objectives of the Army Corps of Engineers
5 (Corps) and Ecology. Those requirements are the Corps' § 404 permitting standard of "free
6 from toxic pollutants in toxic amounts" (U.S Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permitting
7 Standards No. 18. "Suitable Material") and Ecology's requirement that fill materials used for
8 the project not be sources of any contaminants that would exceed state surface water standards
9 (WAC 173-201A) and state groundwater standards (WAC 173-200) at any time over the life of
10 the project. When developing the fill criteria, Ecology was specifically guided by the
11 requirements of WAC 173-201A-040(1) ("[t]oxic substances shall not be introduced above
12 natural background levels in waters of the state which have the potential either singularly or
13 cumulatively to adversely affect characteristic water uses") and the anti-degradation standard
14 in WAC 173-201A-070(4)(a) ("[e]xisting instream uses and the level of water quality
15 necessary to provide full support to those uses must be maintained and protected").

16 30. Under Condition E, the first step in meeting these objectives is the requirement
17 that fill materials for the project must originate from uncontaminated sources. Under that
18 condition, the Port is restricted to using only naturally occurring uncontaminated soils as fill
19 material. This requirement is found in Condition E(1)(d) *Prohibited Fill Sources* which
20 prohibits the use on the proposed Third Runway embankment "[f]ill which consists in whole or
21 in part of soils or materials that are determined to be contaminated following a Phase I or
22 Phase II site assessment." Phase I and Phase II site assessments refer to established protocols
23 from the American Society for Testing and Material Standards (ASTM) for investigating
24 historical uses of a site and necessary record reviews that may disclose actual or potential
25 instances of site contamination. Condition E(1)(d) also prohibits the Port from using "soils or
26 materials that were previously determined to be contaminated by a Phase I or Phase II site

1 assessment and have been treated in some manner so to be considered re-mediated soils or fill
2 material."

3 31. The Port's compliance with the restriction that only naturally occurring
4 uncontaminated soils be used is reinforced by the requirement that the Port investigate the
5 proposed fill source to determine whether the site has any history of contamination. This
6 requirement is set forth in Condition E(1)(a) *Documentation*. This condition defines the
7 detailed nature of the site investigation and the information that must be submitted to Ecology
8 documenting that investigation. Specifically, Condition E(1)(a) requires that:

9 The environmental assessment shall be conducted by an environmental
10 professional in general conformance with the American Society for Testing and
11 Materials Standard (ASTM) E 1527-00 Standard Practice for Environmental
12 Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, and E 1903-
13 97 Standard Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase II
14 Environmental Site Assessment Process.

15 32. The next requirement guaranteeing that the fill used meets the Corps' and
16 Ecology's objectives is the verification of the findings of the site investigation. The
17 verification provisions, contained in Conditions E(1)(a)(iv) *Fill Source Sampling* and E(1)(b)
18 *Criteria*, require the Port to sample fill materials for the potential contaminants identified and
19 sets forth criteria for concentrations of naturally occurring contaminants in soil. The purpose
20 of the verification is twofold: (1) to establish that the source of fill is indeed uncontaminated;
21 and (2) to ensure that even naturally occurring contaminants in soil do not exceed the specified
22 concentrations. The latter requirement is needed because of the potential for naturally
23 occurring contaminants present in the soil at concentrations in excess of the stated criteria to
24 exceed state groundwater and surface water standards if mobilized. For example, naturally
25 occurring contaminants such as arsenic and copper could be at concentrations in a fill source
26 where, if mobilized, they present a risk of violating state groundwater and surface water
standards at some time over the life of the project.

33. Ecology developed the criteria established for concentrations of the naturally
occurring contaminants listed in Condition E(1)(b) to protect surface water and groundwater.

1 Another measure in Condition E(1)(b) designed to further protect surface water and
2 groundwater is the establishment of even lower concentration requirements for certain
3 naturally occurring contaminants (chromium, lead and nickel). These lower concentrations
4 apply to fill materials depending on the location of the fill in the final fill profile. Under that
5 provision, the Port must employ the stricter criteria when screening fill for placement in the fill
6 profile where the location increases the risk of those contaminants reaching surface water or
7 groundwater.

8 34. Conditions E(2) *As-Built Documentation* and E(3) *Post Construction*
9 *Monitoring* provide additional assurance that the fill materials used meet the objective that the
10 placement of fill not jeopardize either state surface or groundwater standards. To that end,
11 Condition E(2) establishes a tracking system for fill materials imported onto the construction
12 site so that Ecology and the Port know with some certainty the exact location and elevation of
13 the materials used. In addition, under Condition E(3) the Port is required to monitor both
14 surface water and groundwater conditions throughout the project development. The
15 monitoring requirement serves as an "early-warning" system concerning surface water and
16 groundwater conditions in the unlikely event that unsuitable fill material was deposited onto
17 the site.


18 35. In my opinion, the fill criteria and protocols established in Condition E provide
19 for the protection of the water quality of state groundwater and surface water in the Port's
20 construction of its proposed project. In particular, the criteria developed for soil concentrations
21 of naturally occurring contaminants are appropriately conservative. As a result, it is highly
22 unlikely that those contaminants will mobilize and move into groundwater and surface waters
23 at concentrations exceeding acute or chronic criteria established in the state's surface and
24 groundwater standards. I believe that the unprecedented requirements placed on the Port in its
25 selection and use of fill material provide Ecology with reasonable assurance that Washington
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

State's surface water and groundwater quality standards will be met throughout the life of this project.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 7th day of March, 2002



KEVIN C. FITZPATRICK

F:SEATAC - 401 APPEAL/DIRECT TESTIMONY/FITZPATRICK FINAL FORM.DOC

AR 002897

Kevin C. Fitzpatrick

Work: Department of Ecology
NW Regional Office
3190 160th Avenue SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7037

Home: 9724 Mercerwood Dr.
Mercer Island, WA 98040
(206) 230-0428

EDUCATION:

B. S. Biology - 1975 - Loyola University of Chicago, Illinois

M. A. Zoology - 1981 - Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Illinois

U.S.C.G. Officer Candidate School - 1980, Yorktown, Virginia Commissioned as Ensign in the United States Coast Guard - January 1981

Completed a number of professional courses and in-service training offered by the Coast Guard, EPA, and Washington State Department of Ecology on environmental law, environmental enforcement, water quality-based permit writing and management, oil and hazardous material handling and response. Trained and familiar with a variety of computer software packages including Windows NT, Windows 95, Office 97 Suite, CG SWSIII, Oracle and Dbase III.

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY:

- 2001-Present **Section Manager, NWRO Water Quality Program**, NW Regional Office, Washington State Department of Ecology: Manage a Department of Ecology Water Quality Program section which consists of 40 professional staff organized into four operational units to carry out the program's mission to protect and preserve the waters of Washington State for the benefit of current and future generations. Professional staff includes environmental engineers, hydrologists, environmental scientists, environmental technicians and environmental managers. The four operational units are the Municipal Permit Unit, the Industrial and Stormwater Unit, the Watershed Unit and the Compliance and Technical Assistance Unit. Delegated signature authority from the agency's director to issue, renew or modify NPDES and State Waste Discharge Permits, impose civil penalties up to \$25,000, responsible official for SEPA decisions, as well as a number of other enforcement related and administrative actions.
- 1990-2001 - **Unit Supervisor, Industrial Permits Water Quality**, NW Regional Office, Washington State Department of Ecology: Direct supervision of staff of nine including environmental engineers, scientists and technicians responsible for

AR 002898

the administration, issuance and management of water quality discharge permits for industries in northwest Washington. Permits include both the Federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), the Washington State Discharge Permit Program and industrial pretreatment; managed permits for Boeing, Weyerhaeuser, Salmon Bay Steel and shipyards on Puget Sound; developed and implemented general statewide permit for boatyards in Washington state.

- 1986-Retired 2000 - **Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve** Duties have included augmenting Marine Safety Office Puget Sound, Seattle, WA: Port Operations head supervised 45 enlisted reserved personnel engaged in port safety and commercial vessel inspection. Last served as the readiness planning officer for the 13th Coast Guard District Readiness Planning branch. Retired from the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve on December 1, 2000.
- 1989-1990 - **Criminal Investigator**, Joint State/Federal Environmental Crime Task Force, Washington State Department of Ecology: Lead state investigator responsible for the investigation of criminal violations of state and federal environmental laws in Washington. Case management involved collection, documentation and preservation of evidence, preparation of affidavits in support of criminal search warrants, and preparation of final disposition with local, state and federal prosecution authorities.
- 1988-1989 - **District Inspector**, NW Regional Office, Washington State Department of Ecology: Responsible for the maintenance of water quality and ensuring compliance with state water quality laws for industries and municipalities in Island, Skagit, Whatcom and San Juan counties. This included the development, issuance and management of water quality discharge permits.
- 1986-1988 - **Criminal Investigator**, Washington State Department of Ecology: First criminal investigator for the state of Washington; developed guidelines and procedures for criminal case referrals to local prosecutors; undertook active investigation of several alleged criminal violations of the state's dangerous waste in water quality laws in coordination with EPA's Office of Criminal Investigations.
- 1985-1986 - **Assistant Port Operations Chief and Planning Officer**, USCG Marine Safety Office Puget Sound, Seattle, Washington: Developed the Puget Sound Oil and Hazardous Material Contingency Plans and emergency contingency plans including marine fire-fighting, marine casualties and collisions and wartime mobilization; supervised eight enlisted personnel in Port Operations

and oil pollution response; assistant on-scene commander for the Arco Anchorage spill in Port Angeles, WA.

1981-1985 -

Marine Environmental Protection Officer, Marine Inspector, and Investigating Officer USCG Marine Safety Office, Toledo, Ohio: Responsibilities included merchant vessel safety inspection, testing and licensing of marine personnel and environmental response to oil and hazardous chemical spills. Collateral duties included management and integration of unit's micro- and main frame computers for utilization of the Marine Safety Information System.

1977-1980 -

Graduate Research Assistant and Teaching Assistant, Department of Zoology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: Instruction and curriculum design for upper level laboratory sections of Comparative Anatomy and Ichthyology; technician in Entomology and Genetics labs.

1975-1977 -

High School Teacher, Heart of Mary High School, Chicago, Illinois: Taught science and math to high school and junior high level students in an institutional setting for teenage girls at risk.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Bilingual with Spanish as second language; found to be very valuable for foreign vessel inspections and in occasional dealings with environmental officials from Spanish speaking countries. Spanish speaking skills acquired through a total of nine months in the Dominican Republic during high school and college.

Have provided numerous presentations to a variety of professional organizations and community groups on water quality issues.

REFERENCES:

Furnished upon request.

RECEIVED
MAR - 7 2002

ENVIRONMENTAL
HEARINGS OFFICE

**POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

AIRPORT COMMUNITIES COALITION,

PCHB No. 01-160

Appellant,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CITIZENS AGAINST SEA-TAC
EXPANSION,

Intervenor/Appellant,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY; and
PORT OF SEATTLE,

Respondents.

Pursuant to RCW 9A.72.085, I certify that on March 7, 2002, I caused to be served, Department of Ecology's Pre-Filed Testimony of: Kevin Fitzpatrick, Dave Garland, Ann Kenny, Ed O'Brien, Erik Stockdale, Katie Walter, Ching-Pi Wang, Gordon White, Kelly Whiting, and Chung Yee, and this Certificate of Service, in the above-captioned matter to be served upon the parties herein, as indicated below:

Peter J. Eglick
Kevin L. Stock
Michael P. Witek
HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP
1500 Puget Sound Plaza
1325 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-2509

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 206.340.0902

AR 002901

1 Rachael Paschal Osborn
Attorney at Law
2 2421 West Mission Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 509.328.8144

4 Linda J. Strout, General Counsel
Traci M. Goodwin, Senior Port Counsel
5 Port of Seattle
2711 Alaskan Way (Pier 69)
6 P.O. Box 1209
Seattle, WA 98111

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered to Foster Pepper
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 206.728.3205

8 Roger A. Pearce
Steven G. Jones
9 FOSTER, PEPPER & SHEFELMAN
1111 3rd Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 206.749.1997

11 Gillis E. Reavis
BROWN, REAVIS & MANNING
1191 Second Avenue, Suite 2200
12 Seattle, WA 98101

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered to Foster Pepper
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 206.292.6301

14 Jay J. Manning
BROWN, REAVIS & MANNING
15 421 S. Capitol Way, Suite 303
Olympia, WA 98501

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 360.786.1835


17 Richard A. Poulin
SMITH & LONEY
18 2317 E. John Street
Seattle, WA 98112

- U.S. Mail
- State Campus Mail
- Hand Delivered
- Overnight Express
- By Fax: 206.860.4187

20 the foregoing being the last known business addresses.

21 I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the
22 foregoing is true and correct.

23 DATED this 4th day of March, 2002, in Olympia, Washington.

24 
25 TANYAM. ROSE
Legal Assistant

26 **AR 002902**