

To: Dravis, Samantha[dravis.samantha@epa.gov]
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO[EOP/Ex. 6]; Greenwalt, Sarah[greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David[fotouhi.david@epa.gov]; Schwab, Justin[schwab.justin@epa.gov]; Bolen, Brittany[bolen.brittany@epa.gov]
From: Craig Montesano
Sent: Tue 6/6/2017 4:49:06 PM
Subject: RE: Read/Response: EPA/Ecology NDZ

Samantha and all--

For that, please let me offer an unqualified apology. It was inappropriate, and I will speak with Charlie.

Please understand that we were not aware of your policies with regard to third parties, and were somewhat frustrated by the lack of communication. As you can appreciate, the area this issue affects is environmentally hypersensitized. We are beginning to take heat.

Nevertheless, and to reiterate what I said, we want to be fully supportive of your efforts. We will stand by for further developments.

Thank you--

Craig

Craig F. Montesano
Vice President - Legislative Affairs
The American Waterways Operators
801 North Quincy Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22203
www.americanwaterways.com
(703) 841-9300, Extension 297
Cell: (703) 907-9612

-----Original Message-----

From: Dravis, Samantha [mailto:dravis.samantha@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2017 12:39 PM
To: Craig Montesano <CMontesano@americanwaterways.com>
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO[EOP/Ex. 6]; Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>; Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Read/Response: EPA/Ecology NDZ

We are well aware of this issue and the senior leadership of this agency is actively working on this. It is not our practice to loop in third parties as to our decision-making process, nor would it be appropriate for the agency to do so. EPA makes every effort to ensure all issues receive full and fair consideration, and this issue is no different. Your characterization of EPA as "dithering" on this issue is neither accurate nor appropriate.

Samantha

> On Jun 6, 2017, at 12:23 PM, Craig Montesano <CMontesano@americanwaterways.com> wrote:
>
> Friends—
>
> We are extremely concerned that the Administration is going to lose on this issue. Notwithstanding the

fact that you are likely short-staffed and overloaded, please see the possible threat vectors (attached, and below). Various members of AWO's team have attempted several times to contact you to ask how we can provide support and relieve some of the burden you're carrying.

>

> Please let us help!

>

> We know you are committed to doing the right thing but we need more clarity on current state of play. I hope we can find a few minutes one day this week to arrange a conference call.

>

> Thanks—

>

> Craig

>

>

> Craig F. Montesano

> Vice President - Legislative Affairs

> The American Waterways Operators [Description: Description:

> cid:767392315@28012010-1B21]

> 801 North Quincy Street, Suite 200

> Arlington, VA 22203

> www.americanwaterways.com<<http://www.americanwaterways.com/>>

> (703) 841-9300, Extension 297

> Cell: (703) 907-9612

> [Facebook

> Icon]<<http://www.facebook.com/pages/American-Waterways-Operators/15948>

> 1737397509> [Twitter Icon] <<https://twitter.com/AWOAdvocacy>>

>

> From: Charlie Costanzo

> Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 6:43 PM

> To: Caitlyn Stewart <CStewart@americanwaterways.com>; Craig Montesano

> <CMontesano@americanwaterways.com>; Lynn Muench

> <LMuench@americanwaterways.com>; Jennifer Carpenter

> <jcarpenter@americanwaterways.com>; Tom Allegretti

> <tallegretti@americanwaterways.com>; Ben Lerner

> <blerner@americanwaterways.com>; Terence Houston

> <THouston@americanwaterways.com>

> Subject: Read/Response: EPA/Ecology NDZ

> Importance: High

>

> Hi all –

>

> The situation with EPA and the NDZ has reached a crucial point and we need to find a way to understand what EPA is doing, if anything.

>

> In addition to the news story that ran on Tuesday, I've now received a letter and some communication from members of our coalition on the activities of the ENGO's on the other side of this issue (attached).

>

> The lack of information and what appears to be slow movement by EPA could turn this potential short-order victory into a loss, regardless of the substantive outcome on the determination. Essentially, EPA needed to move on this quickly and because they appear to have dithered, we may lose substantively and may also invigorate our opposition for a long time. I greatly fear making this issue a cause celebre for our opposition. It's obviously personal and I worry this may impair our advocacy and effectiveness with the delegation in copy on other issues.

>

> I am drafting a letter to the members of the Puget Sound Congressional delegation that states:

>

>
> 1. The breadth of our maritime industry coalition 2. That the NDZ
> would cause significant economic and operation hardship and would be by far the largest of its kind.
> 3. That AWO would support an NDZ or multiple NDZs for areas of water
> quality impairment, beaches, and shellfish beds, or that allows limited use of federally approved Type II
> MSDs 4. Encouraging the delegation to foster collaboration if indeed EPA opts to reconsider and pull
> back.
>
> In the meantime, I am trying through every means I can to determine whether EPA and Ecology have
> communicated on this subject and what was said. Today's call and email to Sarah Greenwalt at EPA
> have not been returned.
>
> Thoughts on next steps? Should we huddle on this in person tomorrow (Friday 6/2)?
>
> - Charlie
>
> From: Charlie Costanzo
> Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 10:14 AM
> To: Ben Lerner
> <BLerner@americanwaterways.com<mailto:BLerner@americanwaterways.com>>
> Cc: Caitlyn Stewart
> <cstewart@americanwaterways.com<mailto:cstewart@americanwaterways.com>
> >; Craig Montesano
> <cmontesano@americanwaterways.com<mailto:cmontesano@americanwaterways.
> com>>; Lynn Muench
> <lmuench@americanwaterways.com<mailto:lmuench@americanwaterways.com>>;
> Jennifer Carpenter
> <jcarpenter@americanwaterways.com<mailto:jcarpenter@americanwaterways.
> com>>; Tom Allegretti
> <tallegretti@americanwaterways.com<mailto:tallegretti@americanwaterway
> s.com>>
> Subject: FW: KING 5 news
>
> Ben –
>
> As we discussed, the story<<http://www.king5.com/local/environment>> is up on the KING 5 news site. It's
> not a particularly well-done story. It came from a tip from the ENGO community and then their first call
> was to the WA Dept. of Ecology. Below is what I sent to Alison Morrow.
>
> - Charlie
>
>
> From: Morrow, Alison [mailto:amorrow@king5.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 12:49 AM
> To: Charlie Costanzo
> <CCostanzo@americanwaterways.com<mailto:CCostanzo@americanwaterways.co
> m>>
> Subject: Re: KING 5 news
>
> Thanks!! Our web folks appear to have left for the night so I'll get
> it up tomorrow
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On May 30, 2017, at 8:57 PM, Charlie Costanzo
> <CCostanzo@americanwaterways.com<mailto:CCostanzo@americanwaterways.com>> wrote:

> *External Email – Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for
> Login Information* Hi Allison –
>
> Thanks so much for calling/writing and getting in touch. The AWO and commercial maritime position on
the Puget Sound NDZ is more nuanced than you might understand from some NGOs.
>
> AWO and our maritime industry friends don't oppose NDZ protection for Puget Sound, but we would like
Ecology to be more collaborative. Currently, we are asking the EPA to review its determination that the
one identified pumpout location (in Bellingham) is sufficient for all of the working vessels in Puget Sound.
>
> The proposed NDZ would be (by far) the largest all-vessel inclusive NDZ in the country. California has a
state-wide NDZ that my organization did not oppose because it allowed continued use of federally-
approved onboard treatment systems. Most working vessels use federally-approved onboard treatment
systems that have never been linked to water quality impairment in Puget Sound. The NDZ regulation
would ask a small number of vessel operators to replace federally-approved onboard treatment systems
and retrofit their boats with costly tanks (\$175,000 per boat and up). The costs would have serious
repercussions for tugboat operators, fishing boats, passenger vessels, and marine tourism in Puget
Sound.
>
> After retrofit, the onboard tanks would just be pumped onto an already overstressed shore-side
infrastructure. This is particularly troubling when shore-side treatment sewage systems have failed
catastrophically in recent months. Furthermore, asking vessels to retrofit for tankage can reduce fuel and
cargo capacity, impair buoyancy and stability, and put crew at risk.

>
> The commercial maritime industry wants to work with environmental regulators to implement NDZ policy
that protects Puget Sound from harmful sewage discharges, but also allows the small number of working
vessels with federally-approved and properly functioning onboard treatment systems to continue to
operate in certain areas of the Sound. The maritime industry is happy to see NDZs in areas of water
quality impairment, and near beaches and shellfish beds, and we've consistently asked the Washington
Department of Ecology to collaborate on more discrete locations where NDZs make more sense. Ecology
hasn't been receptive to four years of requests. The maritime industry stands ready and willing to
collaborate on NDZ policy that provides protection for Puget Sound and for the very small subset of the
maritime industry that cannot reasonably accommodate a Sound-wide NDZ, but can certainly
accommodate something more discrete.
>
> Happy to talk more!
>
> - Charlie
>
> From: Morrow, Alison [mailto:amorrow@king5.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 7:17 PM
> To: Charlie Costanzo
> <CCostanzo@americanwaterways.com<mailto:CCostanzo@americanwaterways.co
> m>>
> Subject: KING 5 news
>
>
> Thanks!
> <image001.jpg>
> <image002.gif>
> <image003.gif>
> <PugetSoundNDZsupport-052617.pdf>
> <Letter to Administrator Scott Pruitt regarding Puget Sound No
> Discharge Zone - 82 FR 11218.eml>