

May 19, 2025

Ms. Peggy Browne  
Acting Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

RE: Request for Withdrawal and Comments of the Proposed National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) 2026 Issuance of the Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity; EPA-HQ-OW-2024-0481

Dear Acting Assistant Administrator Browne:

The undersigned organizations urge that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) withdraw the December 13, 2024 proposed Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) for industrial stormwater discharges. We were pleased that the Agency extended the comment period to allow the regulated community further analysis of the docket but remain concerned regarding the overall approach.

We are aligned with many of the issues raised by the Small Business Low Risk Coalition and are concerned regarding the potential for significant costs and unintended consequences on our member companies, especially small businesses. This is an excellent opportunity for EPA to achieve its new deregulatory goals by issuing a revised proposal that conserves environmental protection provisions that have worked well for decades and eliminate costly recent permit additions with no evident benefits or basis in data.

The following are recommendations related to the proposed inclusion of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in the monitoring requirements for the updated MSGP for consideration:

- Provide evidence that the sectors required by the proposal to monitor PFAS are significantly impacting stormwater discharges. It is likely that stormwater could be contaminated by non-point sources or stormwater run-off from outside the facility given the broad nature of PFAS chemistries.
- Provide, for review and comment by industry stakeholders and other members of the public, the data used by EPA to justify proposed PFAS reporting for specific sectors in specific locations. In providing such data for review, EPA must ensure appropriate protections for confidential business information, including redactions as warranted.
- Consider the total costs of monitoring, including the need for ongoing sampling per outfall and the potential approval of new expensive analytical methods such as pending

Method 1633. While Methods 1621 and 1633 have benefits over existing approaches, the costs will be burdensome on the regulated community.<sup>1</sup>

- Ensure additional lab capacity is available to handle the new requirements, as existing capacity will be overly stressed.

We agree that PFAS monitoring should at the very least be delayed for inclusion in the MSGP process, until more information, understanding of resource requirements, and public engagement on the issue occurs. We suggest that before consideration further action in this area, the Agency should convene a series of dialogues with the business community and other stakeholders to explore the best way forward. Our coalition again respectfully requests that EPA withdraw the current MSGP proposal. Please feel free to contact us with questions.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Chemical Distribution  
American Chemistry Council  
American Coatings Association  
American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers  
American Petroleum Institute  
Associated General Contractors of America  
National Association for Surface Finishing  
National Council of Textile Organizations  
National Mining Association  
National Stone, Sand, & Gravel Association  
PRINTING United Alliance  
The Fertilizer Institute  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce

---

<sup>1</sup> US Chamber of Commerce – EPA MUR Comments submitted on March 24, 2025