



**City of Crescent City**  
*Where the Redwoods Meet the Sea*

377 J Street, Crescent City, CA 95531 • 707.464.7483 • Fax 707.465.4405 • [www.crescentcity.org](http://www.crescentcity.org)



October 27, 2016

Ms. Cathleen Goodwin  
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board  
5550 Skylane Blvd, Suite A,  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

**Subject: City of Crescent City Comments on Draft Order No. R1-2017-0002**

Dear Ms. Goodwin:

The City of Crescent City is in receipt of your letter dated September 27, 2016 with regard to renewal of the Crescent City National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit.

We have completed a detailed review of the Tentative Order No. R1-2017-0002 and overall find many positive changes including a reduction in the frequency, BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS testing/ along with changing both SMR and DMR reports from monthly to quarterly.

However, we have identified some concerns and areas needing clarification. Most of these items were discussed during your conversation with Tom Romesberg of my staff on October 10, 2016. We respectfully request that the Regional Board consider the following comments on the draft:

Item 1 (Section IV Table 4 page 6) Table 4 contains Effluent Limitations for both Tetrachloroethylene and Bis -2.

**As both Tetrachloroethylene and Bis-2 were inconclusive because the reasonable potential analysis result is inconclusive (see Table F-5 of the Tentative Order), the City requests they not be included as a Table 4 effluent limitation.**

Item 2 (Section IV 1 (b) page )– The Draft Order Changes the final effluent BOD5 percent removal efficiency from 75% to 85% and no longer allows use of the BOD5 removed by the Rumiano pretreatment process to be utilized for determining compliance with the percent removal standard.

**The City requests that language consistent with Order No. R1-2011-0019, allowing the Rumiano BOD<sub>5</sub> removal to be utilized for determining compliance with the BOD<sub>5</sub> percent removal requirement, be put back into the permit.**

Item 3 (Attachment E page E-3) – In the draft order Table E-2 reference is made to Monitoring Locations INT-001A, INT-001B, INT-002 and REC-001.

**The City requests that language be added to clarify that these monitoring locations are only applicable in the event recycled water is being produced and distributed.**

Item 4 – In the draft order Table E-4 Ocean Plan sampling schedule is established as an annual requirement.

**The City believes this is too frequent and costly. The City requests the Regional Board consider reducing the frequency to once during the permit term.**

Item 5 – In the draft order Table E-6, Table Notes Item 3 list detection methods specific to the membrane filter procedure under EPA publication EPA 600/4-85/076.

**The City requests the Regional Board clarify language inserted approving alternative methods approved in advance by U.S. EPA pursuant to 40 CFR Part 136.**

Items 6 – The draft Order requires an Effluent Discharge Evaluation including both a Work Plan and Study to evaluate the effluent discharge mixing. Attachment F Section VI B (1) e also identified under condition to reopen the permit in the event the study determines a minimum initial dilution below 29:1.

**The City is concerned about both the cost of these studies and implication of any change to the accepted dilution factor, including potential costly modifications to the outfall which the community cannot afford to pay for. Crescent City is an economically disadvantaged community and we are currently faced with a financial structural deficit within the sewer utility. A few vocal members of the community have expressed strong opposition to any changes in sewer rates. Currently local Measure Q will be voted on this November that could potentially reject new consumption based rates recently approved under the 218 rate process. As such, the City requests that the Regional Board remove this Effluent Discharge Evaluation requirement and consider the 29:1 dilution as acceptable.**

Items 7-10 – Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirement Comments

Item 7 - . In Section V.A.4., it states, "Artificial sea salts shall be used to increase sample salinity".

**The City requests that this language is changed to state that "artificial sea salts or hyper-saline brine may be used to increase sample salinity".**

Item 8 - In Section V.A.4.c., it states, "or a static non-renewal toxicity test with the red abalone, *Haliotis rufescens* (Larval Shell Development Test Method)".

**The City requests that this requirement be replaced with "or a static non-renewal toxicity test with the mussel, *Mytilus spp.* (Embryo-Larval Development Test Method)".**

Item 9 - In Section V.A.6.e., it states, "Chlorine and ammonia shall not be removed from the effluent sample prior to toxicity testing, unless explicitly authorized under this section of the MRP and the rationale is explained in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F)."

However, as stated in the EPA chronic marine test manual:

"SECTION 8 EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER SAMPLING, SAMPLE HANDLING, AND SAMPLE PREPARATION FOR TOXICITY TESTS

8.1 EFFLUENT SAMPLING

8.1.1 The effluent sampling point should be the same as that specified in the NPDES discharge permit (USEPA, 1988b). Conditions for exception would be: (1) better access to a sampling point between the final treatment and the discharge outfall; (2) if the processed waste is chlorinated prior to discharge, it may also be desirable to take samples prior to contact with the chlorine to determine toxicity of the unchlorinated effluent"

and

"8.8.7 Effluents and receiving waters can be dechlorinated using 6.7 mg/L anhydrous sodium thiosulfate to reduce 1 mg/L chlorine (APHA, 1992). Note that the amount of thiosulfate required to dechlorinate effluents is greater than the amount needed to dechlorinate tap water, (see Section 7, Dilution Water). Since thiosulfate may contribute to sample toxicity, a thiosulfate control should be used in the test in addition to the normal dilution water control."

In short, the EPA makes it clear that residual chlorine should NOT be present in the effluent being used for testing.

**The City requests a revision to the permit language to allow for either:**

**(1) collection of the effluent sample prior to chlorination, or**

**(2) de-chlorination of the effluent to non-toxic levels prior to use in testing.**

Item 11- In Section V.A.9.a.i.((6), (7), and (8), it calls for reporting of the NOEC, and EC and IC point estimates. However, these can only be generated when using a series of effluent dilutions. If testing is performed ONLY at the in-stream waste concentration (IWC), then a practical NOEC, or EC or IC point estimate cannot be generated.

**The City requests the language be clarified so that provisions 6, 7 and 8 are only applicable when performing accelerated monitoring which requires effluent dilutions.**

Item 12 - In Section IX, Other Monitoring Requirement Section A (page E-13) and annual outfall inspection is specified to document the condition of the outfall.

**The City requests the inspection frequency be reduced to bi-annually (Once every two years). As a result of safety concerns and the fact that the outfall pipe is rarely visible, the City further requests the language be modified to limit the inspection scope to the observable portion of the outfall only.**

Item 13 – In Section IX, Other Monitoring Requirements section C&D (page E-13)

**The City requests language be added to the Permit to clarify that these provisions only apply when producing and distributing recycled water.**

Item 14 – In Section IX, Other Monitoring Requirements section F(page E-15)

**The City requests language be added to the Permit to clarify that these provisions only apply when and if the facility is receiving septage waste.**

The City appreciates the opportunity to provide additional feedback on the Draft Order.

I also want to acknowledge your efforts and good working relationship with my staff in regards to the renewal process.

We look forward to completion of the NPDES Order renewal process.

Should you need additional information please feel free to contact me at (707) 464-7483, ext 232.

Sincerely,



David M. Van Dermark  
City Manager  
City of Crescent City  
Phone: 707 464 7483 x 232  
Fax: 707 465 4405