## CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, SAN DIEGO REGION

## RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON TENTATIVE ORDER NO. R9-2010-0032, CITY OF ESCONDIDO HALE AVENUE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY (HARRF)

## **CITY OF ESCONDIDO COMMENTS:**

No.	SECTION	COMMENT					RESOLUTION
1	Table 1, Table 4, Table D-1, Facility	Utilities Manager."					Change made in Table 4, and D-1. Reference removed from Table 1.
	Information	(760) 839-6273	one - com	<i>i Burchar</i>	n, Deputy	ounies manager	Table 1.
2	IV.A.1. Table 6. Effluent Limitations	ble 6. Water Quality Objective Ground Water hydrologic Basin plan for Escondido Creek.				ic Basin plan for	The 10 mg/L effluent limitation is overly conservative because the plant uptake will reduce
						nitrate concentration before the recycled water infiltrates to groundwater. Therefore, the effluent limitation for nitrate is removed because of	
			Kit Carson	Kit Carson	Kit Carson		user rules and regulations requiring irrigation at
		Sample	Well	Well	Well		agronomic rates. The user
		Date	#7 mg/l	#14 mg/l	#15 mg/l		rules also require reporting to the City of Escondido and a
		7/18/01	32.1 32.3	35.7 36.0	42.9 43.6		description of user compliance.
		10/24/01	32.6	38.3	41.9		·
		2/7/02	31.3	37.4	40.4		In addition, Monitoring and Reporting Program
		5/30/02	36.9	40.4	43.3		Requirement in Attachment C
		8/22/02 11/20/02	34.8 36.0	42.4 43.8	43.5		section V. A.6.c. inserted: <i>The</i>
		3/12/03	30.1	35.0	39.0		Discharger shall include
		6/25/03	30.7	31.5	40.7		historical data in either tabular

9/17/03	31.3	33.6	39.9	or graphical format for
12/15/03	33.1	34.6	39.8	parameters in section IV o
3/17/04	31.2	31.0	37.9	this MRP. The data shall
6/16/04	29.4	28.2	37.2	summarized to clearly
9/29/04	29.7	31.3	35.8	indicate trends in Receivir
12/8/04	30.1	31.3	36.4	Groundwater monitoring
3/16/200		01.0	00.1	locations.
5	30.2	30.1	38.6	
6/22/200	00.2	00.1	00.0	The Information Sheet
5	29.2	32.2	43.6	(Attachment D) is modified
9/14/200		02:2	10.0	explain the rationale for th
5	32.6	29.5	37.7	changes.
12/21/20				
05	30.4	28.1	39.1	Changes for arsenic and
3/22/200				cadmium limitations are
6	29.9	29.8	38.3	accepted to correct
6/15/200				typographical errors.
6	28.4	30.2	36.6	
9/20/200				
6	28.5	32.7	35.9	
12/14/20				
06	29.3	34.4	36.8	
2/28/200				
7	28.3	34.0	36.3	
5/30/200				
7	27.1	35.2	36.5	
8/29/200				
7	29.4	38.3	39.1	
11/28/20				
07	25.0	37.0	38.0	
2/27/200				
8	26.5	37.5	44.3	
5/21/200				
8	24.9	34.7	38.8	
Average	30.4	34.1	39.3	

		Nitrate As NO3 Data for Ground Water Monitoring in HSA 4.62  MW5 mg/l 8/5/09 45.2	
		Our recycled water has levels of nitrate as NO3 that range from 8.9 to 59.8 mg/l.  The historical data for groundwater shows nitrate levels above the proposed recycled water nitrate limits. The historically high nitrate levels in the groundwater are most likely due to fertilizer use in the agricultural areas in and around Escondido. After recycled water discharge for irrigational purposes began in September of 2004 the nitrate levels in groundwater did not noticeably increase from 2001.  Since the recycled water has shown no impact on groundwater nitrate levels, the city is requesting the nitrate numeric limitation be removed and replaced with a requirement that the effluent nitrate	
		concentration 'not degrade water quality'. Example language could be "The effluent nitrate concentration shall not degrade water quality in Receiving Groundwater as measured in monitoring locations RGW-001, RGW-002, RGW-003, or RGW-004."  The proposed Arsenic limit is 0.01 mg/L, while the basin plan limitation is 0.05 mg/L. We prefer to have our limit match the basin plan.	
		The proposed Cadmium limit is 0.0005 mg/L, while the basin plan limitation is 0.005 mg/l. We prefer to have limit match the basin plan.	
3	V.A.6.d. Standard Provisions	Since we have both UV and Chlorine disinfection ability, we recommend changing the wording from "Failure of UV equipment" to "Failure of Disinfection system." In the case of the UV system, what	Change accepted. Provision 6 is for noncompliance that may endanger health or the

		would be considered a failure? The UV system has the ability to disinfect flows based on UVT, number of banks online and flow rate. Would notification begin if one bank has failed even though disinfection can be met at a lower rate of flow?	environment, for example notification would not be needed if the treated wastewater can be disinfected at a lower flow rate.
4	V.C.1.d. Special Provisions	Since this is a new provision the city is requesting a 6 month delay in the implementation of section d to ensure that all changes have been made and the documentation matches the manual.	Change accepted.
5	V.C.2.b. Recycled Water Use Provisions	The city has scheduled to have the water and wastewater master plans updated during the 2010/11 fiscal year. Since there currently is not a master plan specifically for recycled water we are adding that to the list. In order to complete this task without penalty we are requesting that the 180 days be extended to 1 year.	Change accepted.
6	Attachment A, Facility Map	A revised map is enclosed. There has been one new line installed on Del Dios Highway.	Revised map inserted.
7	Attachment B, Flow Schematic	A revised schematic is enclosed.	Revised schematic inserted.
8	Attachment C, III.A. Table C-2. Effluent Monitoring	Line 2 has Total Coliform Bacteria <sup>c</sup> taken at sample point RWS-001. Historically we have sampled at the disinfection systems separately. For chlorination we use RWS-002 and UV we use RWS-003. We would prefer to continue sampling for coliform bacteria separately at the current location. This would provide us and the Regional Board the ability, if there is a problem, to determine which process was at fault. This does not appear to be in violation with Title 22 regulations.	Change accepted. Total Coliform Bacteria will be sampled at each disinfection system daily when operating. Tables C-3 and C-4 updated accordingly.
9	Attachment C, IV.A.1. Table C-6, Receiving Water Monitoring	The parameters beginning with "Total Dissolved Solids (TDS") Sample Type should be changed from "Composite" to "Grab". These are well samples and are collected as grabs and not composites.	Change accepted.

	Requirements		
10	Attachment C,	We are requesting the daily Monitoring Period be changed from	Changes accepted.
	V.A.3. Table	"Midnight through 11:59 PM" to "8 AM through 7:59 AM."	Monitoring report due dates
	C-7,	Semiannually SMR Due Dates be changed from "August 1 and	will be pushed back to avoid
	Monitoring	February 1" to "September 1 and March 1". The Annually SMR Due	conflict with NPDES permit
	Periods and	Date be changed from "February 1" to "March 1" and the 5 year	due dates.
	Reporting	period SMR due date be changed from "February 1" to "March 1."	
	Schedule		
11	Attachment C,	Change submittal date from "February 1" to "March 1."	Change accepted. Monitoring
	V.C. Annual		report due dates will be
	Recycled		pushed back to avoid conflict
	Water		with NPDES permit due
	Summary		dates.
12	Table D-2,	"Nitrate (NO3)" should be changed to "Nitrate as N."	Change accepted.
	Historic		
	Effluent		
	Limitations		
	and		
	Monitoring		
	Data		
13	Attachment D,	Is there a proposed process to modify the tentative order referenced	Standard Provisions V.A.17
	IV.A.	in the last paragraph?	through V.A.19 describe the
	Rationale for		causes or conditions that may
	Effluent		necessitate modifying the
	Limitations		Order.
14	Attachment D,	Summary of Final Effluent Limitations - Table D-5 should match	Concur; changes made to
	IV.A.	Table 6 on Page 9	Table 6 will be made in Table
	Table D-5		D-5.