

January 30, 2024

Tonya Lane Municipal Facility Manager Washington State Department of Ecology P.O. Box 330316 Shoreline, WA 98133-9716

RE: City of Everett draft permit public comments

Dear Ms. Lane

Comment No. 1 – Condition S9.C.3.b Post Construction Monitoring Plan

The City of Everett requests that the CSO outfalls PSO1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 be excluded from the requirement for water quality and sediment data under a Post Construction Monitoring Plan (PCMP). In accordance with section S9.C.3 Everett will update the PCMP to specify that Port Gardner is designated as a Primary Contact Recreation as required. After the Port Gardner Storage Facility (PGSF) is constructed the PCMP will be updated to address all Everett CSO outfalls. Computer modeling of wastewater flows in Everett's sewer system after the (PGSF) is constructed indicates that PSO1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 would not have had any CSO events in the last 34 years based on the recorded rainfall record over that time period. PSO1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 are all near shore CSO outfalls, whereas PSO4 will be a deep-water outfall after the PGSF project also known as Outfall 100. One primary goal of the PGSF project was to significantly reduce near shore CSO discharges. Over this 34-year period the model predicts only one CSO event, and this would have discharged out of PSO4 at Outfall 100. Outfall 100 discharges at a depth of over 350 feet and 1,300 feet from the shoreline. The outfall has a modern diffuser that achieves a dilution factor of 156 at the edge of the acute mixing zone (a distance of 55 feet from the diffuser ports) and achieves a dilution factor of 696 at the edge of the chronic mixing zone (a distance of 550 feet) as detailed in the NPDES Permit Fact Sheet. Since modeling indicates CSO events at each of the near shore CSO outfalls are expected to have less than a 3% chance of occurring in any one year based on the last 34 years of rainfall data, we believe real-time level monitoring of frequency and duration of PSO1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the presumption approach and therefore water quality monitoring is not needed to demonstrate compliance with numeric water quality standards. Further, due to the physical location of PS04 (Outfall 100), and the mixing and dilution factor at this outfall, we believe real-time level monitoring of frequency and duration of CSOs at this outfall is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the presumption approach and therefore water quality monitoring is not needed to demonstrate compliance with numeric water quality standards as well.



425.257.8800 425.257.8882 fax

€ (

everettpw@everettwa.gov everettwa.gov/pw

## Comment No. 2 - Condition S9.3

The reference to section "IV.F" in the fact sheet appears to be incorrect. The correct reference appears to be section V.F in the fact sheet.

## Comment No. 3 – Condition S9.E

Condition S9.E sets forth a compliance schedule to complete elements of the 2020 CSO Control Plan Update. The City of Everett requests that the language in this condition be consistent with Section IV in the 2015 Agreed Order, Docket No. 11638, between Ecology and the city by allowing for amendments to the projects submitted by the city and approved by Ecology. There should be some flexibility as contemplated under the Agreed Order to modify the specific projects in the plan with Ecology approval as long as the deadline for compliance remains the same. The City of Everett proposes that Ecology incorporate the language from the Agreed Order in lieu of the text and table in condition S9.E:

In order to meet the requirements of WAC 173-245-020(22), Everett shall complete construction of CSO reduction projects identified in the *2020 CSO Control Plan Update* or future amendments submitted by Everett and approved by Ecology to reduce CSOs from the remaining 10 uncontrolled CSO basins down to an average of no more than one overflow per outfall per year by December 31, 2027. Future CSO Reduction Plan Amendments may not result in a compliance date later than December 31, 2027.

## Comment No. 4 – Condition S1.A

The City of Everett is requesting Ecology reevaluate the pH limits proposed for outfall 015. Ecology's calculation spreadsheet used for outfall 015 pH limits that assumes little dilution under static conditions is unnecessarily restrictive for compliance with a pH of 7.0 at the mixing zone boundary. A probabilistic analysis of available dilution combining effluent discharged in Outfall 015 and Snohomish River flows supports a lower pH effluent limitation of 6.4, and perhaps as low as 6.0, while maintaining the water quality standard in the river of pH 7.0

## Comment No. 5 - Condition S6.E

Per section S6.E the City will be required to update or revise the IU inventory to include industry categories known or suspected to discharge PBDEs. The City requests that industrial sampling not be included in the required survey efforts. PBDEs are primarily a legacy contaminant and therefore should not be actively used in industrial processes. The principal manufacture and use of the final remaining PBDE, DecaBDE, was phased out by December 31, 2013. While it still remains in some uses as a flame retardant, the SNUR and TSCA rules regulating its usage are a better mechanism for tracing its presence than sampling industrial discharges. In addition, the current analytical methods for PBDEs are very expensive; therefore, the IUs will bear the cost which would have a negative fiscal impact on the community. If through survey efforts an IU is identified that is actively using PBDEs in their process, then the City may sample the IU in order to determine their PBDE contribution.

Sincerely,

Derek Kerlee Wastewater Quality Process Analyst Everett Water Pollution Control Facility

cc: Jeff Marrs, Operations Superintendent John Smit, WPCF Plant Manager Chris Merwede, Everett Environmental Lab Manager Eddie Jones, WPCF Senior Operator Joe Ferguson, Wastewater Quality Process Analyst Chron file