

I. National Database Information			
Inspection Date:	3/22/21 to 3/31/21	NPDES ID Number:	CO0026662
Entry/Exit Time:	9:30 am / 4:00 pm	Inspection ID:	202103 CO0026662
Inspection Type:	Offsite Pretreatment Compliance Inspection (Offsite PCI)		

II. Facility Location Information	
Name:	South Adams County Water and Sanitation District (District)
Location:	9702 Monaco Street, Henderson, Colorado 80640
Mailing Address:	Same as above

III. Contact Information					
Title	Name	Phone	Email	Present in Opening Conf.	Present in Closing Conf.
Lead Inspector	Emilio Llamozas	(303)-312-6407	Llamozas.emilio@epa.gov	Yes	Yes
Inspector	Jessica Duggan	(303) 312-6195	Duggan.Jessica@epa.gov	Yes	No
Inspector	Lisa-kay Prideaux	(406) 457-5022	Prideaux.Lisakay@epa.gov	Yes	Yes
Wastewater Systems Manager	JM Grebenc	(720) 206-0462	jmgrebenc@sacwsd.org	Yes	Yes
Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator	Gary Bassett	(303) 589-9242	gbassett@sacwsd.org	Yes	Yes
Industrial Pretreatment Specialist	David Kahler	(303) 803-8172	dkahler@sacwsd.org	Yes	Yes
Industrial Pretreatment Technician	Tyler Vertovec	(720) 610-9403	tvertovec@sacwsd.org	Yes	Yes
Industrial Pretreatment Technician	Ryker McDaniel	(720) 883-3101	rmcdaniel@sacwsd.org	Yes	Yes

IV. Industrial User (IU) Characterization		
IUs currently identified by the Control Authority (CA)	IU Type	
24	Significant Industrial Users (SIUs = CIUs + non-categorical)	
	6	Discharging Non-Categorical SIUs (as defined by the CA)
	8	Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs)
	0	Middle Tier CIUs
	10	Zero-Discharging SIU with Categorical Process
0	Non-significant CIU (NSCIU)	
0	Other Regulated IUs (e.g. permitted IUs) Describe: N/A	
0	Waste Haulers Describe: The District does not accept hauled waste.	

V. IU Files Reviewed			
#	IU Name	Permit Type	IU inspected during PCI?
1	Birko Corporation	Categorical Industrial User	No
2	Crystal Packaging	Categorical Industrial User	No
3	S&S Anodizing	Zero Discharge Industrial User	No
4	Steel Storage Systems	Categorical Industrial User	No
5	Precise Cast	Zero Discharge Industrial User	No
6	Land O Lakes Purina Feed #208	Significant Industrial User	No
7	Cummins Rocky Mountain, LLC	Significant Industrial User	No
8	Groendyke Transport	Significant Industrial User	No
9	Veolia	Categorical Industrial User	No

VI. Inspection Summary
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this pretreatment compliance inspection, including the opening conference, records review, and closing conference, were conducted remotely, via the Microsoft Teams platform with the South Adams County Water and Sanitation District (District). The District uploaded program and industrial user records to an EPA OneDrive location so the EPA inspectors could review the files. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) inspectors, Emilio Llamozas, Jessica Duggan and Lisa-kay Prideaux (jointly referred to as inspectors), met with the District's representatives, listed above on March 22, 2021, for an opening conference. The inspectors discussed the purpose and format of the inspection and interviewed the District's representatives about the District's approved pretreatment program. The District owns and operates one wastewater treatment facility (WWTF or POTW) that is subject to pretreatment regulations; the Williams Monaco Wastewater Treatment Facility (CO0026662). Throughout the inspection, the inspectors evaluated the District's pretreatment program by referring to and completing bound and/or electronic checklists with questions reflecting

the federal regulatory requirements at 40 C.F.R. §403.

The inspectors proceeded to review the Industrial Users' files from January 2020 to December 2020 referenced in Part V above. On March 31, 2021, a summary of preliminary findings was discussed with the District representatives listed above at the conclusion of the inspection and is provided in Part VII, below. On April 13, 2021, the EPA sent an email to the District with the preliminary findings from the inspection.

Report Review and Signature		
Drafter Name	Address/Phone Number	Date
Emilio Llamozas	U.S. EPA Region 8 1595 Wynkoop Street 8ENF-W-NW Denver, Colorado 80202	5/12/2021
	303-312-6407	
Reviewer Name	Address/Phone Number	Date
Lisa-kay Prideaux	U.S. EPA Region 8 Helena Office 10 W 15 Street, Suite 3200 MO-309 Helena, Montana 59626	5/17/2021
	406-457-5022	
Supervisor Signature/Name	Address/Phone Number	Date
	U.S. EPA Region 8 1595 Wynkoop Street 8ENF-W-NW Denver, Colorado 80202	5/24/2021
	Mike Boeglin 303-312-6250	

VII. Findings Summary Table		
Finding Number – Title from Evaluation	Corrective Action(s)	Recommendation(s)
Control Mechanism Evaluation		
Finding 1 – The District's January 6, 2010, Industrial Waste Survey procedure did not reflect the District's current practices.	X	
Finding 2 – The Birko Corporation and the Crystal Packaging industrial user permits had the incorrect units for COD/BOD ₇ and the Crystal Packaging industrial user permit had the incorrect units for COD to mass of anhydrous product.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 3 – The Crystal Packaging industrial user permit statement of basis did not document the Control Authority's decision for alternative sampling type for pollutants that are usually sampled as flow proportional composite samples.		Completed. No further action.

VII. Findings Summary Table		
Finding Number – Title from Evaluation	Corrective Action(s)	Recommendation(s)
Finding 4 – The Steel Storage Systems industrial user permit had the incorrect sample type for TTOs.	X	
Finding 5 – The Steel Storage Systems and Cummins industrial user permits did not indicate that oil and grease grab samples must be composited in the lab.	X	
Finding 6 – The Veolia Zero Discharge Permit was not terminated, when the Veolia Discharge Permit was authorized.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 7 – The Statement of Basis for the Veolia industrial user permit did not include information of the characterization of the Wastestream entering Veolia to determine which subpart of the Centralize Waste Treatment Point Source Category applies to Veolia.		X
Finding 8 – The zero discharge permits did not contain all permit requirements.		X
Slug Discharge Control Plans		
Finding 9 – The S&S Anodizing Inc. and the Groendyke Transport, Inc, slug discharge control plans did not contain all required information.	X	X
Compliance Monitoring		
Finding 10 – The District did not sample Steel Storage Systems for all required TTOs required under 40 CFR 433.11(e) during the June 26, 2020 sampling event.	X	
Finding 11 – The District did not meet the temperature preservation for the July 19, 2020 Crystal Packaging sampling.	X	
Finding 12 – The District’s Birko Corporation sampling protocol did not require flow-proportional composite samples and did not require sampling through the entire discharge event.	X	
Finding 13 – Crystal Packaging did not average the two COD samples taken in the first quarter of 2020 to perform the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation for the first quarter of 2020.	X	
Finding 14 – Birko Corporation did not report the correct mass of COD and mass of BOD ₇ in its self-monitoring reports submitted for the four quarters in 2020.	X	
Finding 15 – Birko Corporation did not perform the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation correctly for the first quarter of 2020.	X	
Finding 16 – Crystal Packaging sampled its wastewater from its batch tank on a day it was not discharging to the District.	X	

VII. Findings Summary Table

Finding Number – Title from Evaluation	Corrective Action(s)	Recommendation(s)
Finding 17 – Crystal Packaging performed the wrong conversion factor for the mass of theoretical anhydrous product during the second quarter of 2020.	X	
Finding 18 – The Steel Storage Systems first quarter of 2020 report indicated that from March 3-6, 2020, Steel Storage Systems had pH discharges of less than 5.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 19 – The Cummins 2020 process water log for the pressure washer had some discrepancies on the daily water used and the interceptor running total.	X	
Finding 20 – Birko Corporation's Chain of Custody sheets do not contain the method of analysis for pH.	X	
Finding 21 – Birko Corporation exceeded the preservation temperature of six degrees Celsius for samples collected on June 2, 2020.	X	
Enforcement		
Finding 22 – An enforcement response was not issued to the Birko Corporation for reporting the incorrect mass of COD and BOD ₇ .	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 23 – An enforcement response was not issued to the Birko Corporation for the failure to perform the mass of COD to mass of theoretical anhydrous product ratio calculation correctly.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 24 – An enforcement response was not issued to Birko Corporation for failure to document the pH method of analysis.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 25 – An enforcement response was not issued to Birko Corporation for failure to preserve its samples below 6°C.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 26 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for failure to average the COD concentration and use the average in the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 27 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for failure to sample during the discharge event.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 28 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for reporting the incorrect theoretical anhydrous product.	Completed. No further action.	
Finding 29 – An escalated enforcement response was not issued to Precise Cast Prototypes & Engineering Inc. for failure to provide an updated slug control plan and chemical inventory.	Completed. No further action.	X

VII. Findings Summary Table

Finding Number – Title from Evaluation	Corrective Action(s)	Recommendation(s)
Finding 30 – An enforcement response was not issued to Groendyke Transport, Inc. for failure to provide an updated slug control plan.	Completed. No further action.	
Additional Evaluations		
Finding 31 – The District has exceeded its ammonia NPDES effluent permit limit in November and December 2020 due to possible pass through and/or interference.	X	

III. Evaluation

A. Control Authority (CA) Pretreatment Program Modification

1. When was the last program modification? Did the CA notify the EPA of program modifications? (40 C.F.R. §403.18)

40 C.F.R. §403.18 requires the District to submit program modifications to the EPA if it wants to change its approved pretreatment program. The pretreatment program was approved on January 9, 1986 and has subsequently incorporated substantial modifications as approved by the EPA. The EPA approved the last modifications to the District's pretreatment program on June 18, 2014. The modification included updates to the District's Article IV Rules and Regulations.

B. IU Characterization

1. Describe the procedure for identifying and locating IUs that might be subject to the pretreatment program. Has the CA identified and located all applicable IUs (non-categorical SIUs, CIUs, NSCIUs, etc.)? (40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(i))

The District has an industrial waste survey SOP dated January 6, 2010. Page 5 of the ERP also has the District's procedures for conducting the industrial waste survey. An Industrial Waste Survey (IWS) was conducted when the District's pretreatment program was first developed. Wastewater questionnaires were completed by non-residential users in order to identify industrial users and characterize wastewater discharges. The District has approximately 3,278 accounts out of which approximately 1,474 are industrial accounts. The IWS is updated by the District through wastewater questionnaires, inspections and sampling, with new information provided to the District by the industrial users, and by requiring industrial users to complete a wastewater questionnaire prior to receiving written approval by the District for tapping.

The IWS is updated primarily with information obtained through wastewater questionnaires, inspections and sampling. Wastewater questionnaires, inspections and sampling enable the District to verify the information provided by the industrial user and, in some cases, to identify categorical processes of which the industrial user was unaware. Annual compliance inspections of permitted industries often reveal whether industrial users have reported changes as required. The District's goal is

to inspect approximately one third of its industrial user accounts every year. In 2020, due to the COVID restrictions, the District performed approximately 290 industrial account inspections. During the inspections, the District has the representative for the facility sign the questionnaire on file to certify that nothing has changed since the last questionnaire was completed. The District also performs sampling of the industrial user accounts during the inspections if the industrial facility has an interceptor.

The District has located fifteen dentist offices in its service area and has inspected them in 2020. The District's procedure for authorizing new sewer taps for nonresidential users requires that a wastewater questionnaire be submitted to, and reviewed by, the pretreatment department prior to sewer tapping. A wastewater questionnaire is also required when a tenant moves to a new building or meter service is changed. This procedure helps the District to identify industrial users that move into an area after the inspection process for that area has been completed. The District maintains a list of industrial and commercial facilities in its service area.

Finding 1 – The District's January 6, 2010, Industrial Waste Survey procedure did not reflect the District's current practices.

Section 5.1.2 of the January 6, 2010, District Industrial Waste Survey (IWS) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) regarding inspections based on the New Commercial User List was not accurate of the District's current industrial waste survey practices. The January 6, 2010, IWS SOP indicates that the new commercial user list is obtained from the Business Licensing Agent on a monthly basis and compared with the commercial account listing printed from the Great Plains Billings System. The SOP indicates that for all accounts not listed in the Great Plains System, an inspection would be conducted. Currently, the District is not reviewing the updated commercial user list on a monthly basis and comparing it to the commercial accounts list. Also, the new commercial user list is available on the District's webpage so it is not sent by the Business Licensing Agent to the Pretreatment Program on a monthly basis.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(i) states, "The POTW shall develop and implement procedures to ensure compliance with the requirements of a Pretreatment Program. At a minimum, these procedures shall enable the POTW to:

(i) Identify and locate all possible Industrial Users which might be subject to the POTW Pretreatment Program. Any compilation, index or inventory of Industrial Users made under this paragraph shall be made available to the Regional Administrator or Director upon request;"

Corrective Action 1

Update the District's procedure to identify and locate all possible industrial users which might be subject to the POTW Pretreatment Program. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

**2. Has the CA identified the character and volume of pollutants contributed to the publicly owned treatment works (POTW) by IUs subject to the pretreatment program?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(ii))**

The District has a process for identifying the character and volume of pollutants discharged by IUs, as described in B.1, above. The District also conducts inspections, compliance sampling, and receives self-

monitoring reports from IUs in the service area to identify the character and volume of pollutants contributed to the POTW.

- 3. Has the CA prepared and maintained a list of SIUs, defined in §403.3(v)(1), along with the applicable SIU criteria? Does the list indicate whether the CA has made a determination that an SIU is a Non-Significant Categorical Industrial User, as defined in §403.3(v)(2), rather than an SIU? Have modifications to the list been submitted with annual reports?**
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(6))

The District maintains a list of SIUs, which is updated with new SIUs once they are identified through the industrial waste survey. The District submitted the SIU list to the EPA during the 2020 Pretreatment Annual Report. The inspectors reviewed the list, which included the name of the SIUs, applicable categorical classification, SIC codes and total average process flow, in addition to other information. Currently, the District has fourteen SIUs in the service area. The District does not have any Non-Significant Categorical Industrial Users. The District has ten zero discharge industrial users. The EPA did not identify any additional SIUs during the inspection beyond those identified by the District.

C. Control Mechanism Evaluation

- 1. Has the CA issued individual or general control mechanisms to all SIUs?**
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii))

Yes. The SIU files reviewed had applicable individual permits. The District did not issue general control mechanisms at the time of the inspection.

- 2. Do the applications for general control mechanism contain all of the following?**
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(A)(2))

- a. Contact info
- b. Production processes
- c. Types of wastes generated
- d. Location for monitoring
- e. Any request for waiver for pollutants not present per §403.12(e)(2)

N/A. The District does not issue general control mechanisms.

- 3. Are general control mechanisms only issued for IUs where all of the following is true?**
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(A)(1))

- a. Involve same/substantially similar types of operations
- b. Discharge the same type of waste
- c. Same effluent limitations
- d. Same or similar monitoring
- e. There are no CIU production-based standards, CIU mass limits, combined wastestream formula, or net/gross calculations

N/A. The District does not issue general control mechanisms.

4. Do both individual and general control mechanisms include the following, where applicable?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B))
- a. Statement of duration (5 years max)
 - b. Statement of non-transferability
 - c. Applicable effluent limits (local limits, categorical standards, BMPs)
 - d. Self-monitoring requirements
 - Identification of pollutants to be monitored
 - Sampling frequency
 - Sampling locations/discharge points
 - Appropriate sample types
 - Reporting requirements
 - Record-keeping requirements
 - e. Statement of applicable civil and criminal penalties
 - f. Compliance schedules
 - g. Notice of slug loading or potential problems at POTW
 - h. Notification of spills, bypasses, upsets, etc.
 - i. Notification of significant change in discharge
 - j. 24-hour notification of effluent violation
 - k. Submit resampling results within 30-days
 - l. Slug discharge control plan requirement, if required by POTW
 - m. Certification statements
 - n. Sampling/analysis requirements (Part 136 or alternative)
 - o. Reporting of additional sampling
 - p. 90-day compliance report

The EPA reviewed the permit files listed in Part V above. Many, but not all of the required permit elements listed above were included in the permits. Findings regarding permit conditions are listed below.

Finding 2 – The Birko Corporation and the Crystal Packaging industrial user permits had the incorrect units for COD/BOD₇ and the Crystal Packaging industrial user permit had the incorrect units for COD to mass of anhydrous product.

Part I. Section 1.C and Part II. Section 1.C of the Birko Corporation and Crystal Packaging industrial user permits had the incorrect units for COD/BOD₇ ratio because they were listed as (mg/L & kg/kkg). The units are mg/L over mg/L; therefore, the ratio is unitless.

Part I. Section 1.C and Part II. Section 1.C of the Crystal Packaging industrial user permit had the incorrect units for COD to mass of anhydrous product because they were listed as (mg/L & mg/kkg). The units should be kg/kkg.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(3) requires that permits include effluent limits, including Best Management Practices, based on applicable general Pretreatment Standards in part 403 of this chapter, categorical Pretreatment Standards, local limits, and State and local law.

Corrective Action 2

On April 23, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the Birko Corporation’s industrial user permit had been updated with the correct units for COD/BOD₇ ratio. The District also provided a copy of the Birko Corporation amended permit with an effective date of April 21, 2021. On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the Crystal Packaging’s industrial user permit had been updated with the correct units for COD/BOD₇ ratio and COD to mass of anhydrous product. The District also provided a copy of the Crystal Packaging amended permit with an effective date of April 26, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 3 – The Crystal Packaging industrial user permit statement of basis did not document the Control Authority’s decision for alternative sampling type for pollutants that are usually sampled as flow proportional composite samples.

The Crystal Packaging industrial user permit required metal samples to be collected as grab samples. 40 CFR §403.12(g)(3) requires that metal samples be collected as flow proportional composite samples unless time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority. Where time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority, the samples must be representative of the discharge and the decision to allow the alternative sampling must be documented in the Industrial User file for that facility. The Crystal Packaging’s sampling plan indicated the POTW’s decision to allow for alternative sampling for metal samples to be collected as grabs instead of composites. It is recommended that the decision to allow alternative sampling for metal samples to be collected as grab samples instead of composite samples also be included in the Permit’s Statement of Basis.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(4) requires SIU permits to contain sampling requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.12(g)(3) states, “Grab samples must be used for pH, cyanide, total phenols, oil and grease, sulfide, and volatile organic compounds. For all other pollutants, 24-hour composite samples must be obtained through flow-proportional composite sampling techniques, unless time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority. Where time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority, the samples must be representative of the Discharge and the decision to allow the alternative sampling must be documented in the Industrial User file for that facility or facilities. Using protocols (including appropriate preservation) specified in 40 CFR part 136 and appropriate EPA guidance, multiple grab samples collected during a 24-hour period may be composited prior to the analysis as follows: For cyanide, total phenols, and sulfides the samples may be composited in the laboratory or in the field; for volatile organics and oil & grease the samples may be composited in the laboratory. Composite samples for other parameters unaffected by the compositing procedures as documented in approved EPA methodologies may be authorized by the Control Authority, as appropriate.”

Recommendation 3

On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the Crystal Packaging’s industrial user permit statement of basis, Section 4 Part B, had been updated with the District’s decision to allow alternative sampling for metal samples to be collected as grab samples instead of composite samples because the discharge consists of a homogenized batch discharge. The District also provided a copy of the Crystal Packaging amended statement of basis. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 4 – The Steel Storage Systems industrial user permit had the incorrect sample type for TTOs.

Part II Section 1.C of the Steel Storage Systems industrial user permit indicates that total toxic organics (TTOs) sample type must be composite/certification. The sample type for TTOs must be a grab sample or grabs that are composited in the lab.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(4) requires SIU permits to contain sampling requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.12(g)(3) states, “Grab samples must be used for pH, cyanide, total phenols, oil and grease, sulfide, and volatile organic compounds. For all other pollutants, 24-hour composite samples must be obtained through flow-proportional composite sampling techniques, unless time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority. Where time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority, the samples must be representative of the Discharge and the decision to allow the alternative sampling must be documented in the Industrial User file for that facility or facilities. Using protocols (including appropriate preservation) specified in 40 CFR part 136 and appropriate EPA guidance, multiple grab samples collected during a 24-hour period may be composited prior to the analysis as follows: For cyanide, total phenols, and sulfides the samples may be composited in the laboratory or in the field; for volatile organics and oil & grease the samples may be composited in the laboratory. Composite samples for other parameters unaffected by the compositing procedures as documented in approved EPA methodologies may be authorized by the Control Authority, as appropriate.”

Corrective Action 4

Update the Steel Storage Systems industrial user permit to include the correct sampling type for TTOs. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 5 – The Steel Storage Systems and Cummins industrial user permits did not indicate that oil and grease grab samples must be composited in the lab.

Part II Section 1.D.2 and Part II Section C.2 of the Steel Storage Systems and Cummins industrial user permits indicates that a manual composite means obtaining a series of discrete grab samples and compositing the individual aliquots into a single sample container for analysis with results reported as a single value. The manual composite definition must indicate that for oil and grease samples the grab samples must be composited in the lab in accordance with 40 CFR 403.12(g)(3). The site-specific plans for Steel Storage Systems and Cummins must also be updated to indicate the oil and grease grab samples must be composited in the lab.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(4) requires SIU permits to contain sampling requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.12(g)(3) states, “Grab samples must be used for pH, cyanide, total phenols, oil and grease, sulfide, and volatile organic compounds. For all other pollutants, 24-hour composite samples must be obtained through flow-proportional composite sampling techniques, unless time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority. Where time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority, the samples must be representative of the Discharge and the decision to allow the alternative sampling must be documented in the Industrial User file for that facility or facilities. Using protocols (including appropriate preservation) specified in 40 CFR part 136 and appropriate EPA guidance, multiple grab samples collected during a 24-hour period may be composited prior to the analysis as follows: For cyanide, total phenols, and sulfides the samples may be composited in the laboratory or in the field; for volatile organics and oil & grease the samples may be composited in the laboratory. Composite samples for other parameters unaffected by the compositing procedures as documented in approved EPA methodologies may be authorized by the Control Authority, as appropriate.”

Corrective Action 5

Update the Steel Storage Systems and the Cummins industrial user permits to indicate the oil and grease grab samples must be composited in the lab. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 6 – The Veolia Zero Discharge Permit was not terminated, when the Veolia Discharge Permit was authorized.

The Veolia Zero Discharge Permit (#215) effective on February 21, 2019, and expiring on February 21, 2021, was not terminated, when the Veolia Discharge Permit (#177) was authorized on November 2, 2020. This could cause potential issues with permit coverage and requirements (40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)). On April 12, 2021, the District informed EPA that a letter was sent to Veolia to terminate the Zero Discharge Permit (#215).

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(I) requires SIU permits to contain a statement of duration (in no case more than five years).

Corrective Action 6

On April 12, 2021, the District informed EPA that a letter was sent to Veolia to terminate the Zero Discharge Permit (#215). The District also provide a copy to the EPA of the April 12, 2021, letter terminating the Zero Discharge Permit. No further action is required at this time.

Finding 7 – The Statement of Basis for the Veolia industrial user permit did not include information of the characterization of the Wastestream entering Veolia to determine which subpart of the Centralize Waste Treatment Point Source Category applies to Veolia.

The Statement of Basis for Veolia Discharge Permit (#177) does not include information about the characterization of the wastestream entering Veolia to make the determination to apply the Centralized Waste Treatment Point Source Category 40 CFR 437, Subpart C- Organics Treatment and Recovery. Characterization of the wastestream is necessary to determine the appropriate pretreatment subcategory of the Centralized Waste Treatment point source category limits (40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(3)). The Permit and Statement of Basis include Subpart C – Organics effluent limits and local limits, but the documentation of why Subpart C is applicable was not included.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(3) requires that permits include effluent limits, including Best Management Practices, based on applicable general Pretreatment Standards in part 403 of this chapter, categorical Pretreatment Standards, local limits, and State and local law.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iii) requires that Industrial Users be notified of applicable Pretreatment Standards.

Section 11.1 of the Industrial User Permitting Guidance Manual 833-R-12-001A September 2012 states, “The basis for decisions made during the permitting process are generally summarized in a document commonly referred to as the permit fact sheet. The fact sheet briefly sets forth the significant factual, legal, procedural, and policy questions considered in preparing the permit. In addition, the fact sheet should summarize the findings of review of the application, inspections, and other materials necessary to describe the rationale for the conditions imposed in the control mechanism. The fact sheet should be kept attached to a copy of the permit in the Control Authority’s files.”

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/industrial_user_permitting_manual_full.pdf

It is recommended that the District document the basis for decisions made during the permitting process (for example the determination of an SIU’s applicability to a categorical standard and applicable subpart including whether the SIU is a new or existing source) in a fact sheet and that it be kept with a copy of the permit in the District’s files.

Recommendation 7

Update the statement of basis for the Veolia industrial user permit to indicate the rationale for which subpart of the Centralized Waste Treatment Point Source Category applies to the facility. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 8 – The zero discharge permits did not contain all permit requirements.

South Adams County is not required to issue permits to zero discharge facilities; however, because zero discharge permits were issued, it is recommended that all information within permits remain consistent between discharging and zero discharging permits. For instance, information within S&S Anodizing Inc.’s permit is missing the following areas: a statement of non-transferability without prior notification, a statement of applicable civil and criminal penalties, and immediate notification to the POTW of accidental spills.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f) states, “A POTW pretreatment program must be based on the following legal authority and include the following procedures. These authorities and procedures shall at all times be fully and effectively exercised and implemented.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1) states, “The POTW shall operate pursuant to legal authority enforceable in Federal, State or local courts, which authorizes or enables the POTW to apply and to enforce the requirements of sections 307 (b) and (c), and 402(b)(8) of the Act and any regulations implementing those sections.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii) requires the POTW to control through permit, order, or similar means, the contribution to the POTW by each Significant Industrial User to ensure compliance with applicable Pretreatment Standards and Requirements.

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(2) states, “Statement of non-transferability without, at a minimum, prior notification to the POTW and provision of a copy of the existing control mechanism to the new owner or operator;”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(4) requires SIU permits to contain “Self-monitoring, sampling, reporting, notification and recordkeeping requirements,”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(vi)(C) states, “Procedures for immediately notifying the POTW of Slug Discharges, including any Discharge that would violate a prohibition under §403.5(b) with procedures for follow-up written notification within five days;”

Section 10.3 of the Industrial User Permitting Guidance Manual 833-R-12-001A September 2012 states, “Before issuing a zero-discharge permit, the Control Authority should determine the facility’s potential for discharge. Considerations for potential are discussed in detail in Section 2.2 of this manual. At a minimum the facility’s permit should contain the following conditions:

- A statement indicating that no discharge of process wastewater is permitted. Requirements to notify the POTW of any changes resulting in a potential for discharge.
- Requirements to certify periodically that no discharge has occurred.
- Notice that the POTW may inspect the facility as necessary to assess and assure compliance with the no-discharge requirement.
- Requirement to comply with Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and state hazardous waste regulations regarding the proper disposal of hazardous waste.

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/industrial_user_permitting_manual_full.pdf

Recommendation 8

It is recommended that zero discharge permits contain the following: a statement of non-transferability without prior notification, a statement of applicable civil and criminal penalties, and immediate notification to the POTW of accidental spills. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

D. Application of Pretreatment Standards and Requirements

1. Does the CA apply all applicable pretreatment standards? (40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(ii) and §403.8(5))

Yes, for the files reviewed in Part V of this report, the District applied all the applicable pretreatment standards.

2. Has the CA evaluated the need for SIUs to develop slug discharge control plans? (40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(vi))

Yes, the District required all SIUs to develop slug discharge control plans. The District was also generally evaluating the need for the SIUs to modify the existing slug discharge control plans during the yearly inspections and documenting their decision in their yearly inspection reports. Not all of the required slug plan elements were included in the all slug control plans. Findings regarding slug control plans are listed below.

Finding 9 – The S&S Anodizing Inc. and the Groendyke Transport, Inc, slug discharge control plans did not contain all required information.

S&S Anodizing Inc.’s submitted spill plan (as their Slug Control Plan) does not contain all required information. Specifically, the plan is missing a procedures to prevent adverse impact from accidental spills, including inspection and maintenance of storage areas, handling and transfer of materials, loading and unloading operations, control of plant site run-off, worker training, building of

containment structures or equipment, measures for containing toxic organic pollutants (including solvents), and/or measures and equipment for emergency response. Items are required to be incorporated in the facilities Slug Control Plan (spill plan) per 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(iv).

The Groendyke Transport, Inc. Slug Control Plan (dated October 2015) incorrectly identifies outfall 002, which received the combine facility discharge as the location where South Adams County Water and Sanitation District's Prohibitive Waste Standards (PWS) apply. Therefore, the description of the discharge practices was inaccurate and stated, "The discharge point receives treated wash bay effluent and all domestic waste water from the facility."

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(vi) states, "Evaluate whether each such Significant Industrial User needs a plan or other action to control Slug Discharges. For Industrial Users identified as significant prior to November 14, 2005, this evaluation must have been conducted at least once by October 14, 2006; additional Significant Industrial Users must be evaluated within 1 year of being designated a Significant Industrial User. For purposes of this subsection, a Slug Discharge is any Discharge of a non-routine, episodic nature, including but not limited to an accidental spill or a non-customary batch Discharge, which has a reasonable potential to cause Interference or Pass Through, or in any other way violate the POTW's regulations, local limits or Permit conditions. The results of such activities shall be available to the Approval Authority upon request. Significant Industrial Users are required to notify the POTW immediately of any changes at its facility affecting potential for a Slug Discharge. If the POTW decides that a slug control plan is needed, the plan shall contain, at a minimum, the following elements:

(A) Description of discharge practices, including non-routine batch Discharges;

(B) Description of stored chemicals;

(C) Procedures for immediately notifying the POTW of Slug Discharges, including any Discharge that would violate a prohibition under §403.5(b) with procedures for follow-up written notification within five days;

(D) If necessary, procedures to prevent adverse impact from accidental spills, including inspection and maintenance of storage areas, handling and transfer of materials, loading and unloading operations, control of plant site run-off, worker training, building of containment structures or equipment, measures for containing toxic organic pollutants (including solvents), and/or measures and equipment for emergency response;"

Corrective Action 9

Ensure that S&S Anodizing Inc. updates its slug control plan with all required elements described above. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding. On May 6, 2021, the District sent an email to EPA indicating that on April 26, 2021, Groendyke Transport, Inc. updated its slug control plan with the correct outfall to address the finding above. The District also provided a copy of the Groendyke Transport, Inc. slug control plan.

Recommendation 9

EPA has published a Guidance Manual for Control of Slug Loading to POTWs dated January 1991.

<https://www3.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/owm021.pdf>

It is recommended that the District review this guidance manual and implement it in its pretreatment program activities.

The District has a slug control plan evaluation sheet that has not been used for all SIUs. It is recommended that the slug control plan evaluation sheet be used for all SIUs to evaluate if a slug control plan is needed.

E. Compliance Monitoring

**1. Has the CA inspected and independently sampled each SIU at least once a year? Middle tier CIUs at least once every two years? Sample once during term of CIU control mechanism if CIU sampling waived for pollutants not present?
(40 C.F.R. §§403.8(f)(2)(v), 403.12(e)(2), 403.12(e)(2))**

Yes, the inspectors reviewed 2020 inspection reports and sampling data for the SIU files listed in Part V of this report. Based on the SIU files reviewed, the District has been conducting inspections and sampling at least once per year, except for the finding identified below.

Finding 10 – The District did not sample Steel Storage Systems for all required TTOs required under 40 CFR 433.11(e) during the June 26, 2020 sampling event.

The June 26, 2020, TTO sampling results for Steel Storage Systems did not have the results for pesticides and PCBs. It appears that method 608 was not used. The following pesticides and PCBs were not sampled for in the TTO samples: Aldrin, Dieldrin, Chlordane (technical mixture and metabolites), 4,4-DDT, 4,4-DDE (p,p-DDX), 4,4-DDD (p,p-TDE), Alpha-endosulfan, Beta-endosulfan, Endosulfan sulfate, Endrin, Endrin aldehyde, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide, Alpha-hexachloro-cyclohexane (BHC), Beta-BHC, Gamma-BHC, Delta-BHC, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)-1242 (Arochlor 1242), PCB-1254 (Arochlor 1254), PCB-1221 (Arochlor 1221), PCB-1232 (Arochlor 1232), PCB-1248 (Arochlor 1248), PCB-1260 (Arochlor 1260), PCB-1016 (Arochlor 1016), Toxaphene, 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD).

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(v) requires the POTW to “randomly sample and analyze the effluent from Industrial Users and conduct surveillance activities in order to identify, independent of information supplied by Industrial Users, occasional and continuing noncompliance with Pretreatment Standards. Inspect and sample the effluent from each Significant Industrial User at least once a year...”

40 C.F.R. §433.11(e) defines the term “TTO” and indicates that it shall mean total toxic organics, which is the summation of all quantifiable values greater than .01 milligrams per liter and it list the specific TTOs.

Corrective Action 10

Sample Steel Storage Systems for all pollutants of concern, including all TTOs at least once per year. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

**2. Has the CA used proper sampling and analysis procedures (40 C.F.R. §136) and inspection procedures? Were the procedures done with sufficient care to produce evidence admissible in enforcement proceedings or in judicial actions?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(v) and (vii), 40 C.F.R. §403.12(g)(5))**

Generally, the District appeared to be using proper sampling and analysis procedures at the time of the inspection, except for the finding described below.

Finding 11 – The District did not meet the temperature preservation for the July 19, 2020 Crystal Packaging sampling.

The chain of custody for the June 19, 2020 District sampling of Crystal Packaging indicated that the sample was received by the lab at a temperature of 22 °C. It is unclear whether ice was placed in the sample cooler. The sample was collected on June 19, 2020 at 11:58 am and provided to the lab the same day at 2:46 pm. The BOD₅, BOD₇, COD, TSS, oil and grease and surfactant samples need to be preserved to 6 °C. Footnote 18 of 40 CFR 136.3 states, “Aqueous samples must be preserved at ≤ 6 °C, and should not be frozen unless data demonstrating that sample freezing does not adversely impact sample integrity is maintained on file and accepted as valid by the regulatory authority. Also, for purposes of NPDES monitoring, the specification of “≤ °C” is used in place of the “4 °C” and “< 4 °C” sample temperature requirements listed in some methods. It is not necessary to measure the sample temperature to three significant figures (1/100th of 1 degree); rather, three significant figures are specified so that rounding down to 6 °C may not be used to meet the ≤6 °C requirement. The preservation temperature does not apply to samples that are analyzed immediately (less than 15 minutes).”

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(v) requires the POTW to “randomly sample and analyze the effluent from Industrial Users and conduct surveillance activities in order to identify, independent of information supplied by Industrial Users, occasional and continuing noncompliance with Pretreatment Standards. Inspect and sample the effluent from each Significant Industrial User at least once a year...”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(vii) states, “Investigate instances of noncompliance with Pretreatment Standards and Requirements, as indicated in the reports and notices required under §403.12, or indicated by analysis, inspection, and surveillance activities described in paragraph (f)(2)(v) of this section. Sample taking and analysis and the collection of other information shall be performed with sufficient care to produce evidence admissible in enforcement proceedings or in judicial actions.

40 C.F.R. §403.12(b)(5)(v) states, “Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with the techniques prescribed in 40 CFR part 136 and amendments thereto.”

40 CFR §136 indicates that BOD₅, BOD₇, COD, TSS, oil and grease and surfactant samples must be preserved at or below 6°C.

Corrective Action 11

Ensure sampling, preservation, and analysis techniques align with requirements in 40 CFR 136. Ensure that preservation temperatures are met for BOD₅, BOD₇, COD, TSS, oil and grease and surfactant samples collected during POTW sampling of its SIUs. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 12 – The District’s Birko Corporation sampling protocol did not require flow-proportional composite samples and did not require sampling through the entire discharge event.

The Birko Corporation Site-Specific Sampling Protocol indicates a composite sample is made up of four discrete grab samples collected at equal times and equal amounts but does not specify what happens to the aliquots between sampling events. It is recommended for samples to be more representative of a true composite sample; samples are required to be flow-proportional and preserved between sampling events. Also, it is recommended the sampling events be spread out throughout the discharge timeframe, and not clustered within a 2-hour window. For instance, if the facility discharges for a 12-hour timeframe, collecting a flow-proportionate sample every 3 hours is more representative than collecting 4 samples every 30 minutes.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(v) requires the POTW to “randomly sample and analyze the effluent from Industrial Users and conduct surveillance activities in order to identify, independent of information supplied by Industrial Users, occasional and continuing noncompliance with Pretreatment Standards. Inspect and sample the effluent from each Significant Industrial User at least once a year...”

Corrective Action 12

Update the Birko Corporation Site-Specific Sampling Protocol to require flow-proportional composite samples and the sampling event to spread out throughout the discharge timeframe. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

3. Has the CA kept records for three years including the following?

- a. Period compliance reports and other reports/notices
 - b. All monitoring records including: sample date, place, method, time, personnel; analysis date, personnel, method; results
 - c. BMP compliance documentation
 - d. Other monitoring records
- (40 C.F.R. §403.12(o))

It appeared that records were generally kept for at least three years.

4. Has the CA evaluated, at least once per year, whether NSCIUs continue to meet the criteria of an NSCIU?

(40 C.F.R. §§403.8(f)(2)(v)(b), 403.3(v)(2))

N/A. The District does not have any non-significant categorical industrial users (NSCIUs).

5. Has the CA required, received, and analyzed reports and other notices from SIUs?

- a. Self-monitoring reports
- b. Baseline Monitoring Reports (BMRs) and 90-day compliance reports
- c. Compliance schedules reports
- d. Notice of slug loading or potential problems at POTW
- e. Notification of spills, bypasses, upsets, etc.
- f. Notification of significant change in discharge
- g. 24-hour notification of effluent violation
- h. Resampling results within 30-days

**i. Other reports/notifications required by the CA
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv))**

Based on the files reviewed, the District has been receiving and analyzing required reports, except the District did not identify the issues described in the findings listed below.

Finding 13 – Crystal Packaging did not average the two COD samples taken in the first quarter of 2020 to perform the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation for the first quarter of 2020.

In the first quarter of 2020, Crystal Packaging took two COD samples. The COD samples were taken on January 20, 2020, with a result of 27,550 mg/L and March 3, 2020, with a result of 9,300 mg/L. The April 17, 2020, Crystal packaging self-monitoring report included the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation for the January 20, 2020, and the March 3, 2020, samples; however, the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation is performed by using the quarterly flow and the quarterly theoretical anhydrous product. Therefore, instead of performing two mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculations, Crystal Packaging should have averaged the COD concentrations and performed a mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation for the quarter. The calculations below demonstrate the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation.

For the first quarter of 2020 the following parameters were provided:

COD concentration for January 20, 2020 = 27,550 mg/L

COD concentration for March 3, 2020 = 9,300 mg/L

Average COD concentration for the quarter = $(27,550 \text{ mg/L} + 9,300 \text{ mg/L})/2 = 18,425 \text{ mg/L}$

Flow for first quarter of 2020 = 25,701.79 gallons = 0.02570179 MGD

Mass Load (kg/day) = Flow {MGD} x Concentration {mg/L} x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg/day) = 0.02570179 MGD x 18,425 mg/L x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg/day) = 1,792.40 kg/day of COD

In the March 3, 2020 self-monitoring report, Crystal Packaging reported 904.72 kg of COD, which is lower than the actual mass of COD calculated above of 1,792.40 kg.

The theoretical anhydrous product for the first quarter of 2020 = 454.75 Kkg

Therefore, the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio is equal to:
 $1,792.40 \text{ kg} / 454.75 \text{ Kkg} = 3.94 \text{ kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product}$

In the March 3, 2020, self-monitoring report, Crystal Packaging reported 1.98 kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product, which is lower than the actual mass of COD calculated above of 3.94 kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product. This issue was not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated Enforcement Response Plan (ERP) finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 13

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is performing all the calculations as required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 14 – Birko Corporation did not report the correct mass of COD and mass of BOD₇ in its self-monitoring reports submitted for the four quarters in 2020.

Birko Corporation did not report the correct mass of COD and mass of BOD₇ in its self-monitoring reports submitted for the four quarters in 2020. As an example the calculations for the second quarter of 2020 will be provided. For the second quarter of 2020 the following parameters were provided:

Flow for second quarter 2020 = 53,350 gallons = 0.053350 MGD

COD concentration for June 3, 2020 = 19,400 mg/L

Mass Load (kg) = Flow {MGD} x Concentration {mg/L} x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg) = 0.053350 MGD x 19,400 mg/L x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg) = 3,917.43 kg of COD

For the second quarter 2020 self-monitoring report, Birko Corporation reported 19,400 kg of COD, which is lower than the kg of COD calculated above.

Flow for second quarter 2020 = 53,350 gallons = 0.053350 MGD

BOD₇ concentration for June 3, 2020 = 10,100 mg/L

Mass Load (kg) = Flow {MGD} x Concentration {mg/L} x 3.785

BOD₇ Mass Load (kg) = 0.053350 MGD x 10,100 mg/L x 3.785

BOD₇ Mass Load (kg) = 2,039.49 kg of COD

For the second quarter 2020 self-monitoring report, Birko Corporation reported 10,100 kg of BOD₇, which is lower than the kg of BOD₇ calculated above.

These issues were not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 14

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is performing all the calculations as required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 15 – Birko Corporation did not perform the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation correctly for the first quarter of 2020.

Birko Corporation did not perform the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation correctly for the first quarter of 2020. For correct calculations, see equations below:

For the first quarter of 2020 the following parameters were provided:

Flow for first quarter 2020 = 60,750 gallons = 0.060750 MGD

COD concentration for March 2, 2020 = 18,130 mg/L

Mass Load (kg) = Flow {MGD} x Concentration {mg/L} x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg) = 0.060750 MGD x 18,130 mg/L x 3.785

COD Mass Load (kg) = 4,168.78 kg of COD

In the first quarter 2020 self-monitoring report, Birko Corporation reported 18.130 kg of COD which is lower than the kg of COD calculated above.

The theoretical anhydrous product for the quarter was reported as 690.9 Kkg

Therefore, the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio is equal to:

$4,168.78 \text{ kg} / 690.9 \text{ Kkg} = 6.03 \text{ kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product}$

In the first quarter 2020 self-monitoring report, Birko Corporation reported 7.54 kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product, which is higher than the actual mass of COD calculated above of 6.03 kg of COD/Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product. This issue was not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 15

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is performing all the calculations as required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 16 – Crystal Packaging sampled its wastewater from its batch tank on a day it was not discharging to the District.

The Crystal Packaging second quarter samples were taken on May 27, 2020; however, the flow records indicate that the Crystal Packaging did not discharge on that day. There was a discharge on May 28, 2020, of 1,258.19 gallons. It is important that Crystal Packaging take the sample during a discharge event, otherwise the sample would not be representative of the discharge. Part II Section 1.A of the permit states, “Samples taken for compliance monitoring purposes must be collected from Outfall 001 during times of actual batch discharge from the neutralization tank. Grab sampling must be used to obtain representative samples of the process wastewater discharge from Outfall 001.” This issue was not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

Part II Section 1.A of the permit states, “Samples taken for compliance monitoring purposes must be collected from Outfall 001 during times of actual batch discharge from the neutralization tank. Grab sampling must be used to obtain representative samples of the process wastewater discharge from Outfall 001.”

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 16

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that proper sampling during discharge events is occurring. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 17 – Crystal Packaging performed the wrong conversion factor for the mass of theoretical anhydrous product during the second quarter of 2020.

The Crystal Packaging July 22, 2020, self-monitoring report had a discrepancy between the conversion of mass of theoretical anhydrous product from kg to Kkg. The theoretical anhydrous product kg was listed as 1,099,740 kg and 124,396 Kkg in the self-monitoring report. To convert from kg to Kkg you must divide the kg by 1,000. Therefore, 1,099,740 kg of theoretical anhydrous product would result in 1,099.74 Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product instead of 124,396 Kkg. This issue was not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 17

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is performing all the calculations as required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 18 – The Steel Storage Systems first quarter of 2020 report indicated that from March 3-6, 2020, Steel Storage Systems had pH discharges of less than 5.

The Steel Storage Systems first quarter of 2020 report submitted on April 14, 2020, indicated that from March 3-6, 2020, Steel Storage Systems had pH discharges of less than 5. It also indicated that the sensor was dirty. The pH reported on March 3 was 4.96. The pH reported on March 4 was 4.70. The pH reported on March 5 was 4.59. The pH reported on March 6 was 4.54. Part II. Section 1.D.4 states, “If a pH violation is detected, neutralization and re-sampling must occur immediately and continue until an acceptable pH level is achieved. The initial violation and resample results must also be reported, as required in Part II, Section 1, F. of this WDP. Additionally, the Permittee must ensure all

applicable reporting requirements provided in Section 2, A., 2) of this WDP for noncompliance reporting are met”.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 18

On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA and indicated that the District met with Steel Storage Solutions. The Steel Storage Solutions representative indicated that the pH measurements were to the internal process (neutralization tank) and not a discharge measurement. They indicated that the pH was adjusted before discharge. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 19 – The Cummins 2020 process water log for the pressure washer had some discrepancies on the daily water used and the interceptor running total.

The Cummins 2020 process water log for the pressure washer had some discrepancies on the daily water used and the interceptor running total. The discrepancies in the daily water used and the interceptor running total should be investigated by the District.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 19

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is performing all the calculations as required by the permit. Investigate the discrepancies in the daily water used and the interceptor running total reported by Cummins in 2020. The discrepancy could be due to the hot water evaporating or the water not making it to the trench. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 20 – Birko Corporation’s Chain of Custody sheets do not contain the method of analysis for pH.

Birko Corporation’s Chain of Custody sheets do not contain the method of analysis for pH. Analytical methods used are required to be maintained for all sample collections per Part II.1.B of the industrial user permit #116, and 40 CFR §403.12(b)(5)(vii). This issue was not identified by the District during its review of the self-monitoring reports. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

Corrective Action 20

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is documenting the analytical methods used as required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

Finding 21 – Birko Corporation exceeded the preservation temperature of six degrees Celsius for samples collected on June 2, 2020.

Birko Corporation exceeded the preservation temperature of six degrees Celsius for samples collected on June 2, 2020 (Energy Laboratories received sample at 6.4°C). The chain of custody for the Birko Corporation samples obtained on February 19, 2020, and sent to Colorado Analytical Laboratories did not indicate a temperature received nor indication the sample was received on ice. BOD₅, BOD₇, COD, TSS, oil and grease and surfactant samples are required to be collected and preserved at or below six degrees Celsius per 40 CFR § Part 136, and Monitoring and reporting is required to be completed per Part II.1.B of the industrial user permit #116. See Section VIII.F of this report for associated ERP finding and corrective action.

Pretreatment Requirements

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(iv) requires the District to develop and implement procedures to, “Receive and analyze self-monitoring reports and other notices submitted by Industrial Users in accordance with the self-monitoring requirements in §403.12.”

40 C.F.R. §403.12(b)(5)(v) states, “Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with the techniques prescribed in 40 CFR part 136 and amendments thereto.”

40 CFR §136 indicates that BOD₅, BOD₇, COD, TSS, oil and grease and surfactant samples must be preserved at or below 6°C.

Corrective Action 20

Review reports submitted by SIUs, including self-monitoring reports to ensure that the facility is following the analytical preservation methods required by the permit. In your response to the EPA, indicate how the District will correct this finding.

**6. Have SIUs monitored to demonstrate continued compliance and re-sampling after violation(s)?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(g)(1) & (2))**

Yes, the District has required SIUs to resample after violations.

**7. Has the CA ensured CIUs report on all regulated pollutants at least once every 6 months?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(e)(1) & (g)(1))**

The District has eight CIUs. The inspectors evaluated four of the eight CIUs files during the inspection (Birko Corporation, Crystal Packaging, Steel Storage System, and Veolia). A review of these files indicated that the CIUs reported at least once every six months.

8. Has the CA ensured non-categorical SIUs self-monitor and report at least once every 6 months with a description of the nature, concentration, and flow of the pollutants required to be reported by the Control Authority?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(h) & (g)(1))

Non-categorical SIUs reported at least once every 6 months for the files reviewed by the EPA.

9. Has the CA required self-monitoring reports from CIUs to be signed and certified?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(b)(6), 403.12(l))

Yes, the CIU reports reviewed were signed and certified.

10. Has the CA received notification of hazardous waste discharges?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(j) & (p))

No notifications were received according to the files reviewed, nor was there any indication that a notification should have been received.

F. Enforcement

1. Has the CA implemented its enforcement response plan (ERP)?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5))

The inspectors were provided with a copy of the District's ERP called Enforcement Response Plan South Adams County Water and Sanitation District. The ERP was adopted on January 12, 2012. The District was generally implementing its ERP except for the instances indicated below.

Finding 22 – An enforcement response was not issued to the Birko Corporation for reporting the incorrect mass of COD and BOD₇.

Birko Corporation did not report the correct mass of COD and mass of BOD₇ in its self-monitoring reports submitted for the four quarters in 2020. For additional information see Finding 14. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under reporting requirement violations – minor reporting deficiencies: minor omissions. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 22

On April 23, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Birko Corporation for not reporting the correct mass of COD and mass of BOD₇ in its self-monitoring reports submitted for the four quarters in 2020. The District met with Birko Corporation on April 21, 2021, to inform them about the violations. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 21, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 23 – An enforcement response was not issued to the Birko Corporation for the failure to perform the mass of COD to mass of theoretical anhydrous product ratio calculation correctly.

Birko Corporation did not perform the mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation correctly for the first quarter of 2020. For additional information see Finding 15. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under reporting requirement violations – minor reporting deficiencies: minor omissions. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 23

On April 23, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Birko Corporation for not performing the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation correctly for the first quarter of 2020. The District met with Birko Corporation on April 21, 2021, to inform them about the violation. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 21, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 24 – An enforcement response was not issued to Birko Corporation for failure to document the pH method of analysis.

Birko Corporation's Chain of Custody sheets do not contain the method of analysis for pH. Analytical methods used are required to be maintained for all sample collections per Part II.1.B of the industrial user permit #116, and 40 CFR §403.12(b)(5)(vii). For additional information see Finding 20. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation appears to fall under reporting requirement violations – minor reporting deficiencies: minor omissions. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 24

On April 23, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Birko Corporation for failure to document the pH method of analysis. The District met with Birko Corporation on April 21, 2021, to inform them about the violations. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 21, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 25 – An enforcement response was not issued to Birko Corporation for failure to preserve its samples below 6°C.

Birko Corporation exceeded the preservation temperature of six degrees Celsius for samples collected on June 2, 2020 (Energy Laboratories received sample at 6.4°C). The chain of custody for the Birko Corporation samples obtained on February 19, 2020, and sent to Colorado Analytical Laboratories did

not indicate a temperature received nor indication the sample was received on ice. Samples are required to be collected and preserved at or below six degrees Celsius per 40 CFR § Part 136, and Monitoring and reporting is required to be completed per Part II.1.B of the industrial user permit #116. For additional information see Finding 21. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under monitoring violations – analytical or procedural. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 25

On April 23, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Birko Corporation for failure to preserve its samples below 6°C. The District met with Birko Corporation on April 21, 2021, to inform them about the violation. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 21, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 26 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for failure to average the COD concentration and use the average in the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation.

In the first quarter of 2020, Crystal Packaging failed to average the two COD concentrations and performed a mass of COD (kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation for the quarter with the average COD concentration. For additional information see Finding 13. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under reporting requirement violations – minor reporting deficiencies: minor omissions. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 26

On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Crystal Packaging for failure to average the COD concentration and use the average in the mass of COD (Kg) to mass of theoretical anhydrous product (Kkg) ratio calculation. The District met with Crystal Packaging on April 28, 2021, to inform them about the violation. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 23, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 27 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for failure to sample during the discharge event.

The Crystal Packaging second quarter samples were taken on May 27, 2020; however, the flow records indicate that the Crystal Packaging did not discharge on that day. There was a discharge on May 28, 2020, of 1,258.19 gallons. It is important that Crystal Packaging take the sample during a discharge

event, otherwise the sample would not be representative of the discharge. Part II Section 1.A of the permit states, “Samples taken for compliance monitoring purposes must be collected from Outfall 001 during times of actual batch discharge from the neutralization tank. Grab sampling must be used to obtain representative samples of the process wastewater discharge from Outfall 001.” For additional information see Finding 16. According to the District’s ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under monitoring violations – analytical or procedural. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 27

On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Crystal Packaging for failure to sample during the discharge event. The District met with Crystal Packaging on April 28, 2021, to inform them about the violation. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 23, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 28 – An enforcement response was not issued to Crystal Packaging for reporting the incorrect theoretical anhydrous product.

The Crystal Packaging July 22, 2020, self-monitoring report had a discrepancy between the conversion of mass of theoretical anhydrous product from kg to Kkg. The theoretical anhydrous product kg was listed as 1,099,740 kg and 124,396 Kkg in the self-monitoring report. To convert from kg to Kkg you must divide the kg by 1,000. Therefore, 1,099,740 kg of theoretical anhydrous product would result in 1,099.74 Kkg of theoretical anhydrous product instead of 124,396 Kkg. For additional information see Finding 17. According to the District’s ERP, this type of violation would appear to fall under reporting requirement violations – minor reporting deficiencies: minor omissions. For the first violation, the ERP requires the District to document a phone call or an informal meeting informing the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 28

On April 28, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that the District issued a Letter of Violation to Crystal Packaging for reporting the incorrect theoretical anhydrous product. The District met with Crystal Packaging on April 28, 2021, to inform them about the violation. The District provided the EPA with a copy of the Letter of Violation that was dated April 23, 2021. No further action is needed at this time.

Finding 29 – An escalated enforcement response was not issued to Precise Cast Prototypes & Engineering Inc. for failure to provide an updated slug control plan and chemical inventory.

A Letter of Violation for Minor Reporting Deficiencies for Precise Cast Prototypes & Engineering, Inc. was sent with the annual inspection report (dated June 22, 2020), but did not cover all the minor

reporting deficiencies. Section III of Permit No. 216 has requirements to submit a Spill Plan to the District no later than May 17, 2019, and to post the Spill Plan in all shop and production areas. The June 2020 inspection report and LOV identified the violation for not posting the Spill Plan in the process areas. The LOV did not identify that the Spill Plan was not sent to the District by the May 17, 2019, as required by the permit. Section III of the permit also requires a Chemical Inventory to be sent to District no later than April 17, 2019. The Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) in the file appear to have been submitted to the District on April 29, 2016, and the facility did not submit the Chemical Inventory to the District by April 17, 2019, as required by the permit. This was not identified in the June 22, 2020 LOV. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation appears to fall under Reporting Requirement Violations - Minor Reporting Deficiencies: minor omissions, second violation. The ERP requires the District to issue a LOV informing the industrial user of the violation with a requirement to correct the violation. The LOV shall also warn of escalating enforcement action.

An Annual inspection of Precise Cast was conducted, and the June 2020 inspection report identified a violation for not posting the Spill Plan in the process areas. Verification or response from the facility about implementing the corrective action was not included in the report. It is recommended that the District require a response from the facility to ensure that the corrective actions were accomplished.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 29

On May 3, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA indicating that on April 23, 2021, the District sent a letter of violation to Precise Cast Prototypes & Engineering, Inc. for failure to provide an updated slug control plan and chemical inventory. The District also provided to the EPA a copy of the April 23, 2021, letter of violation. No further action is needed at this time.

Recommendation 29

It is recommended that the District require a response from the facility to ensure that the corrective actions from inspection report were accomplished.

Finding 30 – An enforcement response was not issued to Groendyke Transport, Inc. for failure to provide an updated slug control plan.

Part III, Section 1. A, B, and D, of the Groendyke Transport, Inc. Permit No. 037 required Slug Control Plan (SCP), Chemical Inventory, and Treatment Systems Maintenance Manual (TSMM) to be submitted to the District by September 9, 2018. The SCP in the facility file was received by the District on October 13, 2015. According to the District's ERP, this type of violation appears to fall under Reporting Requirement Violations - Minor Reporting Deficiencies: minor omissions, first violation. The ERP requires the District to document a phone call or informal meeting to inform the industrial user of the violation.

Pretreatment Requirement

40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(5) requires the District to implement its ERP.

Corrective Action 30

On May 6, 2021, the District sent an email to the EPA and indicated that it issued a Letter of Violation to Groendyke on April 26, 2021. On April 26, 2021, Groendyke submitted to the District an updated slug control plan and treatment systems maintenance manual. On April 26, 2021, Groendyke also submitted to the District a permit renewal application that contained the chemical inventory at the facility along with the volumes of chemicals stored at the facility. On May 6, 2021, the District provided the Groendyke updated slug control plan, treatment systems maintenance manual and the chemical inventory to the EPA. No further action is needed at this time.

2. Does the CA evaluate both numeric and narrative criteria for significant non-compliance (SNC) annually and publish a list of IUs in SNC?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(2)(viii))

The District evaluates numeric and narrative criteria SNC on a quarterly basis. The District has published a list of SIUs in SNC annually.

3. Has the CA developed IU compliance schedules?
(40 C.F.R. §403.8(f)(1)(iv)(A))

N/A. Compliance schedules have not been developed for any SIUs.

4. Has the CA ensured CIU compliance within 3 years of standards effective date (or less than 3 years where required by standard)?
(40 C.F.R. §403.6(b))

N/A. The standards have been effective for more than three years.

5. Has the CA ensured CIUs submit complete baseline monitoring reports and 90-day compliance reports within the required time frames?
(40 C.F.R. §403.12(b) & (d))

The District has eight CIUs. The inspectors only evaluated four CIU files during the inspection (Birko Corporation, Crystal Packaging, Steel Storage Solutions and Veolia). The due date for the baseline monitoring report and 90-day compliance report for the files reviewed, except the Crystal Packaging file, were more than three years ago. Therefore, the baseline monitoring report and the 90-day compliance report were not evaluated as a component of this inspection. The District required a baseline monitoring report and 90 day compliance report for Crystal Packaging.

G. Additional Evaluations

Finding 31 – The District has exceeded its ammonia NPDES effluent permit limit in November and December 2020 due to possible pass through and/or interference.

Part I.A.1 of the District's NPDES permit contains ammonia effluent limits at Outfall 001B that were effective January 1, 2017. The ammonia daily maximum limit in the Permit and the ammonia 30-day average limit vary each month. Based on effluent monitoring results submitted on Discharge Monitoring Reports, the District has exceeded its ammonia NPDES daily max limit in November and December 2020 due to possible pass through or interference, as shown below:

2020 Ammonia Exceedances due to pass through or interference

Month	30-Day Average Limit	Daily Max Limit (mg/l)	30-Day Average Result (mg/l)	Daily Max Result (mg/l)
November 2020	NA	7.8	4.52	13.3
December 2020	NA	7.9	4.33	22.2

In November and December 2020, the District had possible interference and pass through events, which inhibited or disrupted the nitrifiers at the POTW and caused the District to exceed their ammonia limits. The District is investigating and has issued enforcement responses to different industrial users (Veolia and Offen) in the service area. On March 3, 2021, Offen indicated that it was planning to permanently block, cut or cap their effluent pipe. EPA would like the District to provide an update of its interference and pass through investigation findings and enforcement responses once the investigations are completed. It is recommended that the District analyze the POTW's monthly ammonia discharge records for the past 5 years to determine any ammonia seasonal trends.

Pretreatment Requirement

Part I.A.1 of the District's NPDES Permit contains ammonia effluent limits at Outfall 001B that were effective January 1, 2017.

According to Part I.B.8.a.iv of the District's NPDES permit, the Permittee shall investigate instances of non-compliance with Pretreatment Standards and requirements indicated in reports and notices required under 40 C.F.R. Section 403.12, or indicated by analysis, inspection, and/or surveillance activities.

According to Part I.B.8.g.x of the District's NPDES permit, the Permittee shall prohibit the introduction of any other pollutant which may cause Pass Through or Interference.

Corrective Action 31

Once the District completes its investigation of the ammonia exceedances due to pass through and/or interference, provide an update to the EPA of the District's findings and any actions taken against any SIUs.