La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

#### Influent Flow and Loading

- 1. Monthly Average Flows and (C)BOD Loadings
- 1.1 Verify the following monthly flows and (C)BOD loadings to your facility.

Outfall No. 701	Influent Monthly Average Flow, MGD	х	Influent Monthly Average (C)BOD Concentration mg/L	х	8.34	=	Influent Monthly Average (C)BOD Loading, lbs/day
January	9.9750	Х	313	Х	8.34	=	26,053
February	9.9713	Χ	327	Χ	8.34	=	27,223
March	10.2878	Χ	318	Χ	8.34	=	27,326
April	10.2620	Χ	312	Χ	8.34	=	26,665
May	11.9393	Χ	285	Χ	8.34	=	28,420
June	11.7385	Χ	294	Χ	8.34	=	28,772
July	10.8872	Χ	300	Х	8.34	=	27,225
August	9.9575	Χ	300	Х	8.34	=	24,887
September	9.6643	Χ	289	Χ	8.34	=	23,283
October	9.8156	Х	321	Х	8.34	=	26,267
November	9.2313	Х	322	Х	8.34	=	24,783
December	9.0428	Х	315	Х	8.34	=	23,727

- 2. Maximum Monthly Design Flow and Design (C)BOD Loading
- 2.1 Verify the design flow and loading for your facility.

Design	Design Factor	Х	%	=	% of Design
Max Month Design Flow, MGD	20	Х	90	=	18
		Х	100	=	20
Design (C)BOD, lbs/day	29793	Х	90	=	26813.7
		Х	100	=	29793

2.2 Verify the number of times the flow and (C)BOD exceeded 90% or 100% of design, points earned, and score:

	Months of Influent	flow was greater	Number of times flow was greater than 100% of	(C)BOD was greater	Number of times (C)BOD was greater than 100% of design
January	1	0	0	0	0
February	1	0	0	1	0
March	1	0	0	1	0
April	1	0	0	0	0
May	1	0	0	1	0
June	1	0	0	1	0
July	1	0	0	1	0
August	1	0	0	0	0
September	1	0	0	0	0
October	1	0	0	0	0
November	1	0	0	0	0
December	1	0	0	0	0
Points per ea	ach	2	1	3	2
Exceedances	5	0	0	5	0
Points		0	0	15	0
Total Numb	er of Po	oints			15

15

Last Updated: Reporting For: La Crosse City 5/2/2018 2017 3. Flow Meter 3.1 Was the influent flow meter calibrated in the last year? Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY) Yes 10/13/2017 O No If No, please explain: 4. Sewer Use Ordinance 4.1 Did your community have a sewer use ordinance that limited or prohibited the discharge of excessive conventional pollutants ((C)BOD, SS, or pH) or toxic substances to the sewer from industries, commercial users, hauled waste, or residences? Yes o No If No, please explain: 4.2 Was it necessary to enforce the ordinance? Yes O No If Yes, please explain: We continue to use enforcement related to restaurants grease issues entering sewer collection system, work with facility to improve grease trap maintenance. Enforcement was used to control loading from Industries. City Brewing Company LLC continues to contribute significant loading to La Crosse WWTP this is why we are at or above 90% of max design BOD loading. 5. Septage Receiving 5.1 Did you have requests to receive septage at your facility? Septic Tanks Holding Tanks **Grease Traps** Yes Yes Yes O No O No O No 5.2 Did you receive septage at your faclity? If yes, indicate volume in gallons. Septic Tanks Yes gallons 883,315.00 o No Holding Tanks Yes gallons 292,600.00 O No Grease Traps Yes 547,245.00 gallons 0 No 5.2.1 If yes to any of the above, please explain if plant performance is affected when receiving any of these wastes. We sample determine the strength of the waste to insure the WWTP can handle the loading. We gather as much information on any new waste streams we consider to treat to insure waste isn't toxic to WWTP. Grease trap waste that we except at the WWTP can be the most challenging. Total gallons trucked La Crosse WWTP in 2017 5,122,435.00 6. Pretreatment

6.1 Did your facility experience operational problems, permit violations, biosolids quality concerns,

or hazardous situations in the sewer system or treatment plant that were attributable to

commercial or industrial discharges in the last year?

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

o Yes

No

If yes, describe the situation and your community's response.

- 6.2 Did your facility accept hauled industrial wastes, landfill leachate, etc.?
- Yes
- O No

If yes, describe the types of wastes received and any procedures or other restrictions that were in place to protect the facility from the discharge of hauled industrial wastes.

La Crosse WWTP accepts Industrial Waste, trucked to the WWTP and from collection system. Pretreatment program regulates the Industrial waste treated at WWTP and the trucked waste treated. Industries are permitted using guidance and follow Sanitary Sewer Ordinance DNR regulation provides support to the program.

Total Points Generated	15
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	85
Section Grade	В

La Crosse City Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

#### Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (BOD/CBOD)

- 1. Effluent (C)BOD Results
- 1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for BOD or

Outfall No.	Monthly	90% of	Effluent Monthly	Months of	Permit Limit	90% Permit
001	Average Limit (mg/L)	Permit Limit > 10 (mg/L)	Average (mg/L)	Discharge with a Limit	Exceedance	Limit Exceedance
			_	with a Limit	_	
January	25	22.5	6	1	0	0
February	25	22.5	5	1	0	0
March	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
April	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
May	25	22.5	5	1	0	0
June	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
July	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
August	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
September	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
October	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
November	25	22.5	4	1	0	0
December	25	22.5	5	1	0	0
		* Eq	uals limit if limit is	<= 10		
Months of d	ischarge/yr			12		
Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge					7	3
Exceedances					0	0
Points					0	0
Total numb	per of points					0

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge. Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is 12/6 = 2.0

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

_			<b>~</b>	
つ	-10	Meter	Calibration	٦

2.1 Was the effluent flow meter calibrated in the last year?

Yes

Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY)

10/12/2017

O No

If No, please explain:

- 3. Treatment Problems
- 3.1 What problems, if any, were experienced over the last year that threatened treatment?

City Brewing Company LLC provides challenges to operate WWTP efficiently. Though WWTP treatment numbers are good, we continue to work closely with City Brewing Company LLC.

- 4. Other Monitoring and Limits
- 4.1 At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for any other pollutants such as chlorides, pH, residual chlorine, fecal coliform, or metals? o Yes

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

	=
• No	
If Yes, please explain:	
4.2 At any time in the past year was there a failure of an effluent acute or chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) test?  O Yes	
• No	
If Yes, please explain:	
4.3 If the biomonitoring (WET) test did not pass, were steps taken to identify and/or reduce source(s) of toxicity?	
o Yes  o No	
• N/A	
Please explain unless not applicable:	

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

#### Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Total Suspended Solids)

1. Effluent Total Suspended Solids Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for TSS:

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average Limit (mg/L)	90% of Permit Limit >10 (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance	90% Permit Limit Exceedance
January	30	27	9	1	0	0
February	30	27	8	1	0	0
March	30	27	9	1	0	0
April	30	27	9	1	0	0
May	30	27	9	1	0	0
June	30	27	5	1	0	0
July	30	27	4	1	0	0
August	30	27	5	1	0	0
September	30	27	6	1	0	0
October	30	27	6	1	0	0
November	30	27	4	1	0	0
December	30	27	6	1	0	0
		* Eq	uals limit if limit is	<= 10		
Months of D	ischarge/yr			12		
Points per	each exceed	ance with 12	months of disch	arge:	7	3
Exceedances					0	0
Points					0	0
Total Num	ber of Points					0
NOTE E						

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge.

Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is 12/6 = 2.0

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

#### Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Phosphorus)

1. Effluent Phosphorus Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for Phosphorus

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average phosphorus Limit (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average phosphorus (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance	
January	1	0.365	1	0	
February	1	0.366	1	0	
March	1	0.405	1	0	
April	1	0.428	1	0	
May	1	0.347	1	0	
June	1	0.292	1	0	
July	1	0.287	1	0	
August	1	0.501	1	0	
September	1	0.413	1	0	
October	1	0.442	1	0	Πo
November	1	0.428	1	0	
December	1	0.329	1	0	
Months of Discharg	ge/yr		12		
Points per each	10				
Exceedances				0	
Total Number of	Points			0	

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to waters of the state, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge.

Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is 12/6 = 2.0

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

### Biosolids Quality and Management

1. Biosolids Use/Disposal	
1.1 How did you use or dispose of your biosolids? (Check all that apply)	
☐ Land applied under your permit	
☐ Publicly Distributed Exceptional Quality Biosolids	
☐ Hauled to another permitted facility	
Landfilled	
☐ Incinerated	
☑ Other	
NOTE: If you did not remove biosolids from your system, please describe your system type such as lagoons, reed beds, recirculating sand filters, etc.  1.1.1 If you checked Other, please describe:	
In 2017 La Crosse WWTP permitted land in Minnesota to dispose of Bio solids. This was reported as other methods in annual land application report. 109 metric tons was disposed of in Minnesota in the fall of 2018 this will be reported to MPCA after crop year.	
2. Land Application Site 2.1 Last Year's Approved and Active Land Application Sites 2.1.1 How many acres did you have? 6388.60 acres 2.1.2 How many acres did you use?  1,355 acres  2.2 If you did not have enough acres for your land application needs, what action was taken?	
<ul><li>2.3 Did you overapply nitrogen on any of your approved land application sites you used last year?</li><li>Yes (30 points)</li><li>No</li></ul>	0
<ul><li>2.4 Have all the sites you used last year for land application been soil tested in the previous 4 years?</li><li>● Yes</li></ul>	
O No (10 points)	1
o N/A	
3. Biosolids Metals  Number of biosolids outfalls in your WPDES permit:	

3.1 For each outfall tested, verify the biosolids metal quality values for your facility during the last calendar year.

Outfall No.	003	- LIC	UID S	LUD	GE													
Parameter	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic		41	75	5.5		5.77			7.33	6.86			5.29		4.71		0	0
Cadmium		39	85	3.56		2.25			3.66	6.66			3.74		2.79		0	0
Copper		1500	4300	787		661			679	764			790		718		0	0
Lead		300	840	21.4		19.3			20.6	21.4			21.3		21.8		0	0
Mercury		17	57	.847		.031			.614	.257			.374		.326		0	0
Molybdenum	60		75	15.3		13.9			20.9	21.7			32.4		17.3	0		0
Nickel	336		420	15.4		17.9			24.2	23.8			24		40	0		0
Selenium	80		100	5.74		4.04			5.91	4.48			4.05		5.11	0		0
Zinc		2800	7500	1040		1000			1280	1150			1320		948		0	0

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

Outfall No	o. 00	2 - C	AKE S	SLUD	GE													
Parameter	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic		41	75	0		4.5		0		0		0		0			0	0
Cadmium		39	85	0		2.72		0		0		0		0			0	0
Copper		1500	4300	0		659		0		0		0		0			0	0
Lead		300	840	0		18.5		0		0		0		0			0	0
Mercury		17	57	0		.283		0		0		0		0			0	0
Molybdenum	60		75	0		19.6		0		0		0		0		0		0
Nickel	336		420	0		19.3		0		0		0		0		0		0
Selenium	80		100	0		3.49		0		0		0		0		0		0
Zinc		2800	7500	0		1050		0		0		0		0			0	0

3.1.1 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the high quality limits OR 80% of the limit for molybdenum, nickel, or selenium = 0

**Exceedence Points** 

- 0 (0 Points)
- 0 1-2 (10 Points)
- 0 > 2 (15 Points)
- 3.1.2 If you exceeded the high quality limits, did you cumulatively track the metals loading at each land application site? (check applicable box)
  - o Yes
- O No (10 points)
- N/A Did not exceed limits or no HQ limit applies (0 points)
- O N/A Did not land apply biosolids until limit was met (0 points)
- 3.1.3 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the ceiling limits = 0 Exceedence Points
- 0 (0 Points)
- 0 1 (10 Points)
- 0 > 1 (15 Points)
- 3.1.4 Were biosolids land applied which exceeded the ceiling limit?
- o Yes (20 Points)
- No (0 Points)
- 3.1.5 If any metal limit (high quality or ceiling) was exceeded at any time, what action was taken? Has the source of the metals been identified?
- 4. Pathogen Control (per outfall):
- 4.1 Verify the following information. If any information is incorrect, use the Report Issue button under the Options header in the left-side menu.

Outfall Number:	002
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	05/01/2017 - 06/30/2017
Density:	22,100
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

0

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	01/01/2017 - 02/28/2017
Density:	31,800
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	No
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	03/01/2017 - 04/30/2017
Density:	23,100
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	03/01/2017 - 04/30/2017
Density:	89,800
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	07/01/2017 - 08/31/2017
Density:	222
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	No
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	09/01/2017 - 10/31/2017
Density:	9,170
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

 $\Omega$ 

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	11/01/2017 - 12/31/2017
Density:	45,100
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

- 4.2 If exceeded Class B limit or did not meet the process criteria at the time of land application.
- 4.2.1 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of land application?Yes (40 Points)
- No

If yes, what action was taken?

- 5. Vector Attraction Reduction (per outfall):
- 5.1 Verify the following information. If any of the information is incorrect, use the Report Issue button under the Options header in the left-side menu.

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

	5/2/2018	2017
Outfall Number:	002	
Method Date:	06/30/2017	7
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
		_
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	02/28/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	No	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	04/30/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
		_
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	04/30/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Incorporation when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
		_
Outfall Number:	003	_
Method Date:	08/31/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	_
Requirement Met:	Yes	_
Land Applied:	No	_
Limit (if applicable):		_
Results (if applicable):		

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	10/31/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/31/2017	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Injection when land apply	
Requirement Met:	Yes	0
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
No     If yes, what action was taken?		
6. Biosolids Storage 6.1 How many days of actual, current b facility have either on-site or off-site?  • >= 180 days (0 Points)  • 150 - 179 days (10 Points)  • 120 - 149 days (20 Points)  • 90 - 119 days (30 Points)  • < 90 days (40 Points)  • N/A (0 Points)  6.2 If you checked N/A above, explain v	iosolids storage capacity did your wastewater treatment	0
7. Issues 7.1 Describe any outstanding biosolids i	ssues with treatment, use or overall management:	

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

### Staffing and Preventative Maintenance (All Treatment Plants)

<ol> <li>Plant Staffing</li> <li>Was your wastewater treatment plant adequately staffed last year?</li> </ol>	
• Yes	
O No	
If No, please explain:	
Could use more help/staff for:	
<ul> <li>1.2 Did your wastewater staff have adequate time to properly operate and maintain the plant and fulfill all wastewater management tasks including recordkeeping?</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	
o No	
If No, please explain:	
<ul> <li>2. Preventative Maintenance</li> <li>2.1 Did your plant have a documented AND implemented plan for preventative maintenance on major equipment items?</li> <li>Yes (Continue with question 2)</li> <li>No (40 points)</li> </ul>	
If No, please explain, then go to question 3:	
in No, please explain, then go to question 3.	
2.2 Did this preventative maintenance program depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, and other tasks necessary for each piece of equipment?  ● Yes	0
O No (10 points)	
<ul> <li>2.3 Were these preventative maintenance tasks, as well as major equipment repairs, recorded and filed so future maintenance problems can be assessed properly?</li> <li>◆ Yes</li> </ul>	
O Paper file system	
O Computer system	
<ul> <li>Both paper and computer system</li> </ul>	
O No (10 points)	
<ul> <li>3. O&amp;M Manual</li> <li>3.1 Does your plant have a detailed O&amp;M and Manufacturer Equipment Manuals that can be used as a reference when needed?</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	
o No	
<ul><li>4. Overall Maintenance /Repairs</li><li>4.1 Rate the overall maintenance of your wastewater plant.</li><li>O Excellent</li><li>O Very good</li></ul>	
● Good	
o Fair	
o Poor	
Describe your rating:	

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

Lacrosse WWTP is an older plant and it still performs well, we continue to upgrade equipment, La Crosse has rehab 3 out 4 anaerobic digesters in the past 3 years and will complete the 4th in 2019. In 2018 WWTP will work with consultants to implement possible power saving projects and evaluate increased Solids capacity.

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

4. Continuing Education Credits

Complia	ance Maintenance Anr	nual Report				
La Crosse (	City			Last Updat 5/2/2018	ted: Reportin 201	0
Operator	Certification and Educat	ion				
1.1 Did you • Yes (0 • No (20 • Name:	O points)	-charge during the	report year?			0
2.1 In accand subclitreatment  Sub Class  A1  A2  A3  A4  A5  B  C  P  N  D  L  U  SS  2.2 Was t	•	erator-in-charge (Oss(es) were held by WWTP Advanced X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X	OIC) to operate y the operate OIT  OIT  NA evel and subc	te the wastev or-in-charge?  OIC  Basic  NA  Class(es) to open and the state of the wastev or in-charge?	Advanced X X X X X X NA perate this	0
3.1 In the to ensure of the follows One of the An arr  ☐ An arr ☐ An ope be cert ☐ A cons ☐ None of the to ensure of the cert	sion Planning e event of the loss of your designal the continued proper operation a lowing options (check all that apport more additional certified operate rangement with another certified or rangement with another community erator on staff who has an operate tified within one year sultant to serve as your certified of of the above (20 points) of the above" is selected, please	and maintenance or oly)? ors on staff operator ity with a certified or-in-training certif	f the plant th operator	at includes o	ne or more	0

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

4.1 If you had a designated operator-in-charge, was the operator-in-charge earning Continuing Education Credits at the following rates?

OIT and Basic Certification:

- Averaging 6 or more CECs per year.
- O Averaging less than 6 CECs per year.

Advanced Certification:

- Averaging 8 or more CECs per year.
- Averaging less than 8 CECs per year.

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City	Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017
Financial Management	
Provider of Financial Information     Name:	
Jared Greeno Telephone: 608-789-7322	(XXX) XXX-XXXX
E-Mail Address (optional):  greenoja@cityoflacrosse.org	
<ul> <li>2. Treatment Works Operating Revenues</li> <li>2.1 Are User Charges or other revenues sufficient to cover treatment plant AND/OR collection system?</li> <li>Yes (0 points)</li> <li>No (40 points)</li> <li>If No, please explain:</li> </ul>	O&M expenses for your wastewater
2.2 When was the User Charge System or other revenue so Year:  2017  • 0-2 years ago (0 points)  • 3 or more years ago (20 points)  • N/A (private facility)  2.3 Did you have a special account (e.g., CWFP required se financial resources available for repairing or replacing equip plant and/or collection system?  • Yes (0 points)  • No (40 points)	egregated Replacement Fund, etc.) or
REPLACEMENT FUNDS [PUBLIC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SH	ALL COMPLETE QUESTION 3]
<ul> <li>3. Equipment Replacement Funds</li> <li>3.1 When was the Equipment Replacement Fund last review Year:  2017  1-2 years ago (0 points)  o 3 or more years ago (20 points)  o N/A  If N/A, please explain:  3.2 Equipment Replacement Fund Activity  3.2.1 Ending Balance Reported on Last Year's CMAR</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3.2.1 Ending Balance Reported on Last Year's CMAR</li> <li>3.2.2 Adjustments - if necessary (e.g. earned interest, audit correction, withdrawal of excess funds, increase making up previous shortfall, etc.)</li> <li>3.2.3 Adjusted January 1st Beginning Balance</li> <li>3.2.4 Additions to Fund (e.g. portion of User Fee, earned interest, etc.)</li> </ul>	\$ 2,829,878.78 \$ 0.00 \$ 2,829,878.78 + \$ 445,135.30

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

3.2.5 Subtractions from Fund (e.g., equipment replacement, major repairs - use description box 3.2.6.1 below\*)

\$ 70,000.00

3.2.6 Ending Balance as of December 31st for CMAR Reporting Year

3,205,014.08

0

All Sources: This ending balance should include all Equipment Replacement Funds whether held in a bank account(s), certificate(s) of deposit, etc.

3.2.6.1 Indicate adjustments, equipment purchases, and/or major repairs from 3.2.5 above.

New equipment in 2017.

3.3 What amount should be in your Replacement Fund?

3,205,014.08

Please note: If you had a CWFP loan, this amount was originally based on the Financial Assistance Agreement (FAA) and should be regularly updated as needed. Further calculation instructions and an example can be found by clicking the SectionInstructions link under Info header in the left-side menu.

- 3.3.1 Is the December 31 Ending Balance in your Replacement Fund above, (#3.2.6) equal to, or greater than the amount that should be in it (#3.3)?
- Yes

o No

If No, please explain.

- 4. Future Planning
- 4.1 During the next ten years, will you be involved in formal planning for upgrading, rehabilitating, or new construction of your treatment facility or collection system?
- Yes If Yes, please provide major project information, if not already listed below.
- O No

Project #	Project Description		Approximate Construction Year
1	Replace Pumps and Controls in Bluff Slough Lift station	48000	2018
2	Rehab and replacement of sewer main	594000	2018
3	Rehab digester # 1 this will be the last of 4 digester to rehab.	1,000,000	2019
4	Add and additional Sanitary lift station pump at New Hagar Lift station.	65,000	2019
5	Upgrade Final Clarifiers to help reduce solids in effluent one of the projects to help reduce phosphorus	2,500,000	2021

#### 5. Financial Management General Comments

Sanitary Sewer Utility works from a cash fund and schedules projects and budgets for upgrades.

#### **ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND USE**

- 6. Collection System
- 6.1 Energy Usage
- 6.1.1 Enter the monthly energy usage from the different energy sources:

COLLECTION SYSTEM PUMPAGE: Total Power Consumed

Number of Municipally Owned Pump/Lift Stations: 26

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

	Electricity Consumed (kWh)	Natural Gas Consumed (therms)
January	79,197	974
February	72,163	691
March	70,164	623
April	59,476	263
May	66,653	148
June	80,173	27
July	65,277	45
August	60,971	42
September	62,555	23
October	52,681	155
November	57,512	435
December	69,652	983
Total	796,474	4,409
Average	66,373	367

6.1.2 Comments:
5.2 Energy Related Processes and Equipment
6.2.1 Indicate equipment and practices utilized at your pump/lift stations (Check all that apply):
☐ Comminution or Screening
□ Extended Shaft Pumps     □ Extended S
☑ Flow Metering and Recording
☑ Pneumatic Pumping
SCADA System     Standard System     Scandard System
☑ Self-Priming Pumps
Submersible Pumps     Submersible P
☑ Variable Speed Drives
☐ Other:
6.2.2 Comments:

6.3 Has an Energy Study been performed for your pump/lift stations?

o No

Yes

Year:

2013

By Whom:

MSA

Describe and Comment:

A power survey of all City Department was done a 15% reduction was found from 2007 to 2013 a large part of that was related to the Aeration upgrade completed in 2012 at WWTP.

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

#### 6.4 Future Energy Related Equipment

6.4.1 What energy efficient equipment or practices do you have planned for the future for your pump/lift stations?

Work with Johnson Controls to find projects to reduce power used.

- 7. Treatment Facility
- 7.1 Energy Usage
- 7.1.1 Enter the monthly energy usage from the different energy sources:

TREATMENT PLANT: Total Power Consumed/Month

	Electricity Consumed (kWh)	Total Influent Flow (MG)	Electricity Consumed/ Flow (kWh/MG)	Total Influent BOD (1000 lbs)	Electricity Consumed/ Total Influent BOD (kWh/1000lbs)	Natural Gas Consumed (therms)
January	427,920	309.23	1,384	807.64	530	10,333
February	453,440	279.20	1,624	762.24	595	9,461
March	404,820	318.92	1,269	847.11	478	7,507
April	465,520	307.86	1,512	799.95	582	6,629
May	467,360	370.12	1,263	881.02	530	3,634
June	508,480	352.16	1,444	863.16	589	2,878
July	485,320	337.50	1,438	843.98	575	856
August	485,320	308.68	1,572	771.50	629	753
September	475,000	289.93	1,638	698.49	680	807
October	429,400	304.28	1,411	814.28	527	710
November	442,800	276.94	1,599	743.49	596	6,374
December	457,120	280.33	1,631	735.54	621	9,445
Total	5,502,500	3,735.15		9,568.40		59,387
Average	458,542	311.26	1,482	797.37	578	4,949

7	. 1	1.2	Comments:

7	.2	E	n	er	gy	Rela	ted Pro	cesses	and	d Equip	oment			
	_	_	-	_			_							

- 7.2.1 Indicate equipment and practices utilized at your treatment facility (Check all that apply):
- ☐ Aerobic Digestion
- ☑ Anaerobic Digestion
- ☑ Biological Phosphorus Removal
- ☐ Coarse Bubble Diffusers
- ☑ Dissolved O2 Monitoring and Aeration Control
- Effluent Pumping
- ☑ Influent Pumping
- ☑ Nitrification
- ☑ UV Disinfection
- ✓ Variable Speed Drives
- ☐ Other:

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/2/2018	Reporting For 2017
7.2.2 Comments:		
7.3 Future Energy Related Equipment		
7.3.1 What energy efficient equipment or practices do you have planned treatment facility?	for the future for	- your
8. Biogas Generation		
<ul> <li>8.1 Do you generate/produce biogas at your facility?</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>		
If Yes, how is the biogas used (Check all that apply):  ☑ Flared Off ☐ Building Heat ☑ Process Heat ☐ Generate Electricity		
☐ Other:		
9. Energy Efficiency Study		
<ul><li>9.1 Has an Energy Study been performed for your treatment facility?</li><li>No</li><li>Yes</li></ul>		
☐ Entire facility  Year:		
By Whom:		
Describe and Comment:   □ Part of the facility		
Year:		
By Whom:  Describe and Comment:		

La Crosse City	Last Updated:	Reporting For:
	5/2/2018	2017

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	А

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

### Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems

3
<ol> <li>Capacity, Management, Operation, and Maintenance (CMOM) Program</li> <li>Do you have a CMOM program that is being implemented?</li> </ol>
• Yes
o No
If No, explain:
1.2 Do you have a CMOM program that contains all the applicable components and items
according to Wisc. Adm Code NR 210.23 (4)?  ● Yes
o No (30 points)
○ N/A
If No or N/A, explain:
1.3 Does your CMOM program contain the following components and items? (check the components and items that apply)  ☑ Goals [NR 210.23 (4)(a)]
Describe the major goals you had for your collection system last year:
Clean/Flush 35% of sewer collection system. Continue to budget \$350,000 annually to line sewers ever other year.
Did you accomplish them?
• Yes
o No
If No, explain:
☐ Organization [NR 210.23 (4) (b)]
Does this chapter of your CMOM include:
☐ Organizational structure and positions (eg. organizational chart and position descriptions)
☐ Internal and external lines of communication responsibilities
☑ Person(s) responsible for reporting overflow events to the department and the public
☐ Legal Authority [NR 210.23 (4) (c)]
What is the legally binding document that regulates the use of your sewer system?  Sewer use ordiance
If you have a Sewer Use Ordinance or other similar document, when was it last reviewed and revised? (MM/DD/YYYY) 07/22/2017
Does your sewer use ordinance or other legally binding document address the following:   Private property inflow and infiltration
☑ New sewer and building sewer design, construction, installation, testing and inspection
☑ Rehabilitated sewer and lift station installation, testing and inspection
■ Sewage flows satellite system and large private users are monitored and controlled, as
necessary
☑ Fat, oil and grease control
☑ Enforcement procedures for sewer use non-compliance
☑ Operation and Maintenance [NR 210.23 (4) (d)]
Does your operation and maintenance program and equipment include the following:  ☐ Equipment and replacement part inventories
☑ Up-to-date sewer system map

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

			$\overline{}$
information for O&M  ☐ A description of rou ☐ Capacity assessmen ☐ Basement back asse ☐ Regular O&M trainin ☐ Design and Performan ☐ What standards and pro ☐ the sewer collection sys ☐ property?	activities, investigation tine operation and main at program essment and correction agonce Provisions [NR 210.2 ocedures are established stem, including building e, DNR NR 110 Standard	tenance activities (see question 2 below)	
<ul> <li>☒ Responsible persons</li> <li>☒ Response order, tim</li> <li>☒ Public notification position</li> <li>☒ Training</li> <li>☒ Emergency operation</li> <li>☒ Annual Self-Auditing of</li> <li>☒ Special Studies Last Y</li> <li>☒ Infiltration/Inflow (I</li> <li>☒ Sewer System Evaluation</li> </ul>	response capability incluined communication processing and clean-up rotocols and implem of your CMOM Program (fear (check only those the /I) Analysis uation Survey (SSES) and Capacity Managment	ide: edures  entation procedures [NR 210.23 (5)] nat apply):	0
	wer collection system m	aintenance program include the following and indicate the amount maintained.  % of system/year  % of system/year  % of system/year  % of system/year  % of system/year	
Manhole			
inspections Lift station O&M	35 113	% of system/year # per L.S./year	
Manhole			
rehabilitation  Mainline rehabilitation	.55	% of manholes rehabbed % of sewer lines rehabbed	
Private sewer inspections	0	% of system/year	

La Crosse City Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017 Private sewer I/I % of private services removal River or water % of pipe crossings evaluated or maintained crossings Please include additional comments about your sanitary sewer collection system below: 3. Performance Indicators 3.1 Provide the following collection system and flow information for the past year. 39.60 Total actual amount of precipitation last year in inches 33.03 Annual average precipitation (for your location) 205 Miles of sanitary sewer 26 Number of lift stations Number of lift station failures 1 Number of sewer pipe failures 9 Number of basement backup occurrences 55 Number of complaints 10.23 Average daily flow in MGD (if available) 14.50 Peak monthly flow in MGD (if available) 45 Peak hourly flow in MGD (if available) 3.2 Performance ratios for the past year: 0.00 Lift station failures (failures/year) 0.00 Sewer pipe failures (pipe failures/sewer mile/yr) 0.00 Sanitary sewer overflows (number/sewer mile/yr) 0.04 Basement backups (number/sewer mile) 0.27 Complaints (number/sewer mile) 1.4 Peaking factor ratio (Peak Monthly: Annual Daily Avg) 4.4 Peaking factor ratio (Peak Hourly: Annual Daily Avg) 4. Overflows LIST OF SANITARY SEWER (SSO) AND TREATMENT FACILITY (TFO) OFERFLOWS REPORTED \*\* Date Location Cause **Estimated** Volume (MG) 0 7/20/2017 3:00:00 AM -Intersection of Park Dr. and N 23rd St., La Crosse, 0.0001 - 0.0002 7/20/2017 4:00:00 AM WI 54601 43.48159, -91.221806 \*\* If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until What actions were taken, or are underway, to reduce or eliminate SSO or TFO occurences in the future? The unusual rain falls that occur in the La Crosse area cause issues. Look at storm water control projects. 5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/I) 5.1 Was infiltration/inflow (I/I) significant in your community last year? o Yes No If Yes, please describe:

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/2/2018 2017

 $5.2\,$  Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year?

YesNo

If Yes, please describe:

5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years:

Conduct flow monitoring replace more sewer main as we rehab more streets.

5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system?

Continue to line and replace sewer mains where ground water is an issue continue to rehab manholes. Conduct more flow monitoring to ID locations of I.I.

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/2/2018 2017

#### **Grading Summary**

WPDES No: 0029581

SECTIONS	LETTER GRADE	GRADE POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	SECTION POINTS
Influent	В	3	3	9
BOD/CBOD	А	4	10	40
TSS	А	4	5	20
Phosphorus	А	4	3	12
Biosolids	А	4	5	20
Staffing/PM	А	4	1	4
OpCert	А	4	1	4
Financial	A	4	1	4
Collection	А	4	3	12
TOTALS		32	125	
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) = 3.91				

#### Notes:

A = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)

B = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)

C = Recommendation Range (Response Required)

D = Action Range (Response Required)

F = Action Range (Response Required)

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/2/2018	Reporting For 2017
Resolution or Owner's Statement		
Name of Governing Body or Owner:		
Date of Resolution or Action Taken:		
Resolution Number:		
Date of Submittal:		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATI SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for grade C, D, or F) Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade = B		C CMAR
Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: TSS: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = A		
Biosolids Quality and Management: Grade = A		
Staffing: Grade = A		
Operator Certification: Grade = A		
Financial Management: Grade = A		
Collection Systems: Grade = A (Regardless of grade, response required for Collection Systems if SSOs we	ere reported)	
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATI GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND ANY GENERAL COMMENTS (Optional for G.P.A. greater than or equal to 3.00, required for G.P.A. less G.P.A. = 3.91		ERALL