La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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	8.9681	Х	339	Х	8.34	=	25,336
February	9.6465	Χ	271	Х	8.34	=	21,814
March	9.4734	Х	226	Х	8.34	=	17,889
April	10.6946	Χ	264	Х	8.34	=	23,583
May	14.3343	Χ	192	Х	8.34	=	22,969
June	14.7114	Χ	230	Х	8.34	=	28,162
July	14.7866	Х	307	Х	8.34	=	37,820
August	10.6220	Х	355	Х	8.34	=	31,468
September	10.2944	Χ	303	Х	8.34	=	25,980
October	9.4388	Х	304	Х	8.34	=	23,954
November	9.2173	Х	357	Х	8.34	=	27,418
December	9.2580	Х	339	Х	8.34	=	25,336

- 2. Maximum Month 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	Number of times	Number of times	Number of times	Number of times
	of Influent	_	flow was greater than 100% of		(C)BOD was greater than 100% of design
January	1	0	0	0	0
February	1	0	0	0	0
March	1	0	0	0	0
April	1	0	0	0	0
May	1	0	0	0	0
June	1	0	0	1	0
July	1	0	0	1	1
August	1	0	0	1	1
September	1	0	0	0	0
October	1	0	0	0	0
November	1	0	0	1	0
December	1	0	0	1	1
Points per ea	ach	2	1	3	2
Exceedances	5	0	0	5	3
Points		0	0	15	6
Total Number of Points 21					

21

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

Last Updated: Reporting For: La Crosse City 7/1/2015 2014 3. Flow Meter 3.1 Was the influent flow meter calibrated in the last year? Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY) 10/13/2014 Yes 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: Some Restaurants contribute grease to the system in which we use enforcement in guidance with the ordinance. Excess grease in the collection system can obstruct flow. 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 facility? If yes, indicate volume in gallons. Septic Tanks Yes gallons 52,250 O No Holding Tanks Yes gallons 1,051,700 o No Grease Traps Yes 145,180 gallons O No 5.2.1 If yes to any of the above, please explain if plant performance is affected when receiving any of these wastes. Performance of the plant is not effected by the extra gallons. The grease does cause some Head works equipment to plug and sometimes have grease floating on primary clarifiers which takes time to skim off. 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? o Yes No

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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.

The Wastewater Treatment Plant does except industrial waste. Pretreatment program does regulate this type of waste received. As part of the LUST program waste is excepted. With these waste stream Discharger applies for discharge. App. includes Facility Name, Address etc, concentration of waste to be discharged. We also use DNR guidelines related to receiving this waste to determine acceptance. Any other waste in question case by case we request MSDS, analysis and DNR guidance.

Total Points Generated			
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	79		
Section Grade	С		

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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 CBOD

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	25	22.5	4	1	0	0	
February	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	
March	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	
April	25	22.5	4	1	0	0	
May	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	
June	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	
July	25	22.5	4	1	0	0	
August	25	22.5	4	1	0	0	
September	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	
October	25	22.5	3	1	0	0	0
November	25	22.5	4	1	0	0	
December	25	22.5	6	1	0	0	
		* Eqi	uals limit if limit is	<= 10			
Months of discharge/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?

2	FLOW	Motor	Calibration	
∠ .	LIOW	weter	Cambration	

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

• Yes Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY) 10/14/2014

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 Brewery had 2 High strength spills that loaded the plant. Because of slug control plan the hit to the plant and to there pretreat plant was minimal.

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
- 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? • 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				
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100			
Section Grade	Α			

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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.	Monthly	90% of	Effluent Monthly	Months of	Permit Limit	90% Permit		
001	Average	Permit Limit	Average (mg/L)	Discharge	Exceedance	Limit		
	Limit (mg/L)	>10 (mg/L)		with a Limit		Exceedance		
January	30	27	6	1	0	0		
February	30	27	5	1	0	0		
March	30	27	5	1	0	0		
April	30	27	7	1	0	0		
May	30	27	6	1	0	0		
June	30	27	3	1	0	0		
July	30	27	4	1	0	0		
August	30	27	3	1	0	0		
September	30	27	4	1	0	0		
October	30	27	3	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 Discharge/yr 12								
Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge:					7	3		
Exceedances					0	0		
Points 0						0		
Total Num	ber 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?

NA

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

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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	1.4	0.3	1	0
February	1.4	0.3	1	0
March	1.4	0.3	1	0
April	1.4	0.4	1	0
May	1.4	0.4	1	0
June	1.4	0.6	1	0
July	1.4	0.5	1	0
August	1.4	0.3	1	0
September	1.4	0.8	1	0
October	1.4	0.4	1	0
November	1.4	0.5	1	0
December	1.4	0.7	1	0
Months of Discharg				
Points per each e	10			
Exceedances	0			
Total Number of	Points			0

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?

NA

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

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

Biosolids Quality and Management

<u> </u>	
 Biosolids Use/Disposal 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: 	
 2. Land Application Site 2.1 Last Year's Approved and Active Land Application Sites 2.1.1 How many acres did you have? 6135.50 acres 2.1.2 How many acres did you use? 1373.8 acres 2.2 If you did not have enough acres for your land application needs, what action was taken? 2.3 Did you overapply nitrogen on any of your approved land application sites you used last year? Yes (30 points) No 2.4 Have all the sites you used last year for land application been soil tested in the previous 4 years? Yes No (10 points) N/A 	0
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 - LIQUID SLUDGE Parameter 80% H.Q. Ceiling Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec 80% High Ceiling Cuality Arsenic 41 75 4.27 3.96 4.52 7.11 4.89 4.92 0 0	9
Cadmium 39 85 3.26 3.77 6.85 5.25 5.13 5.38 0 0	

Outfall No.	003	- LIC	ขบาบ 5	LUD	JŁ													
Parameter	80% of Limit	Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic		41	75	4.27		3.96		4.52		7.11		4.89		4.92			0	0
Cadmium		39	85	3.26		3.77		6.85		5.25		5.13		5.38			0	0
Copper		1500	4300	590		573		613		715		681		767			0	0
Lead		300	840	19.5		20.5		22.8		34.1		28.6		25.4	·		0	0
Mercury		17	57	.393		.527		.5		1.05		.536		.529			0	0
Molybdenum	60		75	12		12.7		14		23.6		34		28.1		0		0
Nickel	336		420	11.7		13.6		15.1		1.2		16.7		17		0		0
Selenium	80		100	4.89		5.64		7.47		6.27		5.79		6.27		0		0
Zinc		2800	7500	784		829		924		1120		1120		1490			0	0

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

Outfall No	o. 00	2 - C	AKE S	SLUC	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			3.96						6.62					0	0
Cadmium		39	85			3.77						5.02					0	0
Copper		1500	4300			573						847					0	0
Lead		300	840			20.5						28.6					0	0
Mercury		17	57			.527						.733					0	0
Molybdenum	60		75			12.7						41.3				0		0
Nickel	336		420			13.6						19.5				0		0
Selenium	80		100			5.64						4.22				0		0
Zinc		2800	7500			829						1130					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, Contact Us.

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	01/01/2014 - 02/28/2014
Density:	336,000
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	No
Process:	AEROB
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

0

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	03/01/2014 - 04/30/2014
Density:	150,000
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	AEROB
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic
rocess Description.	Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	03/01/2014 - 04/30/2014
Density:	344,000
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
·	Yes
Land Applied:	
Process:	AEROB
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	05/01/2014 - 06/30/2014
Density:	115,000
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
	AEROB
Process:	
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	07/01/2014 - 08/31/2014
Density:	5.,6.,26 65,61,2611
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	No
-	No No
Land Applied:	AEROB
Process:	
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	09/01/2014 - 10/31/2014
Density:	321,000
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	AEROB
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	09/01/2014 - 10/31/2014
Density:	55,600
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	AEROB
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees in the Anaerobic Digestion process.
Outfall Number:	003

0

Outfall Number:	003
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F
Sample Dates:	11/01/2014 - 12/31/2014
Density:	45,300
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Process:	ANAER
Process Description:	Sludge is 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, Contact Us.

		7/1/2015	2014
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	02/28/2014		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	No		
Limit (if applicable):			
Results (if applicable):			
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	04/30/2014		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):			
Results (if applicable):			
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	04/30/2014		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INC		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):			
Results (if applicable):			
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	06/30/2014		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):			
Results (if applicable):			
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	08/31/2014		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	No		
Limit (if applicable):			
Results (if applicable):			

	7/1/2015	2017
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	10/31/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INC	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	10/31/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/10/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/09/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	
		_
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/07/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	

	7/1/2015	2014
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/06/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/31/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	INJ	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):		
Results (if applicable):		
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/11/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/12/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	12/17/2014	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	38	
Results (if applicable):	51.80	

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

		77 172013	2014	
Outfall Number:	003			
Method Date:	12/18/2014			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR			
Requirement Met:	Yes			
Land Applied:	Yes			
Limit (if applicable):	38			
Results (if applicable):	51.80			
	•			
Outfall Number:	003			
Method Date:	12/19/2014			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR			
Requirement Met:	Yes			
Land Applied:	Yes			
Limit (if applicable):	38			
Results (if applicable):	51.80			
Outfall Number:	003			
Method Date:	12/20/2014			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR			
Requirement Met:	Yes			
Land Applied:	Yes			
Limit (if applicable):	38			
Results (if applicable):	49.60			0
Outfall Number:	003			
Method Date:	12/22/2014			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR			
Requirement Met:	Yes			
Land Applied:	Yes			
Limit (if applicable):	38			
Results (if applicable):	49.60			
la	1			
Outfall Number:	003			
Method Date:	12/21/2014			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	VSR			
Requirement Met:	Yes			
Land Applied:	Yes			
Limit (if applicable):	38			
Results (if applicable):	49.60			
5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the proceYes (40 Points)No	ess criteria not met at the time of lar	nd application?		

6. Biosolids Storage

If yes, what action was taken?

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

6.1 How	many day	s of	actual,	current	biosolids	storage	capacity	did	your	wastewater	treatmen
facility ha	ave either	on-s	site or o	off-site?							

- >= 180 days (0 Points)
- 0 150 179 days (10 Points)
- 0 120 149 days (20 Points)
- 0 90 119 days (30 Points)
- 0 < 90 days (40 Points)</pre>
- O N/A (O Points)
- 6.2 If you checked N/A above, explain why.

7. Issues

7.1 Describe any outstanding biosolids issues with treatment, use or overall management:

We have good treatment of Biosolids at the Lacrosse WWTP. The challenge Lacrosse has faced the past 2 years is unusual weather conditions. Wet springs and then early soil freezing in the fall. This makes for a small window of time to remove and land apply many gallons Biosolids. This past spring we used more equipment to get the job done sooner.

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

O

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 7/1/2015 2014

Staffing and Preventative Maintenance (All Treatment Plants)

1. Plant Staffing	
1.1 Was your wastewater treatment plant adequately staffed last year?	
• Yes	
o No	
If No, please explain:	,
Could use more help/staff for:	
1.2. Did your wastewater staff house adequate times to properly approach and reciptain the plant and	1
1.2 Did your wastewater staff have adequate time to properly operate and maintain the plant and fulfill all wastewater management tasks including recordkeeping?	
• Yes	
o No	
If No, please explain:	_
2. Droventativa Maintonanas	+
 Preventative Maintenance Did your plant have a documented AND implemented plan for preventative maintenance on 	
major equipment items?	
• Yes (Continue with question 2)	
O No (40 points)	
If 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	О
o No (10 points)	
2.3 Were these preventative maintenance tasks, as well as major equipment repairs, recorded and	
filed so future maintenance problems can be assessed properly?	
• Yes	
O Paper file system	
O Computer system	
 Both paper and computer system 	
O No (10 points)	
3. O&M Manual	
3.1 Does your plant have a detailed O&M Manual that can be used as a reference when needed?	
• Yes	
0 No	
4. Overall Maintenance /Repairs4.1 Rate the overall maintenance of your wastewater plant.	
O Excellent	
O Very good	
• Good	
o Fair	
o Poor	
Describe your rating:	
Lacrosse's WWTP performs well. We budget and upgrade equipment on a schedule to increase	
reliability of an Older WWTP.	

La Crosse City	Last Updated:	Reporting For:
	7/1/2015	2014

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

Last Updated: Reporting For: La Crosse City

7/1/2015 201	4
Operator Certification and Education	
 1. Operator-In-Charge 1.1 Did you have a designated operator-in-charge during the report year? Yes (0 points) No (20 points) Name: JARED R GREENO Certification No: 31667 	0
2. Certification Requirements 2.1 In accordance with Chapter NR 114.08 and 114.09, Wisconsin Administrative Code, what grade and subclass(es) were required for the operator-in-charge to operate the wastewater treatment plant and what grade and subclass(es) were held by the operator-in-charge? Required: 4 - ACEFGIJ; A - PRIMARY SETTLING; C - ACTIVATED SLUDGE; E - DISINFECTION; F - ANAEROBIC DIGESTION; G - MECHANICAL SLUDGE; I - PHOSPHORUS REMOVAL; J - LABORATORY	
Held: 4 - ACEFGIJ; T - H; 4 - A=PRIMARY SETTLING GRADE 4; C=ACTIVATED SLUDGE GRADE 4; E=DISINFECTION GRADE 4; F=ANAEROBIC DIGESTION GRADE 4; G=MECHANICAL SLUDGE GRADE 4; I=PHOSPHORUS REMOVAL GRADE 4; J=LABORATORY GRADE 4; T - H=FILTRATION GRADE T 2.2 Was the operator-in-charge certified at the appropriate level to operate this plant? • Yes (0 points) • No (20 points)	0
3. Succession Planning 3.1 In the event of the loss of your designated operator-in-charge, did you have a contingency plan to ensure the continued proper operation and maintenance of the plant that includes one or more of the following options (check all that apply)? ☑ One or more additional certified operators on staff ☐ An arrangement with another certified operator ☐ An arrangement with another community with a certified operator ☐ An operator on staff who has an operator-in-training certificate for your plant and is expected to be certified within one year ☐ A consultant to serve as your certified operator ☐ None of the above (20 points) If "None of the above" is selected, please explain:	0
 4. Continuing Education Credits 4.1 If you had a designated operator-in-charge, was the operator-in-charge earning Continuing Education Credits at the following rates? Grades T, 1, and 2: O Averaging 6 or more CECs per year. O Averaging less than 6 CECs per year. Grades 3 and 4: Averaging 8 or more CECs per year. O 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: 7/1/2015	Reporting For 2014
Financial Managemen	t			
Provider of Financial Info Name: Telephone: E-Mail Address (optional):	prmation Jared Greeno 608-789-7322 greenoja@cityoflacrosse.org		(XXX) XXX-XXX	(X
treatment plant AND/OR co ● Yes (0 points) ○ No (40 points) If No, please explain:	ther revenues sufficient to cove			
financial resources available plant and/or collection syst • Yes (0 points) • No (40 points)	Dipoints) I account (e.g., CWFP required e for repairing or replacing equeem?	uipment for yo	ur wastewater treat	tc.) or tment
	PUBLIC MUNICIPAL FACILI	TIES SHALL	COMPLETE QUEST	ION 3]
 3. Equipment Replacement 3.1 When was the Equipm Year: 2014 1-2 years ago (0 points) 0 3 or more years ago (20 N/A If N/A, please explain: 	ent Replacement Fund last rev	iewed and/or	revised?	
3.2 Equipment Replaceme	nt Fund Activity			
_		?	\$ 2,208,686	5.08 0.00
3.2.3 Adjusted January	•		\$ 2,208,686	5.08
3.2.4 Additions to Fund (e earned interest, etc.)	.g. portion of User Fee,	+	\$ 367,715	
3.2.5 Subtractions from Fureplacement, major repairs 3.2.6.1 below*)	s - use description box	-	\$ 0	0.00
3.2.6 Ending Balance as	s of December 31st for		\$ 2 576 401	

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

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.

3.3 What amount should be in your Replacement Fund? \$

\$ 2,576,401.08

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 HELP link under Info 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	Digester Cover Repairs/Painting	800,000	2015
2	New Steam Boilers for Sludge Heating and Plant 1 Heating System	750,000	2015
3	Sanitary Sewer Repair and Rehab	300000	2016
4	INSPECT / REHAB LARGE COLLECTION SYSTEM GATES	36000	2015
	Consultant fee evaluate treatment technology for Phosphorus Removal. DNR Limits will drastically reduce for next permit. 1.4 ppm down to .10 ppm.	75000	2015
6	Repalce/Relocate Digester Recir Pumps	130000	2017
7	New Causeway Lift Station Controls	25000	2016
8	Rehab Digester	350,000	2016
9	PLC Replacement @ WWTP and Lift stations.	450,000.00	2015

5. Financial Management General Comments

Rate study was completed in 2014 and rate increase of 9% was implemented 1/1/2015.

Total Points Generated	
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	
Section Grade	Α

0

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems

1.	CMOM	Program

- 1.1 Do you have a Capacity, Management, Operation & Maintenance (CMOM) requirement in your WPDES permit?
- Yes
- O No
- 1.2 Did you have a documented (written records/files, computer files, video tapes, etc.) sanitary sewer collection system operation & maintenance (O&M) or CMOM program last calendar year?
- Yes (Continue with question 1)
- O No (30 points) (Go to question 2)
- 1.3 Check the elements listed below that are included in your O&M or CMOM program.

Describe the specific goals you have for your collection system:

We have a goal to completely clean sanitary collection system every 3 years. Budget \$300,000 every other year to line sewers to reduce I&I Line and rehab manholes with I&I issues. Maintain Lift stations, upgrade controls and communications build in more alarms as notification. Continue planning upgrade of equipment @ WWTP.

X	Orga	niza	ation
			~ · · · · ·

Do you have the following written organizational elements (check only those that apply)?

- ☑ Ownership and governing body description
- ☑ Organizational chart
- ☑ Personnel and position descriptions
- ☐ Internal communication procedures
- ☐ Public information and education program
- Legal Authority

Do you have the legal authority for the following (check only those that apply)?

- ☑ Sewer use ordinance Last Revised Date (MM/DD/YYYY) 06/05/2014
- ☑ Pretreatment/industrial control Programs
- □ Fat, oil and grease control
- ☑ Illicit discharges (commercial, industrial)
- ☑ Private property clear water (sump pumps, roof or foundation drains, etc.)
- ☐ Private lateral inspections/repairs
- ⊠ Service and management agreements
- ☑ Maintenance Activities (provide details in question 2)
- ☑ Design and Performance Provisions

How do you ensure that your sewer system is designed and constructed properly?

- State plumbing code
- ☑ DNR NR 110 standards
- □ Local municipal code requirements
- ☑ Construction, inspection, and testing
- ☐ Others:

	Plan:
--	-------

Does your emergency response capability include (check only those that apply)?

- ☑ Communications/notifications (DNR, internal, public, media, etc.)
- □ Capacity Assurance:

How well do you know you		vall have the following?	
		you have the following:	
☑ Current and up-to-date sewer map☑ Sewer system plans and specifications			
•	wet well capacity infor	rmation	
 ☑ Lift station pump and wet well capacity information ☑ Lift station O&M manuals 			
Within your sewer system have you identified the following?			
☐ Areas with flat sewers			
☐ Areas with surcharging ☐ Areas with bottlenecks or constrictions			
Areas with chronic bas		Os	
☑ Areas with excess deb	•		
☑ Areas with heavy root	· ·	account and the state of the st	
☐ Areas with neavy root	-		
☐ Sewers with severe de	` ,	capacity	О
☐ Adequacy of capacity to		oupuonty	
□ Nacquacy of capacity at Lift station capacity ar		ms	
		ram to ensure above components are being	
implemented, evaluated,	9	,	
☐ Special Studies Last Yea			
☐ Infiltration/Inflow (I/I)	Analysis		
☐ Sewer System Evaluat	ion Survey (SSES)		
☐ Sewer Evaluation and	Capacity Managment	Plan (SECAP)	
☐ Lift Station Evaluation	Report		
☐ Others:			
2. Operation and Maintenan			
	r collection system ma		1
maintonanco activitios? (Con		aintenance program include the following	
		nd indicate the amount maintained.	
Cleaning	20.6	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal		nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year % of system/year	
Cleaning	20.6	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year % of system/year % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing	20.6	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line	20.6 1.5 1.0 0	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising	20.6	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year % of system/year % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole	20.6 1.5 1.0 0	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M	20.6 1.5 1.0 0	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline rehabilitation	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline rehabilitation Private sewer	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112 .035	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed % of sewer lines rehabbed	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline rehabilitation	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline rehabilitation Private sewer inspections Private sewer I/I	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112 .035	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed % of sewer lines rehabbed % of system/year	
Cleaning Root removal Flow monitoring Smoke testing Sewer line televising Manhole inspections Lift station O&M Manhole rehabilitation Mainline rehabilitation Private sewer inspections Private sewer I/I removal	20.6 1.5 1.0 0 1.8 25.0 112 .035 .25	nd indicate the amount maintained. % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed % of sewer lines rehabbed	

Last Updated: Reporting For: 7/1/2015 2014

			/1/2015	2014
3.	Performance Indicat	tors		
3.1 Provide the following collection system and flow information for the past year.				
	33.03	Total actual amount of precipitation last year in inches		
	32.6	Annual average precipitation (for your location)		
	202.86	Miles of sanitary sewer		
	26	Number of lift stations		
	0	Number of lift station failures		
	2	Number of sewer pipe failures		
	12	Number of basement backup occurrences		
	12	Number of complaints		
	10.96	Average daily flow in MGD (if available)		
	13.47	Peak monthly flow in MGD (if available)		
	33.90	Peak hourly flow in MGD (if available)		
3.	2 Performance ration	s for the past year:		
	0.00	Lift station failures (failures/year)		
	0.01	Sewer pipe failures (pipe failures/sewer mile/yr)		
	0.01	Sanitary sewer overflows (number/sewer mile/yr)		
	0.06	Basement backups (number/sewer mile)		
	0.06	Complaints (number/sewer mile)		
	1.2	Peaking factor ratio (Peak Monthly: Annual Daily Avg)		

4. Overflows

	LIST OF SANITARY SEWER (SSO) AND TREATMENT FACILITY (TFO) OFERFLOWS REPORTED **				
	Date	Location	Cause	Estimated Volume (MG)	
	5/9/2014 1:00:00 PM - 5/12/2014 8:00:00 AM	Broken pipe at 1 Greenwood Place, La Crosse, WI	Broken Sewer, Broken Sewer	0.0001 - 0.0001	
1	11/1/2014 1:00:00 PM - 11/1/2014 4:30:00 PM	1615 Gladys St, LaCrosse, 20 gallons	Broken Sewer, Broken Sewer	0.0001 - 0.0001	

^{**} If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected.

3.1 Peaking factor ratio (Peak Hourly: Annual Daily Avg)

What actions were taken, or are underway, to reduce or eliminate SSO or TFO occurences in the future?

Will inspect force mains and work with local contractors to help reduce directional boring through sanitary mains.

- 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:

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?

o Yes

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For:
7/1/2015 2014

	● No		
	If Yes, please describe:		
5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years:			
	High River stage for an increased time causes extra flow due to low flood plains in areas of town.		

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

More lining of collection system rehab a by pass gate to reduce inflow due to higher river stage.

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

Last Updated: Reporting For: 7/1/2015 2014

Grading Summary

WPDES No: 0029581

SECTIONS	LETTER GRADE	GRADE POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	SECTION POINTS
Influent	С	2	3	6
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	А	4	1	4
Collection	А	4	3	12
TOTALS			32	122
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) = 3.81				

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: 7/1/2015	Reporting For: 2014
Resolution or Owner's Statement		
Name of Governing Body or Owner: City of LaCrosse Date of Resolution or Action Taken: Resolution Number:		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for grade C, D, or F. Regard for Collection Systems if SSOs were reported): Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade = C The letter grade C is reflective to a sampling issue, which provided higher Showing increased loading to the plant. During this time frame river stage and WWTP had more flow. So with this being said increased concentration with increase flow determined plant over designed capacity.	dless of grade, restance then normal reste was above floor	equired sults. od stage
Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: TSS: Grade = A Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = A		
Emain Edanty. The sprietes of add		
Biosolids Quality and Management: Grade = A		
Staffing: Grade = A		
Operator Certification: Grade = A		
Financial Management: Grade = A		
Collection Systems: Grade = A		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO POINT AVERAGE AND ANY GENERAL COMMENTS (Optional for G.P.A. greate required for G.P.A. less than 3.00) G.P.A. = 3.81		