La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

Influent Flow and Loading

. Monthly Av 1.1 Verify the	erage Flo e followin	ows and BOD og monthly flo	Load ws a	ings nd BOD loading	s to	you	r fac	ility.		
Influent No. Influent Monthly x Influen 701 Average Flow, MGD Avera Concentr				Influent Mor Average B Concentration	nthly OD mg	y g/L	х	8.34	=	Influent Monthly Average BOD Loading, Ibs/day
January	8	3.6901	x 285 x 8.34 =		20,644					
February	9	9.1276	x	295			Х	8.34	=	22,482
March		9.0540	x	321			х	8.34	=	24,212
April	1	3.1212	x	252			х	8.34	=	27,562
May	1	3.1932	x	251			х	8.34	=	27,646
June		9.8820	x	291			х	8.34	=	23,958
July	8	3.9935	x	306			х	8.34	=	22,943
, August	0	9.4599	x	366			х	8.34	=	28,873
September	0	9.7372	x	463			х	8.34	=	37,559
October	(9.9423	x	331			х	8.34	=	27,480
November		9.9664	x	585			х	8.34	=	48,654
December	1	2.6541	x	499			X	8.34	=	52,696
2.1 Verify the	e design i	flow and load	ing f	or your facility.	v	1	0,	6	<u> </u>	% of Design
	Design		D	esign Factor	Х		9	6	=	% of Design
Max Month D	esign Flo	w, MGD	20		Х		90 =		=	18
							1(100 =		20
Design BOD,	esign BOD, lbs/day			29793	х		9	0	=	26813.7
					х		10	00	=	29793
2.2 Verify the and score:	e number	of times the	flow	and BOD excee	ded	90%	ό or	100% (of de	esign, points earned,
	Months	Number of ti	mes	Number of time	es	Nun	nbe	r of time	es	Number of times
	of	flow was gre	ater	flow was greate	er	BOD) wa	s great	er	BOD was greater
	Influent	than 90%	of	than 100% of	t	than	90%	6 of des	ign	than 100% of design
January	1	0		0	_			0		0
February	1	0		0	_			0		0
April	1	0		0	_			1		0
Mav	1	0		0	-			1		0
June	1	0		0				0		0
July	1	0		0				0		0
August	1	0		0				1		0
September	1	0		0				1		2
October	1	0		0				1		0
November	1	0		0				1		2
December	1	0		0	+			1		2
Points per ea	ach	2		1				3		2
Exceedances	5	0		0				7		3
Points		0		0				21		6
Total Numb	per of Po	oints								27

La Crosse City			Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For 2023
 3. Flow Meter 3.1 Was the influen Yes No If No, please expla 	nt flow meter calib Enter last calibra 2023-09-19 in:	rated in the last year? ition date (MM/DD/YYYY)		
 4. Sewer Use Ordinal 4.1 Did your communication excessive convention industries, commerce Yes No If No, please explant 	nce unity have a sewer onal pollutants ((C) cial users, hauled ain:	r use ordinance that limited or prohil)BOD, SS, or pH) or toxic substances waste, or residences?	bited the dischar <u>c</u> s to the sewer fro	ge of om
 4.2 Was it necessar Yes No If Yes, please exp FOG from 3 com TSS from 1 comr 	y to enforce the or lain: mercial entities. mercial entity.	rdinance?		
5. Septage Receiving 5.1 Did you have re Septic Tanks	g equests to receive Holding Tanks	septage at your facility? Grease Traps		
• Yes	• Yes	• Yes		
○ No	○ No	O NO		
 5.2 Did you receive Septic Tanks Yes No 	septage at your fa	acility? If yes, indicate volume in gal gallons	lons.	
Holding Tanks • Yes • No	1,450,350	gallons		
Grease Traps • Yes	1,362,850	gallons		
5.2.1 If yes to any any of these waste We sampled truck streams. We also receiving area is r be resolved in the	of the above, plea es. ed waste at rando require sampling f not the best and ca e active facility upp	ase explain if plant performance is af om on a quarterly basis to maintain to for any new waste stream to be haul an cause some periodic operational i grade process which is scheduled to b	fected when rece baselines for thos led in. The curren ssues; however, be completed in 2	eiving e waste nt grease this will 2024.
 6. Pretreatment 6.1 Did your facility or hazardous situati commercial or indus o Yes 	experience operations in the sewer strial discharges in	tional problems, permit violations, b system or treatment plant that were the last year?	iosolids quality co attributable to	oncerns,

La Crosse	City
-----------	------

• 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.

Leachate received from La Crosse County Solid Waste via the collection system. We receive a waste profile annually from this facility.

Received Metallics process waste via hauler, waste stream is sampled and analyzed 6 times throughout the year.

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

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

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.	Monthly	90% of	Effluent Monthly	Months of	Permit Limit	90% Permit		
001	Average	Permit Limit	Average (mg/L)	Discharge	Exceedance	Limit		
		> 10 (mg/L)				Exceedance		
January	25	22.5	6	1	0	0		
February	25	22.5	/	1	0	0		
March	25	22.5	6	1	0	0		
April	25	22.5	5	1	0	0		
May	25	22.5	5	1	0	0		
June	25	22.5	6	1	0	0		
July	25	22.5	7	1	0	0		
August	25	22.5	8	1	0	0		
September	25	22.5	11	1	0	0		
October	25	22.5	6	1	0	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 e	ach exceedand	ce with 12 mor	ths of discharge		7	3		
Exceedance	S				0	0		
Points					0	0		
Total num	ber of points					0		
exceedanc the numbe of the year 1.2 If any v	e for this section of months of the multiplications occur	on shall be bas discharge. Exa ation factor is red, what actio	ed upon a multipl ample: For a wast 12/6 = 2.0 on was taken to re	ewater facility	of 12 months d discharging or ce?	livided by hly 6 months]	
 2. Flow Meter Calibration 2.1 Was the effluent flow meter calibrated in the last year? Yes Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY) 2023-09-19 O No If No, please explain: 								
3. Treatmer 3.1 What pr We are ur The fact o normal op	 3. Treatment Problems 3.1 What problems, if any, were experienced over the last year that threatened treatment? We are under a major facility upgrade for Phosphorus control as well as other plant processes. The fact of construction causes some necessary and unavoidable alterations and hiccups in normal operations. 							
4. Other Mor 4.1 At any t such as chlo	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?							

mnliance Maintenance Annual Penort

 Yes No If Yes, please explain: Monthly E. Coli Geomean exceeded: August 2023 disinfection treatment has been a challenge. Around a week into this month, we experienced major nocardia growth. At first, we did not suspect this. We were under the assumption it was a result of reduced treatment capacity in aeration and final clarifiers due to ongoing plant upgrades. It wasn't until we did gram staining that we discovered what we were dealing with. Through this upset, we were trying every trick and tool in the operator's toolbox to no avail. Finally, we reached out to local septic hauler and had them vector off foam in our aeration basins 9/11-12/23. Treatment appears to be turning around. Foam is greatly reduced in aeration and eff. TSS and BOD has been declining. Hopefully this filamentous upset is behind us. Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were turning a comer with vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with disinfection treatment up until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather helped out. It has been dry and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23rd we received .88" and continued to receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were still only running on 1/2 off aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we should be in a much better position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plant upgrade. 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? Yes No N/A Please explain unless not applicable: 	a Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For 2023
 o No If Yes, please explain: Monthly E. Coli Geomean exceeded: August 2023 disinfection treatment has been a challenge. Around a week into this month, we experienced major nocardia growth. At first, we did not suspect this. We were under the assumption it was a result of reduced treatment capacity in aeration and final clarifiers due to ongoing plant upgrades. It wasn't until we did gram staining that we discovered what we were dealing with. Through this upset, we were trying every trick and tool in the operator's toolbox to no avail. Finally, we reached out to local septic hauler and had them vector off foam in our aeration basins 9/11-12/23. Treatment appears to be turning around. Foam is greatly reduced in aeration and eff. TSS and BOD has been declining. Hopefully this filamentous upset is behind us. Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were turning a comer with vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with disinfection treatment up until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather helped out. It has been dry and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23'd we received .88" and continued to receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were still only running on 1/2 of aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we should be in a much better position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plant upgrade. 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: 	• Yes		
If Yes, please explain: Monthly E. Coli Geomean exceeded: August 2023 disinfection treatment has been a challenge. Around a week into this month, we experienced major nocardia growth. At first, we did not suspect this. We were under the assumption it was a result of reduced treatment capacity in aeration and final clarifiers due to ongoing plant upgrades. It wasn't until we did gram staining that we discovered what we were dealing with. Through this upset, we were trying every trick and tool in the operator's toolbox to no avail. Finally, we reached out to local septic hauler and had them vector off foam in our aeration basins 9/11-12/23. Treatment appears to be turning around. Foam is greatly reduced in aeration and eff. TSS and BOD has been declining. Hopefully this filamentous upset is behind us. Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were turning a comer with vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with disinfection treatment up until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather helped out. It has been dry and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23rd we received. 88" and continued to receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were still only running on 1/2 of aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we should be in a much better position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plant upgrade. 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? • Yes • No • N/A Please explain unless not applicable:	○ No		
Monthly E. Coli Geomean exceeded: August 2023 disinfection treatment has been a challenge. Around a week into this month, we experienced major nocardia growth. At first, we did not suspect this. We were under the assumption it was a result of reduced treatment capacity in aeration and final clarifiers due to ongoing plant upgrades. It wasn't until we did gram staining that we discovered what we were dealing with. Through this upset, we were trying every trick and tool in the operator's toolbox to no avail. Finally, we reached out to local septic hauler and had them vector off foam in our aeration basins 9/11-12/23. Treatment appears to be turning around. Foam is greatly reduced in aeration and eff. TSS and BOD has been declining. Hopefully this filamentous upset is behind us. Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were turning a comer with vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with disinfection treatment up until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather helped out. It has been dry and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23rd we received .88" and continued to receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were still only running on 1/2 of aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we should be in a much better position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plant upgrade. 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? • Yes • No • N/A Please explain unless not applicable:	If Yes, please explain:		
Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were turning a comer with vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with disinfection treatment up until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather helped out. It has been dry and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23rd we received .88" and continued to receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were still only running on 1/2 of aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we should be in a much better position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plant upgrade. 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? • Yes • No • N/A Please explain unless not applicable:	 Monthly E. Coli Geomean exceeded: August 2023 disinfection treatment has been a challenge. Around a we experienced major nocardia growth. At first, we did not suspect this. We assumption it was a result of reduced treatment capacity in aeration arongoing plant upgrades. It wasn't until we did gram staining that we did dealing with. Through this upset, we were trying every trick and tool in the operator Finally, we reached out to local septic hauler and had them vector off f 9/11-12/23. Treatment appears to be turning around. Foam is greatly eff. TSS and BOD has been declining. Hopefully this filamentous upset 	ek into this month le were under the nd final clarifiers d iscovered what we 's toolbox to no av oam in our aeratic reduced in aeratio is behind us.	n, we ue to were vail. on basins n and
 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? Yes No N/A Please explain unless not applicable: 	Sept 2023 E. Coll monthly Geomean exceedance. This deficiency is a continuation from last month. We thought we were vectoring off nocardia foam, but it was short lived. We struggled with o until the 25th then we saw an improvement. We wonder if weather hel and hot (Eff. temps above 23'C) and finally on the 23rd we received .8 receive small amounts of precipitation. Another hindrance is we were s aeration and 1/2 final clarifier capacity. Going forward, next year, we s position for disinfection treatment due to major completion to our plan	turning a comer v disinfection treatm ped out. It has be 8" and continued t still only running ou should be in a muc t upgrade.	vith ent up en dry to n 1/2 of h better
 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? Yes No N/A Please explain unless not applicable: 	4.2 At any time in the past year was there a failure of an effluent acute of toxicity (WET) test?	or chronic whole ef	fluent
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:	• No		
 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: 	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? Yes No N/A Please explain unless not applicable: 			
 No N/A Please explain unless not applicable: 	4.3 If the biomonitoring (WET) test did not pass, were steps taken to ide source(s) of toxicity? • Yes	ntify and/or reduc	e
• N/A Please explain unless not applicable:	○ No		
Please explain unless not applicable:	• N/A		
	Please explain unless not applicable:		

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

La Crosse City

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Total Suspended Solids)

1.1 Verify th	ne following m	onthly average	e effluent values, e	exceedances, a	ind points for			
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	12	1	0	0		
February	30	27	10	1	0	0		
March	30	27	9	1	0	0		
April	30	27	9	1	0	0		
May	30	27	6	1	0	0		
June	30	27	8	1	0	0		
July	30	27	15	1	0	0		
August	30	27	15	1	0	0		
September	30	27	16	1	0	0		
October	30	27	12	1	0	0		
November	30	27	10	1	0	0	0	
December	30	27	13	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		
Exceedance	S				0	0		
Points					0	0		
Total Number 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?								

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

La Crosse City

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Ammonia - NH3)

1. Effluent Ammonia Results

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

Outfall No.	Monthly	Weekly	Effluent	Monthly	Effluent	Effluent	Effluent	Effluent	Weekly	
001	Average	Average	Monthly	Permit	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Permit	
	NH3	NH3	Average	Limit	Average	Average	Average	Average	Limit	
	Limit	Limit	NH3	Exceed	for Week	for Week	for Week	for Week	Exceed	
	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	ance	1	2	3	4	ance	
January	108	108	4.408	0	6.953	2.865	5.756	2.398	0	
February	108	108	12.438	0	9.25	8.514		15.994	0	
March	108	108	13.146	0		19.047	13.882		0	
April	108	108	5.156	0	1.564	3.365	7.283	8.412	0	
May	108	108	1.438	0	4.579	.174	1.86	.052	0	
June	108	108	4.858	0	8.17	1.54	3.25	6.47	0	
July	108	108	2.385	0	2.521	5.549	1.357	.111	0	
August	108	108	11.564	0	1.51		12.193	21.36	0	
September	108	108	20.565	0	23.87	22.449	27.585	8.354	0	
October	108	108	17.588	0	23	13.63	15.48	18.24	0	
November	108	108	3.056	0	14.06	.05	.585	0	0	
December	108	108	.423	0	1.38	.09	.08	.14	0	
Points per e	ach excee	dance of N	fonthly av	verage:					10	
Exceedance	s, Monthly	/:							0	
Points:									0	
Points per e	ach excee	dance of w	veekly ave	erage (wh	en there is	no month	nly averag	e):	2.5	
Exceedance	s, Weekly	:							0	
Points:									0	
Total Num	ber of Po	ints							0	
NOTE: Limit exceedances are considered for monthly OR weekly averages but not both. When a monthly average limit exists it will be used to determine exceedances and generate points. This will be true even if a weekly limit also exists. When a weekly average limit exists and a monthly limit does not exist, the weekly limit will be used to determine exceedances and generate points. 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	A

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Phosphorus)

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

	phosphorus Limit	Effluent Monthly Average phosphorus	Months of Discharge with a	Permit Limit Exceedance
	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	Limit	
January	1	0.580	1	0
February	1	1.080	1	1
March	1	0.391	1	0
April	1	0.390	1	0
Мау	1	0.336	1	0
June	1	0.494	1	0
July	1	1.212	1	1
August	1	0.723	1	0
September	1	0.980	1	0
October	1	0.709	1	0
November	1	0.787	1	0
December	1	0.787	1	0
lonths of Discharg	e/yr		12	
oints per each e	10			
xceedances	2			
otal Number of	20			

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?

La Crosse City	Last Updated:	Reporting For:
	5/6/2024	2023

Total Phos. Monthly Exceedance: 1.21 mg/I Lacrosse VVWILI exceeded monthly phos. limit of 1 mg/I. The cause we feel was a combination of events from emergency equipment maintenance, ongoing plant upgrade and possible slug loading. Starting on the 10th we began the process of cleaning our gravity thickeners due to south thickener influent pipe plugging. Normal forward flow along with south thickener wastewater was diverted and pumped to north thickener during cleaning process. Cleaning of north thickener commenced on the 13th. Same process was followed and both thickeners were back online midday Friday 14th. Going into the weekend plant treatment was returning to normal but by Sunday morning effluent began to deteriorate. We suspect that we received a slug of raw wastewater that fouled up our treatment. Monday morning the aeration basin had an unfamiliar smell and foam. The final clarifiers were loaded with scum as well. During normal operational conditions, of all aeration basins and final clarifiers online (currently we are running 1/2 aeration and 1/2 final clarifiers due to plant upgrading), we believe the task of thickener cleaning and slug loading would not have been nearly as detrimental.	20
 2-27-23: INF Composite Sampler malfunctioned. No sample was collected. 2-18-23: Eff Composite sampler malfunctioned. No sample was collected. Monthly Phos. Ave. Exceedance: 1.08mg/I. Limit: 1mg/i We had monthly average total Phos limit exceedance. Reason for exceedance was due to failure of new process aeration system. Parts of new submerged fine bubble diffuser piping broke apart. We quickly isolated and shutdown failed aeration train to negate anymore damage. This quick action drove all forward flow into existing old aeration train. We adjusted secondary parameters as fast as we could to accept all flow thru one aeration train but still experienced a spike in composite affluent phase sample of 12.28mg/L. 24brs later 2.47mg/L. and within 48brs we were 	

composite effluent phos. sample of 13.28mg/I. 24hrs later 3.47mg/I, and within 48hrs we were back down to .66mg/I. These 2 high readings skewed our monthly phos. average to just over the 1mg/I limit.

Total Points Generated	20
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	80
Section Grade	С

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

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 Mauled 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 Ap 2.1 Last Y 2.1.1 Ho 6208.4 2.1.2 Ho 1111.1 2.2 If you 2.3 Did yo o Yes (3 • No 2.4 Have years? • Yes o No (10 o N/A	plicat 'ear's w ma acres w ma i did r i did r ou ov 0 poir all the	erapp erapp ts) e site	ite oved a cres die ares die ave en oly nitr	and A d you es ough ogen used	on a	e Lan e? es for iny o year	d App your f you	r land	tion S	olicati ed lar	ion ni nd ap n bee	eeds, plica n soi	, what tion s	t act sites	ion w you u n the	vas ta used l previo	ken? ast ye ous 4	ar?	0
3. Biosolid Number of 3.1 For ea calendar y Outfall No Parameter Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead Mercury Molybdenum Nickel Selenium Zinc	s Met of bios ach ou year. . 002 80% of Limit Limit 60 336 80	als solids utfall - CL/ H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300 17 2800	outfal tested ASS B Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840 57 75 420 100 7500	ls in , ver CAKI Jan 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	your ify th E SLU Feb	WPD De bio JDGE Mar	ES p psolid Apr <2.08 .686 633 12.3 <.469 8.25 23 <2.83 565	ermi s me May 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	t: etal q	ualit Jul 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Oct	ur fa Nov 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Dec	durin 80% Value 0 0 0	g the Quality 0 0 0 0 0	Ceiling O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

Outrall No	o. 00	3 - C	LASS	B LI	QUI	D SL	UDG	E							-			-
Parameter	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic		41	75	.805		<1.65		<2.84		1.7		<1.7		<3.04			0	0
Cadmium		39	85	.784		.683		.758		.864		.758		.772			0	0
Copper		1500	4300	827		743		653		644		798		806			0	0
Lead		300	840	15.1		13.3		14.6		13.8		18.1		14.8			0	0
Mercury		17	57	<.086		<1.81		<1.56		<1.86		<1.86		<1.67			0	0
Molybdenum	60		75	22.6		14.5		11		13.5		24		23.7		0		0
Nickel	336		420	26.7		24		22.9		23.8		24		18.3		0		0
Selenium	80		100	1.2		<2.25		<3.87		<2.32		<2.31		<4.15		0		0
Zinc		2800	7500	1060		818		705		736		22.8		675			0	0
Outfall No 0	10 - C	ASS P																
	10 0		LIQUI	J SLUI	JGL													
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
Parameter Arsenic	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit 75	Jan 0	Feb	Mar 0	Apr	May 0	Jun	Jul 0	Aug	Sep 0	Oct	Nov 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0	Ceiling 0
Parameter Arsenic Cadmium	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit 41 39	Ceiling Limit 75 85	Jan 0	Feb	Mar 0 0	Apr	May 0	Jun	Jul 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0	Oct	Nov 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0	Ceiling 0 0
Parameter Arsenic Cadmium Copper	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300	Jan 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0	Apr	May 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0
Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840	Jan 0 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0 0	Apr	May 0 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0
Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead Mercury	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300 17	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840 57	Jan 0 0 0 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0 0 0 0	Apr	May 0 0 0 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0 0 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0 0 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0 0
Parameter Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead Mercury Molybdenum	80% of Limit 60	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300 17	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840 57 75	Jan 0 0 0 0 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Apr	May 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0 0 0 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0 0 0 0
Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead Mercury Nolybdenum Nickel	80% of Limit 60 336	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300 17	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840 57 75 420	Jan 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Apr	May 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0 0 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Parameter Arsenic Cadmium Copper Lead Mercury Molybdenum Nickel Selenium	80% of Limit 60 336 80	H.Q. Limit 41 39 1500 300 17	Ceiling Limit 75 85 4300 840 57 75 420 100	Jan 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Feb	Mar 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Apr	May 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Jun	Jul 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Aug	Sep 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Oct	Nov 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Dec	80% Value	High Quality 0 0 0 0 0	Ceiling 0 0 0 0 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)
- 1-2 (10 Points)
- o > 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
- No (10 points)
- N/A Did not exceed limits or no HQ limit applies (0 points)

• 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?

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.

La Crosse City

Last Opuateu:	керогину г
5/6/2024	2023

Outfall Number:	002
Biosolids Class:	В
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	03/01/2023 - 04/30/2023
Density:	40,100
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:	B
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform
Sample Dates:	01/01/2023 - 02/28/2023
Density:	29,500
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:	03/01/2023 - 04/30/2023
Density:	79,900
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:
5/6/2024	2023

Outfall Number:	003]
Biosolids Class:	В	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform	
Sample Dates:	05/01/2023 - 06/30/2023	
Density:	33,300	
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	1 I
Biosolide Class:	B	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Eecal Coliform	
Sample Dates:	07/01/2023 - 08/31/2023	
Density:	2 299	
Sample Concentration Amount:		
Paquirement Met:		
Land Applied:	No	
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion	
Process Description:	Sludge is mixed and heated to 95 degrees in the anaerobic digestion process	
Outfall Number:	003	, I
Biosolide Class:	B	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Eecal Coliform	
Sample Dates:		
Density:	2 300	
Sample Concentration Amount:		
Pequirement Met:		
Land Applied:	Voc	4
	Anaerobic Digestion	4
Process Description	Sludge is mixed and heated to 05 degrees in the	4
	anaerobic digestion	

La Crosse City

Last Updated:	Reporting For:
5/6/2024	2023

	5,0,2021	
Outfall Number:	003	
Biosolids Class:	В	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform	
Sample Dates:	11/01/2023 - 12/31/2023	
Density:	104,000	
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:	010	
Biosolids Class:	В	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	Fecal Coliform	
Sample Dates:	01/01/2023 - 12/31/2023	0
Density:	79,900	
Sample Concentration Amount:	CFU/G TS	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	No	
Process:	Anaerobic Digestion	
Process Description:	Sludge is heated to 95 degrees at all time and well mixed to meet vector attraction.	

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.

Outfall Number:	002
Method Date:	04/26/2023
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduction
Requirement Met:	Yes
Land Applied:	Yes
Limit (if applicable):	>=38
Results (if applicable):	41.8

La Crosse City

	5/6/2024	2023
Outfall Number:	003	\neg
Method Date:	01/29/2023	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduction	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	No	
Limit (if applicable):	>=38	
Results (if applicable):	65.4	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	03/08/2023	_
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduction	-
Requirement Met:	Yes	-
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	&qt=38	
Results (if applicable):	57.9	
	002	
Outrail Number:	003	
	07/24/2023	_
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduction	_
Requirement Met:	Yes	_
Land Applied:	Yes	
Limit (if applicable):	>=38	_
Results (if applicable):	59.6	
Outfall Number:	003	
Method Date:	07/07/2023	
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduction	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	No	
Limit (if applicable):	>=38	
Results (if applicable):	58.3	
Outfall Number	002	_
Outrain Number:	00/08/2022	_
Method Date:	09/08/2023	_
Dequirement Mate		_
Requirement Met:	res V	_
	ITES	_
	>=38	_
Results (if applicable):	b1.4	

a Crosse City		Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For 2023
Outfall Number:	003		
Method Date:	11/10/2023		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduc	tion	
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	No		
Limit (if applicable):	>=38		
Results (if applicable):	60.6		
Outfall Number:	010		
Method Date:	03/08/2023		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	Volatile Solids Reduc	tion	
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	No		
Limit (if applicable):	>=38		
Results (if applicable):	40.4		
 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 to a second secon	iosolids storage capacity did your wa	astewater treati	ment 0
7 Jaques			
7.1 Describe any outstanding biosolids	ssues with treatment, use or overall	management:	

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

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

Staffing and Preventative Maintenance (All Treatment Plants)

	——
 Plant Staffing Was your wastewater treatment plant adequately staffed last year? Yes 	
If No. please explain:	
Could use more help/staff for:	
1.2 Did your wastewater staff have adequate time to properly operate and maintain the plant and fulfill all wastewater management tasks including recordkeeping?	
Tf No. nlease explain:	
 2. Preventative Maintenance 2.1 Did your plant have a documented AND implemented plan for preventative maintenance on major equipment items? Yes (Continue with question 2) □□ 	
○ No (40 points) \Box \Box	
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 	0
 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 	
 Paper file system 	
 Computer system 	
 Both paper and computer system 	
 No (10 points) 	
 3. O&M Manual 3.1 Does your plant have a detailed O&M and Manufacturer Equipment Manuals that can be used as a reference when needed? Yes 	
o No	
 4. Overall Maintenance /Repairs 4.1 Rate the overall maintenance of your wastewater plant. o Excellent 	
○ Very good	
• Good	
• Fair	
O Poor	
Describe your rating:	

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

The La Crosse WWTP is an older facility and we continue to upgrade to ensure reliability. We are in the last year of a major upgrade which started in March of 2021 which will touch most of the WWTP over several years. Included will be Biosolids management by installing a biosolids heat dryer and storage silo, low level Phosphorus compliance through the addition of disc filters, and dewatering equipment to gain capacity within our digestion process which will give us the ability to handle more solids. We will also add gas collection and a methane engine for energy production with the goal of being energy neutral.

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

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 2. Certification Requirements 1 In accordance with Chapter NR 114.56 and 114.57, Wisconsin Administrative Code, what level and subclass(es) were required for the operator-in-charge (OIC) to operate the wastewater treatment plant and what level and subclass(es) were held by the operator-in-charge? 				0		
Class		Advanced		Basic	Advanced	
A 1	Currended Crewth Dresses	Auvaliceu	011	Dasic	Auvaliceu	
	Attacked Crowth Processes	X			×	
AZ	Attached Growth Processes					
A3	Recirculating Media Filters					
A4	Ponds, Lagoons and Natural					
A5	Anaerobic Treatment Of Liquid	X				
В	Solids Separation	X			X	
C	Biological Solids/Sludges	X			X	
P	Total Phosphorus	Х			X	
N	Total Nitrogen					
D	Disinfection	Х			X	
	Laboratory	Х			X	0
U	Unique Treatment Systems					Ŭ
SS	SS Sanitary Sewage Collection X NA X NA					
 2.2 Was the operator-in-charge certified at the appropriate level and subclass(es) to operate this plant? (Note: Certification in subclass SS is required 5 years after permit reissuance.) Yes (0 points) No (20 points) 2.3 For wastewater treatment facilities with a registered or certified laboratory, is at least one operator that works in the laboratory certified at the basic level in the laboratory (L) subclass? Yes No N/A - Wastewater treatment facilities that own and operate a sanitary sewage collection system, has at least one operator been designated the OIC for sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system (SS) subclass? Yes No N/A - Owner of the Wastewater treatment facility does not own and operate a sanitary sewage collection system 						
 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 						

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting Fo 2023	or
 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 you 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: 	r plant and is exp	pected to)
 4. Continuing Education Credits 4.1 If you had a designated operator-in-charge, was the operator-in-charge Education Credits at the following rates? OIT and Basic Certification: Averaging 6 or more CECs per year. Averaging less than 6 CECs per year. Advanced Certification: Averaging 8 or more CECs per year. Averaging less than 8 CECs per year. 	ge earning Contin	nuing	

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

Compliance Ma	intenance Annual Repor	t	
La Crosse City		Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For: 2023
Financial Manage	ment		
 Provider of Financia Name: Telephone: E-Mail Address (optional): 	Il Information Jared Greeno 608-789-7322 greenoja@cityoflacrosse.org	(XXX) XXX-XXX	x
 2. Treatment Works O 2.1 Are User Charges treatment plant AND/ Yes (0 points) □□ No (40 points) If No, please explain 2.2 When was the Use Year: 2023 0-2 years ago (0 p 3 or more years ago N/A (private facility 2.3 Did you have a splinancial resources av plant and/or collection Yes (0 points) No (40 points) 	<pre>perating Revenues s or other revenues sufficient to cover OR collection system ? n: per Charge System or other revenue s points) □□ po (20 points)□□ y) pecial account (e.g., CWFP required s ailable for repairing or replacing equip n system?</pre>	O&M expenses for your wastew cource(s) last reviewed and/or re egregated Replacement Fund, e oment for your wastewater treat	evised? tc.) or ment
REPLACEMENT FUND	S [PUBLIC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SH	HALL COMPLETE QUESTION 3]	

3. Equipment Replacement Funds

3.1	When w	as the	Equipment	Replaceme	nt Fund	last i	reviewed	and/or	revised?
Yea	ar:								

2023

- 1-2 years ago (0 points)□□
- \circ 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 CM/
--

3.2.2 Adjustments - if necessary (e.g. earned interest,
audit correction, withdrawal of excess funds, increase
making up previous shortfall, etc.)

3.2.3 Adjusted January 1st Beginning Balance

3.2.4 Additions to Fund (e.g. portion of User Fee, earned interest, etc.)

1,841,954.58 \$ \$ 0.00

\$ 1,841,954.58

\$ 0.00

+

La Crosse City	Last Update 5/6/2024	d: Reporting For 2023	
3.2.5 Subtractions from Fund (e.g., equipment replacement, major repairs - use description box 3.2.6.1 below*)-\$3.2.6 Ending Balance as of December 31st for CMAR Reporting Year\$	0	.00	
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 repai	rs from 3.2.5 a	above.	
 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? \$ 1,666,125.72 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 			
○ No If No, please explain.			
 4. Future Planning 4.1 During the next ten years, will you be involved in formal planning for or new construction of your treatment facility or collection system? Yes - If Yes, please provide major project information, if not already l No Project Description 	upgrading, rel isted below.□I Estimated	habilitating, □ Approximate	
#	Cost	Construction Year	
1 Repair/rehab sanitary sewer collection system	\$365,000	2023	
2 Sanitary lift station rehabilitation	\$1,370,000	2025	
3 Treatment plant facility upgrades for low level phosphorus removal, biosolids management, methane production/energy capture. 3 year project.	\$62,000,000	2021	
4 Repair/rehab sanitary sewer collection system	\$1,370,000	2024	
5 Sanitary lift station rehabilitation	\$100,000	2024	
6 Sanitary forcemain rehabilitation	\$800,000	2024	
7 Sanitary lift station electrical and control upgrades	\$733,500	2024	
8 Repair/rehab sanitary sewer collection system	\$365,000	2023	
9 Treatment plant facility upgrades for low level phosphorus removal, biosolids management, methane production/energy capture. 3 year project.	\$62,000,000	2021	
10 Repair/rehab sanitary sewer collection system	\$1,370,000	2025	
11 Sanitary lift station rehabilitation	\$100,000	2024	
12 Sanitary lift station electrical and control upgrades	\$733,500	2026	
13 Sanitary lift station electrical and control upgrades	\$733,500	2026	
14 Sanitary lift station electrical and control upgrades	\$733,500	2027	
15 Sanitary lift station electrical and control upgrades	\$733,500	2027	
5. Financial Management General Comments			

-		-	
La Crosse City			Last Updated: Reporting Fo 5/6/2024 2023
ENERGY EFF	ICIENCY AND USE		
6. Collection S 6.1 Energy Us 6.1.1 Enter t COLLECTIO	ystem sage he monthly energy usage N SYSTEM PUMPAGE: T	from the different energy otal Power Consumed	sources:
Number of M	unicipally Owned Pump/Li	ift Stations: 26	
	Electricity Consumed (kWh)	Natural Gas Consumed (therms)	
January	66,863	1,156	
February	62,207	983	
March	61,792	778	
April	84,528	474	
Мау	77,599	206	
June	52,779	41	
July	50,861	32	
August	50,961	28	
September	48,689	25	
October	48,961	90	
November	53,591	372	
December	41,077	763]
Total	699,908	4,948]
Average	58,326	412	

6.1.2 Comments:

6.2 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

I Extended Shaft Pumps

 \boxtimes Flow Metering and Recording

☑ Pneumatic Pumping

SCADA System

Self-Priming Pumps

Submersible Pumps

☑ Variable Speed Drives

 \Box Other:

6.2.2 Comments:

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

• No

o Yes

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For: 2023
Year:		
Describe and Comment:		
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?

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	431,560	269.39	1,602	639.96	674	949
February	514,080	255.57	2,012	629.50	817	2,965
March	394,240	280.67	1,405	750.57	525	1,871
April	435,200	393.64	1,106	826.86	526	498
May	516,520	408.99	1,263	857.03	603	22
June	431,200	296.46	1,454	718.74	600	0
July	473,920	278.80	1,700	711.23	666	0
August	583,040	293.26	1,988	895.06	651	66
September	324,800	292.12	1,112	1,126.77	288	298
October	330,400	308.21	1,072	851.88	388	5,289
November	420,000	298.99	1,405	1,459.62	288	8,429
December	462,000	392.28	1,178	1,633.58	283	11,885
Total	5,316,960	3,768.38		11,100.80		32,272
Average	443,080	314.03	1,441	925.07	526	3,227

7.1.2 Comments:

7.2 Energy Related Processes and Equipment

- 7.2.1 Indicate equipment and practices utilized at your treatment facility (Check all that apply):
- □ Aerobic Digestion
- oxtimes Anaerobic Digestion
- Biological Phosphorus Removal
- □ Coarse Bubble Diffusers
- ☑ Dissolved O2 Monitoring and Aeration Control
- Effluent Pumping

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting 2023	For
 Fine Bubble Diffusers Influent Pumping Mechanical Sludge Processing Nitrification SCADA System 			
 ☑ UV Disinfection ☑ Variable Speed Drives □ Other: 			
7.2.2 Comments:			
 7.3 Future Energy Related Equipment 7.3.1 What energy efficient equipment or practices do you have planned f treatment facility? Enhanced methane gas production to use as sustainable energy replacent 	or the future for nent. Energy effi	your ciency	
8. Biogas Generation			
 8.1 Do you generate/produce biogas at your facility? No Yes If Yes, how is the biogas used (Check all that apply): If Flared Off Building Heat Process Heat Generate Electricity Other: 			
9. Energy Efficiency Study			
 9.1 Has an Energy Study been performed for your treatment facility? No Yes Entire facility Year: By Whom: 			
Describe and Comment:			

a Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting For: 2023
Year: By Whom:		
Describe and Comment:		

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

La Crosse City

Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems

 Capacity, Management, Operation, and Maintenance (CMOM) Program 1.1 Do you have a CMOM program that is being implemented?
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
 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:
Goal to clean 33% of the collection system annually.
Did you accomplish them?
• Yes
○ No
If No, explain:
\square Organization [NR 210 23 (4) (b)]
Does this chapter of your CMOM include:
\boxtimes Organizational structure and positions (eq. organizational chart and position descriptions)
⊠ Internal and external lines of communication responsibilities
\boxtimes Person(s) responsible for reporting overflow events to the department and the public
\boxtimes Legal Authority [NR 210.23 (4) (c)]
What is the legally binding document that regulates the use of your sewer system?
Sewer Use Ordinance
If you have a Sewer Use Ordinance or other similar document, when was it last reviewed and revised? (MM/DD/YYYY) 2017-07-07
Does your sewer use ordinance or other legally binding document address the following:
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
oxtimes Fat, oil and grease control
Enforcement procedures for sewer use non-compliance
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ 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
☑A management system (computer database and/or file system) for collection system information for O&M activities, investigation and rehabilitation

La Crosse City			Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting Fo 2023
 A description of routin Capacity assessment Basement back assess Regular O&M training Design and Performance What standards and proce the sewer collection syste property? State Plumbing Code, Construction, Inspecti Others: 	e operation and main program sment and correction e Provisions [NR 210.2 edures are established m, including building DNR NR 110 Standard on, and Testing	tenance activities (see qu 23 (4) (e)] I for the design, construct sewers and interceptor se ds and/or local Municipal	estion 2 below) tion, and inspecti wers on private Code Requireme	ion of nts
 Overflow Emergency Re Does your emergency res Responsible personne Response order, timin Public notification prof Training Emergency operation Annual Self-Auditing of Special Studies Last Yea Infiltration/Inflow (I/I Sewer System Evaluation Lift Station Evaluation Others: 	sponse Plan [NR 210 ponse capability incluid communication proce g and clean-up cocols protocols and impleme your CMOM Program [ur (check only those th) Analysis cion Survey (SSES) Capacity Managment Report	23 (4) (f)] de: edures entation procedures [NR 210.23 (5)] nat apply): Plan (SECAP)		0
2. Operation and Maintenan 2.1 Did your sanitary sewe maintenance activities? Cor 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	ce r collection system manufactorial nplete all that apply a 41.58 3.69 0 0 0 0 0 9.41 9.41 41.58 104 1.70 1.70	aintenance program incluind indicate the amount model of system/year % of system/year # per L.S./year % of manholes rehabbed % of sewer lines rehabbed % of system/year	de the following aintained.	

La Crosse City		Last Updated 5/6/2024	Reporting For 2023
River or water	Q 0/ of pipe crossin	as avaluated or mainta	inod
crossings		gs evaluated of mainta	ineu
Please include addition	al comments about your sanitary sewer co	llection system below:	
3. Performance Indicators 3.1 Provide the following 27.67 To	s g collection system and flow information fo otal actual amount of precipitation last year	r the past year. r in inches	
35.3 Ar	nnual average precipitation (for your location	on)	
198.9 Mi	les of sanitary sewer		
26 Nu	umber of lift stations		
0 Nu	umber of lift station failures		
1 Nu	umber of sewer pipe failures		
25 Nu	umber of basement backup occurrences		
37 Nu	umber of complaints		
11.08 Av	verage daily flow in MGD (if available)		
14.45 Pe	ak monthly flow in MGD (if available)		
45.0 Pe	eak hourly flow in MGD (if available)		
3.2 Performance ratios fo	or the past year: ft station failures (failures/year)		
0.01 Se	ewer pipe failures (pipe failures/sewer mile	/vr)	
0.01 Sa	anitary sewer overflows (number/sewer mi	le/vr)	
0.13 Ba	asement backups (number/sewer mile)		
0.19 Cc	omplaints (number/sewer mile)		
1.3 Pe	aking factor ratio (Peak Monthly:Annual D	aily Avg)	
4.1 Pe	eaking factor ratio (Peak Hourly:Annual Dai	ily Avg)	
4. Overflows			
LIST OF SANITARY SE	WER (SSO) AND TREATMENT FACILITY (TF	OVERFLOWS REPO	RTED **
Date	Location	Cause E	stimated Volume
0 9/26/2023 11:00:00 AM - 9/26/2023 12:30:00 PM	905 Joseph Houska Drive La Crosse, WI 54601	Broken Sewer, Broken Sewer	105,000
** If there were any SSOs or T corrected.	FOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNF	R and stop work on this secti	on until
A contractor accidentally drov pipe repair made. Contactor w	e a sheet pile rail through the RAS pipe. The flow wa vas warned to be careful and adhere to markings.	as stopped, site was containe	d, and a
 5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/1 5.1 Was infiltration/inflo 0 Yes No 	I) w (I/I) significant in your community last y	year?	
If Yes, please describe:			

La	Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting Fo 2023	or:
5 y	 5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or our collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the poor Yes No If Yes, please describe: 	r created proble bast year?	ms in	
5	5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous yea	ars:		
	Some I & I has been reduced due to pipe replacements as needed.			
5	.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection syste	em?		
	We line and replace sewer mains where ground water is an issue and rehalso conduct flow monitoring when necessary to identify areas to focus o I&I.	ab the manhole ur efforts for rec	s. We lucing	

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

La Crosse City

Last Updated: Reporting For: 5/6/2024 **2023**

Grading Summary

WPDES No: 0029581

SECTIONS	LETTER GRADE	GRADE POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	SECTION POINTS
Influent				
BOD/CBOD	A	4	10	40
TSS	A	4	5	20
Ammonia	A	4	5	20
Phosphorus	С	2	3	6
Biosolids	A	4	5	20
Staffing/PM	A	4	1	4
OpCert	A	4	1	4
Financial	A	4	1	4
Collection	A	4	3	12
TOTALS			34	130
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) = 3.82				

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)

a Crosse City	Last Updated: Report 5/6/2024 20	ing For
Resolution or Owner's Statement		
Name of Governing Body or Owner:		
City of La Crosse		
Date of Resolution or Action Taken: 2024-06-13		
Resolution Number:		
Date of Submittal:		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for g	OWNER RELATING TO SPECIFIC CMAP grade C, D, or F):	٤
Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade =		
Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A		
Effluent Quelitur TCC: Cuede A		
Emuent Quality: TSS: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: Ammonia: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = C		
Total Phos. Monthly Exceedance: 1.21 mg/I Lacrosse VVWILI exceeded monthly phos. limit of 1 mg	I. The cause we feel was a combination o	f

events from emergency equipment maintenance, ongoing plant upgrade and possible slug loading. Starting on the 10th we began the process of cleaning our gravity thickeners due to south thickener influent pipe plugging. Normal forward flow along with south thickener wastewater was diverted and pumped to north thickener during cleaning process. Cleaning of north thickener commenced on the 13th. Same process was followed and both thickeners were back online midday Friday 14th. Going into the weekend plant treatment was returning to normal but by Sunday morning effluent began to deteriorate. We suspect that we received a slug of raw wastewater that fouled up our treatment. Monday morning the aeration basin had an unfamiliar smell and foam. The final clarifiers were loaded with scum as well.

During normal operational conditions, of all aeration basins and final clarifiers online (currently we are running 1/2 aeration and 1/2 final clarifiers due to plant upgrading), we believe the task of thickener cleaning and slug loading would not have been nearly as detrimental.

2-27-23: INF Composite Sampler malfunctioned. No sample was collected.

2-18-23: Eff Composite sampler malfunctioned. No sample was collected.

Monthly Phos. Ave. Exceedance: 1.08mg/I. Limit: 1mg/i

We had monthly average total Phos limit exceedance. Reason for exceedance was due to failure of new process aeration system. Parts of new submerged fine bubble diffuser piping broke apart. We quickly isolated and shutdown failed aeration train to negate anymore damage. This quick action drove all forward flow into existing old aeration train. We adjusted secondary parameters as fast as we could to accept all flow thru one aeration train but still experienced a spike in composite effluent phos. sample of 13.28mg/I. 24hrs later 3.47mg/I, and within 48hrs we were back down to .66mg/I. These 2 high readings skewed our monthly phos, average to just over the 1mg/I limit.

La Crosse City	Last Updated: 5/6/2024	Reporting Fo 2023
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	were reported)	
TSO: A contractor accidentally drove a sheet pile rail through the RAS stopped, site was contained, and a pipe repair made. Contactor was w adhere to markings.	pipe. The flow was varned to be careful	and
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELA GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND ANY GENERAL COMMENTS (Optional for G.P.A. greater than or equal to 3.00, required for G.P.A. le G.P.A. = 3.82	STING TO THE OVE ss than 3.00)	RALL