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## Baton Rouge Consent Decree 2004 Annual Report

This Annual Report covering the period from January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004 is submitted in accordance with Paragraph 52 of the Consent Decree. The report addresses all items identified in Consent Decree Exhibit I regarding the Annual Report format and content.

## I Remedial Measures Action Plan (RMAP)

The City/Parish identified a comprehensive remedial action plan for the collection system during consent decree negotiations, identified as Altemative 1 (the original SSO Plan) in the Consent Decree. Shortly thereafter, a VE study was commissioned to explore cost-saving alternatives, and the VE study identified seven options of the original SSO Plan for further considerations. Three of those options ( 3,4 and 7 ) were considered equivalent low-cost options. Through a series of Metro Council and public meetings, Option 7, the Composite Plan, was selected.

The First RMAP, submitted on January 10, 2001, consists of the projects common to the three lowest cost VE options. Table 1 lists the projects in the First RMAP and identifies the status of each project based on the original schedule. The Second RMAP, submitted on November 19, 2002, consists of the projects required to complete the selected overall remedial action plan, Option 7. Table 2 lists the projects in the Second RMAP and identifies the status of each project based on the original schedule. As the planning and design activities for the RMAPs have progressed, it has become apparent that modifications to the projects and schedule are necessary, for the following reasons:

1. To provide for logical construction and start-up sequencing, some projects have been recombined with other projects, and therefore some project numbers have been deleted.
2. To reflect delays in permitting and implementation of Ballasted Flocculation Units for treatment plants.
3. To add new projects to replace existing projects, accomplishing the same objectives for either less money or for other operational advantages.
4. Some rehabilitation projects, like $N-12 \& N-99$ have been divided into smaller construction projects.
5. Tunnel projects T-01 through T-17 have been regrouped to reflect current Tunnel routing.

The proposed modifications will not affect the consent decree RMAP milestone date for completion of all construction by January 1, 2015. A written request with proposed RMAP modifications for review and approval was submitted on December 3, 2004. While the proposed modifications are being reviewed, we wanted to provide information in this annual report on the status of projects based on the proposed schedule. This will provide a better picture of the current projects and status.

Table 3 is the revised First RMAP, which lists the current status of the projects with revised descriptions and construction schedule dates. Table 4 is the revised Second RMAP, which lists the current status of the projects with revised description and construction schedule dates.

The updated implementation schedules for the revised First and Second RMAP projects, indicating total project time (design and construction), are presented in Appendix A. The City/Parish met with EPA and LDEQ at EPA Region 6 offices on May 25, 2004 for a program status presentation. That presentation included an update of the status of current RMAP projects.

The Consent Decree RMAP milestone dates are as follows:
Consent Decree Date Actual Date

Start construction of $1^{s t}$ RMAP remedial measures Submit $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ RMAP schedule

January 15, 2001
December 1, 2002 November 20, 2002
Complete construction of I ${ }^{\text {st }}$ RMAP remedial measures May 4, 2007
Complete construction of $33 \%$ of total RMAP
Complete construction of $66 \%$ of total RMAP
Complete construction of $100 \%$ of the total RMAP

July 1, 2007
July 1, 2011
January 1, 2015

The City/Parish was in compliance with Section XIC Collection System Remedial Program during this reporting period. There were no problems encountered in the Collection System Remedial Program during this reporting period and non-compliance is not anticipated during the next reporting period. There is a need to modify the projects and schedule for the first and second RMAPs, as previously mentioned.

Table 1
First RMAP Project Status (original)

|  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description | Design Status | Start Date |  | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. | Actual |  |
| N-01 Choctaw Basin Retum System ${ }^{1}$ | 0\% | 01/01/03 |  | 10/19/04 |  |  |
| N-02 PS 49/52 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 03/10/03 |  | 06/25/04 |  |  |
| N-04 PS 47 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 04/07/03 |  | 07/23/04 |  |  |
| N-05 PS 24 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 02/09/04 |  | 05/27/05 |  |  |
| N-06 PS 43 Area Upgrades ${ }^{3}$ | 25\% | 10/22/01 |  | 11/08/02 |  |  |
| N-07 PS $39 / 55$ Area Upgrades | 5\% | 04/07/03 |  | 07/23/04 |  |  |
| N-09 PS 44/46 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 02/09/04 | 12/01/03 | 05/27/05 |  | 5\% |
| N-10 PS 240 Area Upgrades | 95\% | 11/12/01 |  | 02/28/03 |  |  |
| N-11 PS 65 Area Upgrades | 20\% | 11/12/01 |  | 02/28/03 |  |  |
| N-12 North Sewer Rehab Projects ${ }^{2}$ | 0\% | 01/21/02 |  | 11/07/03 |  |  |
| N-13 North Choctaw Basin System | 0\% | 03/18/02 |  | 01/02/04 |  |  |
| N-99 Further Investigations (North Area) ${ }^{2}$ | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| C-03 PS 2 Area Rehabilitation | 100\% | 11/21/01 | 03/04/02 | 02/28/03 | 09/28/02 | 100\% |
| S-01B SWWTP-Influent Pump Station | 100\% | 10/16/00 | 01/10/01 | 08/02/02 | 04/14/03 | 100\% |
| S-08 Industriplex Area Upgrades | 95\% | 03/20/01 |  | 07/08/02 |  |  |
| S-11 PS 40 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 11/12/01 | 08/06/03 | 02/28/03 | 12/22/03 | 100\% |
| S-14 Kleinpeter Area Upgrades | 0\% | 02/15/02 |  | 03/06/03 |  |  |
| S-16 PS 136 Area Upgrades | 95\% | 04/09/01 |  | 01/24/03 |  |  |
| S-99 Further Investigations (South Area) | 100\% | 10/01/01 | 07/5/02 | 09/26/03 | 05/22/03 | 100\% |

[^0]Table 2
Second RMAP Project Status (original)

|  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description | Design Status | Start Date |  | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. | Actual |  |
| BFUI Ballasted Flocculation Unit for N-08 | 0\% | 03/02/04 |  | 06/15/05 |  |  |
| BFU2 Ballasted Flocculation Unit for $\mathrm{N}-03$ | 0\% | 04/12/05 |  | 01/27/07 |  |  |
| BFU3 Ballasted Flocculation Unit for C-02 | 0\% | 03/25/08 |  | 01/09/10 |  |  |
| BFU4 Ballasted Flocculation Unit for SWWTP | 0\% | 03/01/05 |  | 06/14/06 |  |  |
| N-03 North Park Area Upgrades | 0\% | 04/12/05 |  | 01/27/07 |  |  |
| N-08 PS 45 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/16/04 |  | 04/30/05 |  |  |
| C-01 PS 59 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 03/27/07 |  | 01/10/09 |  |  |
| C-02 PS 23/PS 60 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 03/25/08 |  | 01/09/10 |  |  |
| C-04 PS 4 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/14/11 |  | 04/28/12 |  |  |
| C-05 PS 5 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/23/09 |  | 01/06/11 |  |  |
| C-06 PS 15/PS 48 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/16/12 |  | 04/30/13 |  |  |
| C-07 PS 1 Areà Upgrades | 0\% | 01/13/09 |  | 04/28/10 |  |  |
| S-01A PS 58 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/15/08 |  | 04/29/09 |  |  |
| S-02 East Highland Road Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/13/09 |  | 04/28/10 |  |  |
| S-03 PS 58 Area Upgrades \#1 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0\% | 12/23/09 |  | 01/06/11 |  |  |
| S-04 PS 66 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/22/10 |  | 01/05/12 |  |  |
| S-05 PS 58 Area Upgrades \#2 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0\% | 01/16/12 |  | 04/30/13 |  |  |
| S-06 PS 31 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/15/10 |  | 04/30/11 |  |  |
| S-07 PS 944 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/20/07 |  | 01/02/09 |  |  |
| S-09 Gardere/GSRI Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/20/07 |  | 01/02/09 |  |  |
| S-10 Tiger Bend/Antioch Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/17/11 |  | 05/01/12 |  |  |
| S-12 PS 177 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/19/08 |  | 01/02/10 |  |  |
| S-13 PS 170/PS274 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/19/08 |  | 01/02/10 |  |  |
| $\qquad$ | 0\% | 12/20/07 |  | 01/02/09 |  |  |
| S-17 South Siegen Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/15/08 |  | 04/29/09 |  |  |
| S-18 PS 40 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/15/08 |  | 04/29/09 |  |  |
| S-19 PS 53 Area Upgrades ${ }^{4}$ | 0\% | 01/14/09 |  | 04/29/10 |  |  |
| S-20 PS 56 Area Upgrades ${ }^{4}$ | 0\% | 01/13/09 |  | 04/28/10 |  |  |
| S-21 BPS 100 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/16/12 |  | 04/30/13 |  |  |
| S-22 BPS 508 Area Uperades | 0\% | 01/15/13 |  | 04/30/14 |  |  |
| S-23 PS 120 Area Upgrades ${ }^{4}$ | 0\% | 01/14/11 |  | 04/28/12 |  |  |
| S-24 PS 50 Area Upgrades \#2 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0\% | 01/14/11 |  | 04/28/12 |  |  |
| S-25 PS 236 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 01/15/10 |  | 04/30/11 |  |  |
| T-01 SWWTP Tunnel Pump Station | 5\% | 05/10/04 |  | 08/17/06 |  |  |
| T-02 CWWTP Tunnel Pump Station | 5\% | 05/10/04 |  | 02/16/06 |  |  |
| T-03 Tunnel - CWWTP to PS 2 | 5\% | 13/10/04 |  | 08/09/06 |  |  |
| T-04 Tunnel - SWWTP to Highland | 5\% | 11/11/04 |  | 11/16/06 |  |  |
| T-05 Bluebonnet Tunnel Highland - South of I- <br> 10  | 0\% | 05/10/05 |  | 11/27/07 |  |  |
| T-06 Brightside/Perkins/Ben Hur Tunnel | 0\% | 05/09/07 |  | 07/22/09 |  |  |
| T-07 Southeast Baton Rouge Minor Tunnels | 0\% | 11/10/06 |  | 02/18/10 |  |  |

Table 2 (continued)
Second RMAP Project Status (original)

|  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description |  | Design Status | Start Date |  | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. | Actual |  |
| T-08 | Old Hammond Highway Minor Tunnels ${ }^{\text {I3 }}$ |  | 0\% | 05/11/09 |  | 06/20/1 I |  |  |
| T-09 | Tunnels South of Old Hammond to Bluebonnet ${ }^{1,3}$ | 0\% | 05/10/05 |  | 12/30/08 |  |  |
| T-10 | Tunnels North of PS 2, Central Service Area ${ }^{1,3}$ | 0\% | 02/08/08 |  | 05/20/11 |  |  |
| T-1 1 | Perkins Road Tunnel. Pecue to Bluebonnet ${ }^{1,3}$ | 0\% | 11/09/05 |  | 03/19/08 |  |  |
| T-12 | Highland Road Tunnel West of Gardere ${ }^{1 / 3}$ | 0\% | 05/10/05 |  | 02/19108 |  |  |
| T-13 | Pecue Lane Tunnel ${ }^{1.3}$ | 0\% | 05/09/06 |  | 10/21/08 |  |  |
| T-14 | Sherwood Forest Boulevard Tunnel ${ }^{1,3}$ | 0\% | 08/11/08 |  | 03/08/11 |  |  |
| T-15 | Tunnels South of PS 2 in Central Area ${ }^{\text {L.3 }}$ | 0\% | 05/09/07 |  | 04/08/09 |  |  |
| T-16 | Tunnel Tie-ins (Phases 1, 2, \& 3) ${ }^{1.3}$ | 0\% | 05/26/08 |  | 02/21/13 |  |  |
| T-17 | Highland Road East Tunnels ${ }^{1,3}$ | 0\% | 11/09/05 |  | 12/30/09 |  |  |
| T-18 | Pump Station Demolition (Phases 1 \& 2) ${ }^{1 / 3}$ | 0\% | 03/26/12 |  | 07/16/14 |  |  |

${ }^{T}$ Project deleted
${ }^{2}$ Project separated into smaller scopes/projects (Project number \& description may be changed or re-used)
${ }^{3}$ Project combined with others (Project number \& description may be changed or re-used)
${ }^{4}$ Project description may have changed
${ }^{5}$ New Project
Table 3
First RMAP Project Status (proposed revision)

|  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description |  | Design <br> Status | Start Date |  | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. | Actual |  |
| N-02 | PS $49 / 52$ Area Upgrades |  | 100\% | 04/16/04 | 05/24/04 | 04/12/05 |  | 19\% |
| N-05 | PS 24 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 04/12/04 | 05/17/04 | 04/14/05 |  | 75\% |
| N-09 | PS 44/46 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 02/09/04 | 12/01/03 | 05/27/05 |  | 89\% |
| N-10 | PS 240 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 05/24/04 | 08/30/04 | 05/26/05 |  | 8\% |
| N - l 1 | PS 65 Area Upgrades | 50\% | 03/28/05 |  | 03/30/06 |  |  |
| N-12 | North Area Lateral Rehabilitation | 50\% | 09/17/04 |  | 03/15/06 |  |  |
| N-14 | Bellingrath Rehabilitation | 100\% | 12/09/03 | 12/09/03 | 12/07/04 |  | 86\% |
| N-I5 | Frenchtown Road Rehabilitation | 100\% | 04/23/04 | 05/24/04 | 04/25/05 |  | 47\% |
| $\mathrm{N}-23$ | North Area Comp. Rehabilitation | 100\% | 08/10/04 | 08/30/04 | 08/09/05 |  | 64\% |
| N-31 | PS 45 Area Rehabilitation | 100\% | 05/09/00 | 05/09/00 | 01/23/01 | 01/23/01 | 100\% |
| N-99 | Further Investigations (North Area) | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A. | N/A |
| C-03 | PS 2 Area Rehabilitation | 100\% | 11/21/01 | 03/04/02 | 02/28/03 | 09/28/02 | 100\% |
| S-01B | SWWTP-Influent Pump Station | 100\% | 10/16/00 | 01/10/01 | 08/02/02 | 04/14/03 | 100\% |
| S-08 | Industriplex Area Upgrades | 95\% | 06/16/04 |  | 12/11/05 |  |  |
| S-11 | PS 40 Area Upgrades | 100\% | 11/12/01 | 08/06/03 | 02/28/03 | 12/22/03 | 100\% |
| S-14 | Kleinpeter Area Upgrades | 95\% | 03/15/05 |  | 12/14/05 |  |  |
| S-16 | PS 136 Area Upgrades | 95\% | 05/20/04 |  | 11/14/05 |  |  |
| S-99 | Further Investigations (Souch Area) | 100\% | 10/01/01 | 07/5/02 | 09/26/03 | 05/22/03 | 100\% |

Table 4
Second RMAP Project Status (proposed revision)

| Project Description |  | Design Status | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Start Date | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. |  | Actual |
| NBFU | Ballasted Flocculation Unit for $\mathrm{N}-08$ |  | 0\% | 07/24/05 |  | 07/24/08 |  |  |
| CBFU | Ballasted Flocculation Unit for C-02 |  | 0\% | 05/30/07 |  | 12/03/08 |  |  |
| SBFU | Ballasted Flocculation Unit for SWWTP | 0\% | 12/17/05 |  | 12/22/07 |  |  |
| N-01 | Choctaw Area Pump Station | 0\% | 12/07/05 |  | 06/04/07 |  |  |
| N-03 | North Park Area Upgrades | 0\% | 08/27/06 |  | 11/04/08 |  |  |
| N-04 | PS 47 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 06/09/07 |  | 06/09/08 |  |  |
| N-07 | PS $39 / 55$ Area Upgrades | 5\% | 03/05/06 |  | 03/05/07 |  |  |
| N-08 | PS 45 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/11/07 |  | 11/04/08 |  |  |
| N-13 | North Choctaw Area Upgrades | 0\% | 08/22/05 |  | 08/27/07 |  |  |
| N-16 | Annual Rehabilitation Contract \# [ | $100 \%$ | 01/19/04 | 01/19/04 | 12/30/06 |  | 33\% |
| $\mathrm{N}-17$ | Annual Rehabilitation Contract \#2 | 100\% | 07/10/04 | 07/16/04 | 12/31/07 |  | 7\% |
| N-18 | Annual Rehabilitation Contract \#3 | 100\% | 10/09/04 | 09/27/04 | 12/31/07 |  | 13\% |
| N-19 | Annual Rehabilitation Contract \#4 | 100\% | 01/03/05 |  | 12/31/07 |  |  |
| N-20 | Nont Area Influent Forcemain | 0\% | 08/02/06 |  | 08/06/08 |  |  |
| N-21 | North Area Influent Pump Station | 0\% | 02/10/07 |  | 08/06/08 |  |  |
| C-01 | PS 59 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 08/01/07 |  | 02/05/09 |  |  |
| C-02 | PS 23/PS 60 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 11/29/07 |  | 06/05/09 |  |  |
| C-04 | PS 4 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 06/28/11 |  | 06/26/12 |  |  |
| C-05 | PS 5 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 06/29/10 |  | 03/31/11 |  |  |
| C-06 | PS 15/PS 48 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 06/26/12 |  | 06/25/13 |  |  |
| C-07 | PS 1 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 06/30/09 |  | 07/02/10 |  |  |
| S-01A | PS 58 Area Upgrades $\$ 1$ | 0\% | 01/24/08 |  | 01/25/09 |  |  |
| S-02 | East Highland Road Area Upgrades | 0\% | 11/25/08 |  | 11/27/09 |  |  |
| S-03 | PS 58 Area Upgrades \#2 | 0\% | 06/01/10 |  | 06/02/11 |  |  |
| S-04 | PS 66 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 11/30/10 |  | 11/30/11 |  |  |
| S-05 | South Choctaw Area Upgrades \#2 | 0\% | 11/15/05 |  | 11/20/07 |  |  |
| S-06 | PS 31 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 12/01/09 |  | 12/03/10 |  |  |
| S-07 | PS 944 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/27/08 |  | 05/29/09 |  |  |
| S-09 | Gardere/GSRI Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/27/08 |  | 05/29/09 |  |  |
| S-10 | Tiger Bend/Antioch Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/31/11 |  | 05/29/12 |  |  |
| S-12 | PS 177 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/26/09 |  | 05/28/10 |  |  |
| S-13 | PS 170/PS274 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/26/09 |  | 05/28/10 |  |  |
| S-15 | Hoo Shoo Too \& Jefferson Hwy Area Upgrades | 0\% | 03/24/09 |  | 12/23/09 |  |  |
| S-17 | South Siegen Area Upgrades | 0\% | 04/01/08 |  | 04/03/09 |  |  |
| S-18 | PS 40 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/27/08 |  | 05/29/09 |  |  |
| S-19 | PS 53 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/26/09 |  | 05/28/10 |  |  |
| S-20 | PS 56 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/26/09 |  | 05/28/10 |  |  |
| S-21 | BPS 100 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 03/27/12 |  | 03/26/16 |  |  |
| S-22 | BPS 508 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 09/11/12 |  | 09/10/12 |  |  |
| S. 23 | PS 120 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/31/11 |  | 05/29/12 |  |  |
| S-24 | PS 50 Area Upgrades ${ }^{\text {H }} 2$ | 0\% | 05/29/07 |  | 05/30/08 |  |  |
| S-25 | PS 236 Area Upgrades | 0\% | 05/18/10 |  | 11/10/11 |  |  |
| T-01 | SWWTP Tunnel Pump Station | 5\% | 05/18/05 |  | 05/13/07 |  |  |

# Table 4 (continued) <br> Second RMAP Project Status (proposed revision) 

|  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description |  | Design Status | Start Date |  | Completion Date |  | Percent Complete |
|  |  | Sched. | Actual | Sched. | Actual |  |
| T-02 | CWWTP Tunnel Pump Station |  | $5 \%$ | 05/18/05 |  | 08/14/06 |  |  |
| T-03 | Central Service Area Trunk Tunnels | 5\% | 06/22/05 |  | 01/11/10 |  |  |
| T-04 | South Service Area Trunk Tunnels | 5\% | 06/23/05 |  | 12/30/10 |  |  |
| T-05 | Bluebonnev/Airline Tunnels | 0\% | 10/26/06 |  | 03/26/11 |  |  |
| T-06 | Airline Externsion Tunnels | 0\% | 12/12/07 |  | 12/12/10 |  |  |
| ¢-07 | Old Hammond Tunnels | 0\% | 06/12/07 |  | 06/20/12 |  |  |

In accordance with Paragraph 35 of the Consent Decree, the City/Parish shall spend at least $\$ 3$ million per year for sewer repairs, sewer rehabilitation, and other capital needs related to reduction of Infiltration and Inflow ("I \& I") into the North, Central, and South Plant Collection Systems. The following table identifies the funds expended during 2004 to meet this requirement.

Table 5
Infiltration \& Inflow Reduction Activities

| PROJECT | DESCRIPTION | 2003 \% <br> COMPLET | ACTUAL \% <br> COMPLETE | CONSTRUCTION <br> COST/BID | EXPENDITURES <br> 2004 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02-WWC- <br> RBLl | Annual Lining <br> Projecl (Yr. 3) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1.000,000.00$ | $\$ 999,855.00$ |
| 02-CDR-02 | Annual Point Repair <br> Project (Yr. 2) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1,500,000.00$ | $\$ 1,487,601.20$ |
| 03-CDR-06 | Annual Manhole <br> Rehab. Project <br> (Yr. I) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 769,540.00$ | $\$ 472,775.22$ |
| 04-CDR-01 | Annual Parishwide <br> Point Repair Project <br> (Yr. 1) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1,000,000.00$ | $\$ 539,371.23$ |

## II Treatment Facility Assessment

The Treatment Facility Assessment was submitted March 26, 2002. In the Treatment Facility Assessment, all process units and conveyance elements were determined to have capacity for current and projected design flows at all three WWTPs. Also, all WWTPs have the ability to meet their permit effluent limits. Based on these findings, no WWTP facility improvements or expansion are required. The Treatment Facility Assessment also indicated that the monthly Operators Process Control meetings currently led by Dr. John J. Sansalone of LSU are having a beneficial impact on plant performance.

The City/Parish submitted a Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Reports on May 25, 2004, July 21, 2004 and October 18, 2004 (see Appendix B). This report contains an evaluation and rating for influent loadings, plant performance, overflows \& bypasses, treatment plant age, sludge disposal, new development in collection system, and
operator certification training for the North, South and Central Wastewater Treatment Plants. The MWPP audit rated the treatment plants on the above factors for the year following the entry into the Consent Decree. The actions that will be taken to maintain compliance and prevent effluent violations are presented in a MWPP Resolution, which was submitted along with the audit. Some of those actions include implementation of aggressive process control strategies recommended by Louisiana State University Civil \& Environmental Engineering Department and managing a project to reduce the high concentration of hydrogen sulfide at the treatment plants.

## III Environmental Results Monitoring (ERM)

The objective of the ERM program is to measure the environmental impacts of the SSO Program by monitoring sewage indicating pollutants in major receiving waters prior to and following completion of remedial measures within each drainage basin. The four sampling locations, identified in Figure 1, include all major tributaries in East Baton Rouge Parish, which enter the Amite River System - and eventually Lake Ponchatrain.

Two Phase I Baseline Monitoring events were conducted during the 2004 reporting period. Reports identifying the rain event characteristics, sampling procedures, and summary of the laboratory results for each monitoring event are provided in Appendix C. Water quality samples were analyzed for the parameters established in the ERM plan; Fecal Coliform, Fecal Streptococcus, and Enterococcus.

Laboratory results for each parameter during each event are also provided in Appendix C. According to the water quality criteria set forth in LAC 33.IX.11, the fecal coliform content of a stream designated for primary contact recreation shall not exceed $200 \mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{ml}$. During the non-recreational period of November $\&$ through April 30, fecal coliform content should not exceed $1,000 \mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{ml}$. Water quality criteria for fecal streptococcus and enterococcus are not available.

## Summary of Water Ouality Sampling Events

On December 29, 2003, the City/Parish conducted the fifth quarterly Phase I Baseline Monitoring event. This rain event was shor-duration, high-intensity event, with peak intensity occurring between 8:00 a.m. and 9:00a.m. The end of rainfall occurred at approximately 1 p.m. Sampling at the four designated sites occurred between the hours of $3: 50$ p.m. and $4: 35 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. Results of laboratory analysis are summarized in Table 6, which shows that the fecal coliform criterion was exceeded in three of the four sample locations. Further analysis of these results will be made following future water quality sampling events.


Figure 1 - Sampling Locations

Table 6
WQ Sampling Results for Phase I, $5^{\text {th }}$ Quarter

|  | Sampling Location |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 1-Comite <br> River | 2-Jones <br> Creek | 3-Ward Creek | 4-Bayou <br> Fountain |
| Fecal Coliform | $>1600$ | $>1600$ | 110 | $>1600$ |
| Fecal Streptococcus | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Enterococcus | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| ND $=$ None detected $(<2$ colonies $/ 100 \mathrm{ml})$ |  |  |  |  |

On February 6, 2004, the City/Parish conducted the sixth quarterly Phase I Baseline Monitoring event. This rain event was a drenching, long-duration rain event, with continuous rainfall occurring over a 24 -hour period. The highest intensity occurred during the evening hours of February 5. The end of rainfall occurred at approximately midnight of February 6. Sampling at the four designated sites occurred between the hours of 8:45 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. on February 6. Results of laboratory analyses are summarized in Table 7, which shows that the fecal coliform criterion was not exceeded in all four-sample locations. Further analysis of these results will be made following future water quality sampling events.

Table 7
WQ Sampling Results for Phase $\mathbf{X}, 6^{\text {© }}$ Quarter

|  | Sampling Location |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 1-Comite <br> River | 2-Jones <br> Creek | 3-Ward <br> Creek | 4-Bayou Fountain |
| Fecal Coliform | 188 | 188 | 900 | 350 |
| Fecal Streptococcus | ND | $\overline{\text { ND }}$ | ND | ND |
| Enterococcus | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| ND $=$ None detected $(<2$ colonies $/ 100 \mathrm{ml})$ |  |  |  |  |

## IV Interim Relief Measures Activities

Paragraph 39 of the Consent Decree provides interim effluent limits of $75 \%$ removal of BOD and TSS (based on 30-day average removal rates), until completion of all RMAP construction projects, as an interim relief to the $85 \%$ removal requirement of the three WWTP NPDES permits. During 2004 the North and Central WWTPs have been in compliance with the $75 \%$ interim effluent limits for removal of TSS. In fact, the Central WWTP met the permit limit of $85 \%$ removal of TSS the entire year. Both the North WWTP and the Central WWTP were in compliance with the $75 \%$ interim effluent limits for the removal of BOD eleven months out of twelve months in 2004, as illustrated by Table 8.

The South WWTP has been in compliance with the $75 \%$ interim effluent limit for TSS all year. However, it did not meet the $75 \%$ interim effluent limit for BOD for 9 months of the year. The South WWTP is experiencing operational difficulcies related to snail infestation and failures of the trickling filter distributor arms. The snail screening systern was put into operation in August 2004, but problems with the controls were immediately encountered and delayed full operation of the system for two additional months.

Replacing the distributors at the four South WWTP trickling filters was completed in March 2004. The contract replacing the remaining four defective trickling filter distributors started construction in November 2004 and is scheduled for completion in June 2005 as documented in appendix D. Presently, these four, smaller, older trickling filters and their associated clarifiers are out of service. Once these trickling filters are fully operational, the BOD removal will improve.

In August 2004, a side-by-side pilot test of two Ballasted Flocculation Systems was conducted at the South WWTP under a grant from the U. S. Corps of Engineers. A Design Engineer has been selected and a contract negotiated for the South WWTP Ballasted Flocculation Unit. However, the Notice To Proceed is being held pending the outcome of the Permit Modification Application to allow a ballasted flocculation unit to handle wet weather flows above the currently permitted level.

The Central WWTP has one defective trickling filter distributor, refurbishing on that distributor started construction in November 2004 and is scheduled for completion in April 2005 as document in Appendix D. When all three trickling filters are back in service the reliability BOD removal will improve.

Table 8
Monthly Average Percent Removal

|  | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | April | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| North Plant- <br> LA0036439 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BOD | 74 | 76 | 78 | 77 | 81 | 75 | 81 | 83 | 83 | 82 | 79 | 77 |
| TSS | 82 | 80 | 86 | 78 | 82 | 84 | 83 | 87 | 86 | 85 | 81 | 82 |
| Central Plant- <br> LA0036421 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BOD | 80 | 70 | 83 | 82 | 82 | 86 | 85 | 88 | 86 | 85 | 79 | 78 |
| TSS | 90 | 87 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 90 | 90 | 89 |
| South Plant- <br> LA0036412 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BOD | 67 | 66 | 80 | 80 | 77 | 68 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 67 | 73 | 66 |
| TSS | 80 | 84 | 89 | 90 | 87 | 82 | 86 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 80 |

## V Outreach and Public Awareness Program

During this reporting period various meetings were held with the Mayor and Metropolitan Council as well as in various Metropolitan Council Districts regarding the SSO Program status. During the City/Parish budgeting process this year, the Mayor-President presented information about the Sanitary Sewer Overflow Program (SSO) and the Consent Decree. In November 2004 the City/Parish was granted a $\$ 25,000,000$ dollar SRLF loan from the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) for certain RMAP projects. In addition to these funds, the LDEQ will also provide the City/Parish a loan in the amount of $\$ 15,000,000$ dollars per program year at an interest rate of $3.95 \%$ if funding is available.

A series of workshops/seminars occurred during this reporting period. The City/Parish has quarterly meeting with the Citizen Advisory Committee, in which the Committee is informed about the SSO program's progress schedules and other sewer related programs and functions. In March 2004, the City/Parish made a presentation at the North American Society for Trenchless Technology Conference and participated in the annual Trenchless Technology Roundtable Discussion with other municipalities from around the country. The City/Parish also held an informational meeting with the Greater Baton Rouge Federation of Civic Associations in August 2004. Members of various Cjvic Associations, located across the Greater Baton Rouge area, attended this meeting. The topic of discussion was a SSO program overview and a question an answer section in which members of the associations could voice their concerns. During this reporting period, the City/Parish also met with the City of Zachary's Rotary Club to discuss the SSO projects that would have an impact on their community.

With the completion of the SEP projects in 2004, the City/Parish developed a Sewer Tie-in Program, which enables the homeowner to abandon their old septic tank at a fixed price. The City/Parish, through negotiations with several plumbing contractors, developed an agreement between the homeowners and contractors to wave all City/Parish permit fees in order to keep the
septic tank abandonment fees to a minimum. In order to assist low income homeowners, the City/Parish, with funding from of a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), pays for the septic tank abandonment fees after the homeowner has met the program guidelines (see Appendix E). The information handed out at the public meeting (see attachment) was placed on the program website for public access. The information presented in this section demonstrates that the City/Parish has been in compliance with Section XV Outreach and Public Awareness Program during the reporting period.


#### Abstract

Activity 1. Provide Program informational brochures on SSO Plan 2. Neighborhood meetings in various Metropolitan Council Districts 3. Meet with Mayor and the Metropolitan Council members on program status 4. Develop information program on the Consent Decree and the Sewer ongoing Improvement Program 5. Post Consent Decree and overflow information on City-Parish website

June 2002 6. Public appearances by DPW Director ongoing 7. Provide SCIP and SSO CAP information in the Mayor-President's Budget Nov 2004 Message 8. Sewer Tie-In Program

Jan 2004 9. Provide fact sheet about the SEPs on City-Parish website

Dec 2002 10. Consent Decree copies made available ongoing 11. SRF Loan Program

Nov 2004

\section*{VI Plan Modification Needs}

The City/Parish has not identified any deficiencies in the Cross Connection Elimination Plan or the Preventive Maintenance Program. However the Remedial Measures Action Plan (RMAP) and the Sanitary Sewer Overflow Response Plan (SSORP) are both being revised and will be submitted for approval during the First Quarter of 2004. The Sanitary Sewer Overflow Response Plan (SSORP) needs to be revised to include updating of the overflow response procedures, regulatory agency notification plan, general forms, and to include additional definitions. The Remedial Measures Action Plan (RMAP) needs to be revised to provide for logical construction and start-up sequencing by combining some projects with others, adding new projects to replace existing, and to break projects into smaller construction projects. These changes will not affect the final Consent Decree RMAP construction date of January 1, 2015.


## VII Stipulated Penalties

Table 11 presents a summary of submittal and construction milestone dates subject to stipulated penalties in accordance with Section XXI of the consent decree. As of December 31, 2004 the City/Parish has not missed any submittal or construction milestone deadlines, and therefore is not subject to any stipulated penalties due to milestone dates.

Non-compliance items, which are subject to stipulated penalties in accordance with Section XXI of the consent decree, are identified in each consent decree quarterly report. A summary of noncompliance items and associated stipulated penalties reported in quarterly reports for the year 2004 are presented in Table 12.

Table 9
Summary of Stipulated Penalties for Submittal/Construction Milestones

| Stipulated Penalties | Deadline | Completion | Total Owed* | Total Paid ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Past Stipulated Penalties | 15-Apr-02 | 12-Apr-02 | \$216.000 | \$216,000 |
| Failure to Submit Timely Reports |  |  |  |  |
| Quarterly Reports $7^{\text {rd }}$ Report | 31-Jan-04 | 30-Jan-04 |  |  |
| $8^{\text {dh }}$ Report | 30-Apr-04 | 23-Apr-04 |  |  |
| $9^{\text {dh }}$ Report | 31-July-04 | 26-July-04 |  |  |
| $10^{\text {b/ }}$ Report | 31-Oct-04 | 27-Oct-04 |  |  |
| Annual Reports 2004 Report | 31-Jan-04 | 24-Jan-04 |  |  |
| Collection System PMP Plan | 30-Mar-01 | 29-Mar-0] |  |  |
| Treatment Facility Assessment Report | 30-Mar-02 | 26-Mar-02 |  |  |
| SEP Completion Report | 15-Sep-04 | 10-Sep-04 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Failure to Submit Timely and Complete $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ RMAP | 1-Dec-02 | $20-\mathrm{Nov-02}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Failure to Meet RMAP and Construction Milestones |  |  |  |  |
| Start of Construction | 15-Jan-01 | 10-Jan-01 |  |  |
| 1st RMAP Construction Complete | 4-May-07 |  |  |  |
| 1st \& 2nd RMAP at 33\% | I-July -07 |  |  |  |
| 1st \& 2nd RMAP at 66\% | I-July - I1 |  |  |  |
| 2nd RMAP Design Completion | 3-June-13 |  |  |  |
| Completion of all Construction | 1.Jan-15 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Failure to Meet SEP Milestone Dates |  |  |  |  |
| Donwood/Oak Manor Project (start construction) | 14-Mar-03 | 21-Feb-03 |  |  |
| (end construction) | 14-Mar-04 | 04-Sept-03 |  |  |
| Pleasant Hills/Green Acres Project (slarl construction) | 14-Jun-03 | 27-Jun-03 |  |  |
| (cnd construction) | 14-Jun-04 | 30-Jul-04 |  |  |
| Sharon Hills/Cedar Glen/Pleasant Hills Project (stan construction) | 14-Mar-03 | 27-Jun-03 |  |  |
| (end construction) | 14-Aug-04 | 30-Jul-04 |  |  |
| Stumberg Lane Project (stan construction) | 14-Mar-03 | 28-Mar-03 |  |  |
| (end construction) | 14-Mar-04 | 15-Sepl-03 |  |  |
| Total |  |  | \$216,000 | \$216,000 |

Table 10
Summary of Stipulated Penalties for Non-Compliance Items

| Stipulated Penalties | $\#$ of Occurrences | Per Occurrence | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Failure to Seal/Eliminate New Cross Connections |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Unauthorized Discharges |  |  |  |
| Less Than I million gallons and Non-Compliance | 2 | $\$ 5,000$ | $\$ 10,000$ |
| Less Than I million gallons and Compliance <br> (Post-remedial) | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| 1 million gallons or more | 4 | $\$ 5,000$ | $\$ 20,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant Discharges |  |  |  |
| Daily Maximum Limits |  | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 15,000$ |
| Weekly Average Limits | 15 | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 77,500$ |
| Monthly (30-day Average) Limits | 31 | Total | $\$ 122,500$ |

Appendix A


|  |  | \$508 | EBR Department of Public Works SSO Consent Decree Projects Summary Schedule By Project <br> RMAP 1 and RMAP 2) | Sheer $3 \alpha^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




## Appendix B

# Department of Public Works 

City of Baton Rouge
Parish of East Baton Rouge
Poss Office Box 1471
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821

RECEIVED

May 25. 2004

## JUN IB 2004 <br> Sewer Operations

## COPY

Department of Environmental Quality

## Office of Water Resources

ATTN: Permits
Post Office Box 82215
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2215
Re: Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Repon
NPDES PERMIT NUMBER:
LA0036439 Al出 4843

Dear Sirs:
As required by your office, we are submining the annual Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit repon along with the MWPP Resolution. This report represents our North Wastewater Treatment Plant.

If you have any questions conceming this matter, please contact Mr. Charles O'Brien of my staff ar (225) 389-3240.

Sincerely yours,

Fred E. Raiford
Director of Public Works
FRMO/pas

xs: Jerome Klier, Deputy Director of Public Works Okent Mudd, Special Projects Engineer - DPW<br>Robert Grohis Jr., Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager<br>Bob Wilks, Wastewater Treatment Process Control Supervisor<br>Walter Jenkins, Assistant WW Treatment Plant Manager<br>Garcia Dialekwa. Wastewater Laboratory Supervisor

Arachment(s):

City of Baton Rouge
Parish of Easl Baton Rouge
Post Office Box 1471
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821

May 25, 2004
Deparment of Environmental Quality
Office of Water Resources
ATTN: Permits
Post Office Box 82215
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2215

## Re: Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Report <br> NPDES PERMIT NUMBER: <br> LA0036439 AI\#4843

Dear Sirs:

As required by your office, we are submiting the annual Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit report along with the MWPP Resolution. This report represents our North Wastewater Treatment Plant.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Mr. Charles O'Brien of my staff at (225) 389-3240.

Sincerely yours.

Fred E. Raiford III
Director of Public Works
FR/MO/pas
xc: Jerome Klier, Deputy Director of Public Works
Kent Mudd, Special Projects Engineer - DPW
Robert Groht, Jr., Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager
Bob Wilks, Wastewater Treatment Process Control Supervisor
Walter Jenkins, Assistant WW Treatment Plant Manager
Garcia Dialekwa, Wastewater Laboratory Supervisor

Attachment(s):

## LOUISIANA <br> MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION MWPP



| Facility Name: | NORTH TREATMENT PLANT |
| :---: | :---: |
| LWDPS Permir Number: |  |
| NPDES Permit Number: | LA0036439 AL\# 4843 |
| Address: | 55 MILLS AVENUE |
|  | BATON ROUGE |
|  | LOUISIANA |
| Parish: | EAST BATON ROUGE |
| (Person Completing Form) Name: | CHARLES M. O'BRIEN |
|  | ASSISTANT WW LAB SUPERVISOR |
| Date Completed: | MAY 25, 2004 |

## Instructions to the Operator-in-Charge

1. Complete only the sections of the Environmental Audit which apply to your wastewater treatuent system. Leave sections that do not apply blank and enter a " 0 " for the point value.
2. Parts 1 through 7 contain questions for which points may be generated. These points are intended to communicate to the department and the governing body or owner what actions will be necessary to prevent effluent violations. Place the point totals from parts 1 through 7 on the Point Calculation page.
3. Add up the point totals.
4. Submit the Environmental Audit to the governing body or owner for their review and approval.
5. The governing body must pass a resolution which contains the following items:
a. The resolution or letter must acknowledge the governing body or owner has reviewed the Environmental Audit.
b. The resolution must indicate specific actions, if any, will be taken to maintain compliance and prevent effluent violations. Proposed actions should address the parts where maximum or close to maximum points were generated in the Environonental Audit.
c. The resolution should provide any other information the governing body deems appropriate.

Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadings (All plants)
A. List the average monthly volumetric flows and BOD loadings received at your facility during the last reporting year.

Col. 1
Average
Monthly Fiow
(million gallons per day, MGD)

| 18.58 |
| :--- |
| 12.29 |
| 16.15 |
| 17.51 |
| 13.17 |
| 16.81 |
| 12.92 |
| 14.64 |
| 15.10 |
| 19.86 |
| 34.22 |
| 20.53 |

Col. 2
Average
Monthly BODs
Concentration
( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{f}$ )

|  | (m) |
| :---: | :---: |
| X | 122 |
| X | 139 |
| X | 112 |
| X | 97 |
| X | 120 |
| X | 106 |
| X | 122 |
| X | 130 |
| X | 141 |
| X | 124 |
| X | 92 |
| X | 122 |

Col. 3
Average Montbly BOD, Loading
(pounds per day)

| $\times 8.34=$ | 18,905 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 14,247 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 15,085 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 14,165 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 13,180 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 14,861 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 13,146 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 15,873 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 17,757 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 20,538 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 26,256 |
| $\times 8.34=$ | 20,889 |

$B O D$ loading $=$ Average Monthly Flow (in MGD) $\times$ Average Monthly BOD concentration (in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{f}) \times 8.34$.
B. List the design flow and design BOD loading for your facility in the blanks below. If you are not aware of these design quantities, refer to your Operation and Maintenance Manual ( $O \& M$ ) or contact your consulting engineer.

| Design Flow, MGD | 54 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 48.60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Design BOD, Ib/day | 75,210 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 67,689 |

C. How many months did the monthly flow (Col. 1) to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) exceed $90 \%$ of design flow?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
D. How many months did the monthly flow (Col. I) to the WWTP exceed the design flow? Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { months } \\
\text { points }
\end{array}\binom{0}{0} \begin{array}{llllllllll}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
5 & 5 & 10 & 10 & 15 & 15 & 15 & 15 & 15 & 15 \\
5 & 15 & 15 & \text { points } \\
& \text { Write } 0,5,10 \text {, or } 15 \text { in the D point total box } & 0 & 0 & \text { D Point Total }
\end{array}
$$

E. How many months did the monthly BOD loading (Col. 3) to the WWTP excesd $90 \%$ of the design loading?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

F. How many times did the monthly BOD loading (CoI. 3) to the WWTP exceed the design loading?

Circle the number of months and correspooding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

G. Add together each point total for $C$ through $F$ and place this sum in the box below at the right.

$(\max =80)$
Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
A. List the monthly average effluent BOD and TSS concentrations produced by your facility during the last reporting year.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Month } \\ \text { APRI } \\ \hline \text { MAY } \\ \hline \text { Column 1 } \\ \text { Avg. Monthly } \\ \text { BOD (mg/) }\end{array}\right)$
B. List the monthly average permit limits for your facility in the blanks below.

## Permit Limit

| BOD, $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{A}$ | 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| TSS, mg/ | 30 |

90\% of Permit
Limit
$X 0.90=\square 27$
$\times 0.90=-27$
C. Continuous Discharge to Surface Water
i. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | 0 | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| points | 0 | 0 | 2 <br> 10 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | months |
| 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | points |  |

Write $0,10,20,30$ or 40 in the i point total box 10 i Point Total
ii. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | 0 | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |  | points |
|  |  |  | Write 0,5 , or 10 in the ii point total box |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | int Tocal |

iii. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (Col. 2) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.


Write $0,10,20,30$, or 40 in the iii point total box 0 iii Point Total
iv. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (Col. 2 ) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

v. Add together each point total for ithrough iv and place this sum io the box below at the right

Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
D. Other Monitoring and Limits
i. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for other pollutants such as: ammonia-nitrogen, phosphorus, pH , residual chlorine, or fecal coliform?
$\checkmark$ Check one box
$\square$ Yes No
If yes, please describe:
ii. At any time in the past year was there a "failure" of a Biomonitoring (Whole Effluent Toxicity) test of the effluent?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes $\triangle$ No If yes, please describe:

iii. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for a toxic substance?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes No If yes, please describe:

## PARM 3: A GE OR IHE W ASUWWATER TREAUMENT PA CTISMILS

A. What year was the wastewater treatment plant constructed or last major expansion/improvements completed? 1998

Current Year - (Answer to A) = Age in years
$\qquad$ - 1998 $=6$ years

Enter Age in Part C below.
B. Check the type of treatment facility that is employed:

## Factor

| X | Mechanical Treatment Plant <br> (Trickling filter, activated <br> sludge, etc.) <br> Specify Type Trickling Filter | 2.5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Aerated Lagoon | 2.0 |  |
| $\square$ | Stabilization Pond | 1.5 |
|  | Other (Specify) | 1.0 |

C. Multiply the factor listed next to the type of facility your community employs by the age of your facility to determine the total point value of Part 3:

TOTAL POINT VALUE FOR PART $3=\frac{2.5}{\text { FACTOR }} \times \frac{6}{\mathbf{A G E}}=\square 15$
Also eater this value or 50 , which ever is less, on the peint calculation table on page 16.
D. Please attach a schematic of the treatmeat plant.
A. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was an overflow, bypass, or unpermitted discharge of untreated or incompletely treated wastewater due to heavy rain: 1
(Circie One) $0=0$ points
$1=5$ points
$4=30$ points
$2=10$ points
$3=15$ points
5 or more $=50$ points
(2) List the number of bypasses, overflows, or unperritted discharges shown in $A$ (1) that were within the collection system and the number at the treatuent plant.
Collection System
1
Treatment Plant
0
B. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was a bypass or overflow of untreated or incompletely created wastewater due to equipment failure, either at the treatment plant or due to pumping problems in the collection system: $\qquad$
50
(Circle One) $0=0$ points
$1=5$ points
$3=15$ points
$4=30$ points
$2=10$ points
5ormore $=50$ proints
(2) List the number of bypasses or overflows shown in B (1) that were within the collection system and the vumber at the treatment plant.

Collection System_ 48 Treatment Plant 2
C. Specify whether the bypasses came from the city or village sewer system or from contract or tributary communities/sanitary districts, etc.
D. Add the point values circled for $A$ and $B$ and place the total in the box below.


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
E. List the person responsible for reporting overflows, bypasses, or unpermitted discharges to State and Federal authorities:

CHARLES M. O'BRIEN, ASSISTANT WASTEWATER LABORATORY SUPERVISOR (225) 389-3240

Describe the procedure for gathering, compiling, and reporting:
THE PROCEDURE FOR GATHERING, COMPILING AND REPORTING IS SPEGIFIED IN THE PERMIT.
A. Sludge Storage

How many months of sludge storage capacity does your wastewater treatment facility have available, either on-site or off-site?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right

| months | $<2$ | 2 | 3 | 4 to 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| prints | 50 | 30 | 20 | $>6$ | | months |
| :---: |
| 0 |

Write 0, 10, 20, 30, or 50 in the A point total box 10 A Point Total
B. For how many months does your facility have access to (and approval for) sufficient land disposal sites to provide proper land disposal?

Circle the number of months and correspondiag point tocal. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
\(\left.\begin{array}{cccccc}months \& <2 \& 6 to 11 \& 12 to 23 \& 24 to 35 \& >36 <br>

points \& 50 \& 30 \& 20 \& 10\end{array}\right)\)| months |
| :---: |
| 0 |

Write 0, 10, 20, 30, or 50 in the B point total box $0 \quad$ B Point Total
C. Add together the A and 8 point values and place this sum in the box below at the right


Also enter this value on the proint calculation table on page 16.
A. Please provide the following information for the total of all sewer line extensions which were installed during the last year.

B. Has an industry (or other development) moved into the community or expanded production in the past year, such that eidher flow or poliutant loadings to the sewerage system were significantly increased (5\% or greater)?


Describe: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

List any new pollutants:
C. Is there any development (iadustrial, commercial, or residential) anticipated in the next 2-3 years, such that either flow or pollutant loadings to the sewerage system could significantly increase?

$$
\text { (Circle One) } \quad \text { No }=0 \text { points } \quad \text { Yes }=15 \text { points }
$$

Describe: $\qquad$

List any new pollutants that you anticipate:
D. Add together the point value circled in B and C and place the sum in the blank below.


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
A. What was the name of the operator-in-charge for the reporting year? GERALD SPRULL Name
B. What is his/her cerification number?

10-560 Cert. \#
C. What level of certification is the operator-in-charge required to bave to operate the wastewater treament plant? WASTEWATER TRMT. IV Level Required
D. What is the leved of certification of the operator-in-charge? WASTEWATER TRMT. IV Level Certified
E. Was the operator-in-charge of the report year certified at least at the grade level required in order to operate this plant? $\quad \checkmark$ Check one box $\quad$ yes $=0$ points $\quad \square$ no $=50$ points Write 0 or 50 in the E point total box $\quad 0$ E Point Total
F. Has the operator-in-charge maintained recentification requirements during the reporting year?
$\checkmark$ Check one box
$\square \square$ yes $\square$
G. How many hours of continuing education has the operator-in-charge-completed-over the last two calendar years? Check one box $\quad \$ 12$ bours or more $=0$ prints $\quad \square$ Less than 12 hours $=50$ points Write 0 or 50 in the $G$ point total box 0 G Point Total
H. Is there a writen policy regarding continuing education and iraining for wastewater treatment plant employees? Check one box 凶 yes $\square$ no

## Explain:

16 HOURS OE TRAINING IN WASTEWATER TREATMENT EVERY TWO YEARS.
I. What percentage of the continuing education expenses of the operator-in-ctarge were paid for:
By the permittee? $\quad 100 \%$

By the operator? $\qquad$
J. Add together the E and G point values and place this sum in the box below at the right:
total point value for part 7
$0 \quad(\max =100)$
Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
A. Are User-Charge Reveniues sufficient to cover operation and maintenance expenses? $\checkmark$ Check one box $\otimes$ Yes $\square$ No If no, bow are $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ coses being financed? Explain:

SAME AS B
B. What financial resources do you have available to pay for your wastewater improvements and reconstruction needs?

WhSIEWATER IMPRONEMENTS AND RECONSTRUCTION NEEDS ARE FUNDED FROM FOUR MAIN REVENUE SOURCES. THEY ARE A ONE HALF PERCENT SALES \& USE TAX, SELER USER FEES, SEWER IMPACI FEES, NND A $\$ 4$ MILLION SUBSIDY FROM THE GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED FROM GAMINC REVENUES.
A. Collection System Maintenance

1. Describe what sewer systerm maintenance work bas been done in the last year.

SEE ATTACHMENT
2. Describe what lift station work bas been done in the last year.

3. What collection system improvements does the community have under consideration for the gext 5 years?

SEE ATTACRMENC
B. If you have ponds, please answer the following questions:

1. Do you have duckweed buildup in your ponds?
2. Do you mow your dikes regularly (at least monthly), to the waters edge?
3. Do you have buches or trees growing on the dikes or in the ponds?Yes $\square$ No
4. Do you have excess sludge buildup ( $>1$ foot) on the bottom of any of your ponds? $\square$ YesNo
5. Do you exercise all of your valves?
6. Are your control manholes in good structural shape?
7. Do you traintain at least three feet of freeboard in all your ponds?
$\square$ YesNo
8. Do you visit your pond system, at least weekly?NoNo
DYesNo

## LA0036439 NORTH PLANT

## LA MWPP ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

## PART 9: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION


#### Abstract

A1. AS PART OF THE CONSENT DECREE, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NORTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA IS PERFORMED AND REPORTED ON A QUARTERLY BASIS. THE FOLLOWING TABLE IS A BREAKDOWN/SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES PERFORMED WITHIN THE NORTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION SYSTEM AREA DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD.


NORTH TREATMENT AREA
MONITORING PERIOD (4/03-3/04)
LINE CLEANING $23 \%$

CCTV INSPECTIONS 19\%
SMOKE TESTING $25 \%$
DYE TESTING . $2 \%$
MANHOLE INSPECTION $4 \%$
LINE REPAIRED $6 \%$
MANHOLE REHABLITATION $0.5 \%$
FORCEMAIN-INSPECTIONS $104 \%$
REPARRED 7\%
AIR RELEASE VALVES-INSPECTIONS $189 \%$
REPAIRED $29 \%$
WET WELL CLEANED $79 \%$
PUMP STATIONS-REPAIRED $11 \%$

A3. DURING THE NEXT 5 YEARS APPROXIMATELY 20 PROJECTS $\mathbb{N}$ THE NORTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA (RELATED TO THE SSO CONSENT DECREE PROGRAM) ARE SCHEDULED TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THE PROJECTS WILL INCLUDE PUMPSTATION UPGRADES, FORCEMAIN IMPROVEMENTS, GRAVITY SEWERS, STORAGE AND WET WEATHER TREATMENT FACILITIES. ADDITIONALLY, ANNUAL CONTRACTS FOR SEWER REHABILTTATION INCLUDING LINING, POINT REPAIR, UPSIZING, AND OTHER REHABILITATION METHODS WILL ALSO BE MMPLEMENTED.

## C. Treatment Plants

1. Have the influent and effluent flow meters been calibrated in the last year? Yes $\square$ No

> Influent flow meter calibration dates(s): Effluent flow meter calibration date(s):

| gravity |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 / 17 / 03$ | $12 / 15 / 03$ | $6 / 17 / 03$ | $6 / 18 / 03$ | $10 / 03 / 03$ |

2. . What problems, if any, have been experienced over the last year that have threatened treatment?

Increase in snails at trickling filters.
Loss of digester treatment capacity due to sand, snails and debris from collection system during high flows.
3. Is your community presently involved in formal planning for treatment facility upgrading?
$\square$ Yes No If yes, describe:

## D. Preventive Maintemance

1. Does your plant have a written plan for preventive maintenance on major equipment items?
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:
Weekly, monthly and semi-annual preventive maintenance sheets that reflect type and frequency as specified in the O\&M manuals. A new computer program will manage the maintenance and preventive maintenance of plant equipment and spare parts.
2. Does this preventive maintenance program depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, and other preventive maintenance tasks necessary for each piece of equipment?
$\square$ Yes No
3. Are these preventive maintenance tasks, as well as equipment problems, being recorded and filed so fuoure maintenance probiems can be assessed properly? 纤Yes $\square$ No

## E. Sewer Use Ordinance

1. Does your community have a sewer use ordinance that limits or prohibits the discharge of excessive conventional pollutants ( $\mathrm{BOD}, \mathrm{TSS}$, or pH ) or toxic substances to the sewer from industries, commercial users, and residences?
[2] Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:
Sewer User Fee Ordinance (No. 7853) limits the discharge of BOD \& TSS to $200 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ and $250 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ respectively. Any discharge above these limits is surchaged at a rate of $2 \%$ of the monthly sewer user fee for each limit of $10 \mathrm{mg} / 1$. Pretreatment ordinance (No. 9195) limits the discharge of heavy metals, chemicals and toxic substances.
2. Has it been necessary to enforce? $\triangle$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:

The Sewer User Fee Ordinance is strictly enforced by City-Parish and self monitoring sampling. The same apply to the Pretreatment Ocdinance. Enforce mechanisms include discharge permits, surcharges, letter and notice of violations, administrative orders, water termination and fines.
F. Ariy additional comments about your treatment plant or collection system? (Attach additional sheet if necessary.)

## POINT CALCULATION TABLE

Fill in the values from parts 1 through 7 in the columns below. Add the uumbers in the left column to determine the point total that the wastewater system has generated for the previous year.

| Actual Values | Actuat Values | Maximum |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadings | 0 | 80 Points |
| Part 2: Effluent Quality/Plant |  |  |
| Performance |  | 15 |
| Part 3: Age of WWTT | 15 | 100 Points |
| Part 4: Overflows and Bypasses | 50 | 50 Points |
| Part 5: Uitimate Disposition of Sludge | 10 | 100 Points |
| Part 6: New Developoneot | 0 | 100 Points |
| Part 7: Operator Cettification Training | 0 | 30 Points |

TOTAL POINTS 95

## ADOPTED <br> METROPOLTAAN councl

JUN O 2 204

RESOLUTION433 43
COUNCIL ADMINISTRATOR TREASURER

REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR SUBMITTAL OF THE LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL WATER POLIUTION PREVENTION (MWPP) ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT REPORT FOR THE NORTH WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT TO DEQ FOR THE MONITORING PERIOD OF APRIL 2003 THROUGH MARCH 2004.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Council of the Parish of East Baton Rouge and City of Baton Rouge that the submittal of the Louisiana Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Report for the North Wastewater Treatment Plant to DEQ for the monitoring period of April 2003 through March, 2004, is hereby approved.

## CEBTIPIED <br> A TRUECOPY

JUN I. 42004


## ATTACHMENT 3

## SAMPLE MWPP RESOLUTION

Resolved that the city/town of BATON ROJGE $\qquad$ informs Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality that the following actions were taken by the_CITY/PARLSH METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (goveraing body).

1. Reviewed the Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit Report which is attached to this resolution.
2. Set forth the following actions necessary to maintain permit requirements contained in the Louisiana Water Discharge Perroit Systern (LWDPS) number LA0036439 AI \# 4843
(Please be specific in listing the actions that will be taken to address che problems identified in the audit report.)
a. CURRENILY, WE ARE OPERATING UNDER A CONSENT DECREE WHYCH BECAME EFEECTIVE MARCH 14, 2002.
b. IMPLEMPNTATION OF AGGRESSIVE PROCESS CONTROL STRATEGIES RECOMRIENDED BY LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY CIVTL \& ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.
c. A PROJECT IS UNDERWAY TO REDUCE THE HIGH CONCENTRATION OE HYDROGEN SULFIDE ( $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ ).
d.
etc.

Passed by a majority manimous)(circle one) vote of the CITY/PARISH METROPOLITAN COUNCIL, on $\qquad$ June 9, 2004


CLERK


# Department of Public Works 

City of Baton Rouge
Parish of East Baton Rouge
Post Office Box 1471
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
70821

July 21, 2004
Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Water Resources
ATCN: Permits
Post Office Box 82215
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2215
Re: Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Report
LPDES PERMIT NUMBER:
LA0036412 AI\# 4841

Dear Sirs:
As required by your office, we are subinitting the annual Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit report along with the MWPP Resolution. This report represents our South Wastewater Treatment Plant for the monitoring period of June 1, 2003 through May 31, 2004.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Mr. Charles O'Brien of my staff at (225) 389-3240.

Sincerely yours


S, ofiliforf $N$
Fred E. Raiford il
Director of Public Works
FR/MO/pas

cc: Jerome Klier, Deputy Director of Public Works<br>Kent Mudd, Special Projects Engineer - DPW<br>Robert Groht, Jr., Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager<br>Bob Wilks, Wastewater Treatment Process Control Supervisor<br>Walter Jenkins, Assistant WW Treatment Plant Manager<br>Garcia Dialekwa, Wastewater Laboratory Supervisor

Attachments):

## LOUISIANA

MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION MWPP



## Instructions to the Operator-in-Charge

1. Complete only the sections of the Environmental Audit which apply to your wastewater treatment system. Leave sections that do not apply blank and eater a " 0 " for the point value.
2. Parts 1 through 7 contain questions for which points may be generated. These points are intended to communicate to the department and the governing body or owner what actions will be necessary to prevent effluent violations. Place the point totals from parts 1 through 7 on the Point Calculation page.
3. Add up the point totals.
4. Submit the Eavirommental Audit to the governing body or owner for their review and approval.
5. The governing body must pass a resolution which contains the following items:
a. The resolution or letter must acknowledge the governing body or owner has reviewed the Euvironmental Audit.
b. The resolution must indicate specific actions, if any, will be taken to maintain compliance and prevent effluent violations. Proposed actions should address the parts where maximum or close to maximum points were generated in the Environmental Audit.
c. The resolution should provide any other information the governing body deems appropriate.

## 

Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadings (All plants)
A. List the average monthly volumetric flows and BOD loadings received at your facility during the last reporting year.

Col. 1
Average Monthly Flow (midion gallone per day, MGD)

| 34.14 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33.34 |
| 29.47 |
| 31.20 |
| 27.18 |
| 31.05 |
| 30.07 |
| 33.91 |
| 51.90 |
| 33.25 |
| 32.53 |
| 46.38 |

Col. 2
Average Monthly BOD, Concentration

|  | (mel) |
| :---: | :---: |
| X | 137 |
| X | 119 |
| X | 142 |
| X | 137 |
| X | 159 |
| K | 163 |
| X | 166 |
| X | 150 |
| X | 107 |
| X | 144 |
| X | 157 |
| X | 114 |

Col. 3
Average Monthly BODs Loading (pounde per day)

| 39,008 |
| :---: |
| 33,089 |
| 34,901 |
| 35,648 |
| 36,042 |
| 42,210 |
| 41,630 |
| 42,421 |
| 39,932 |
| 42,594 |
| 44,096 |

BOD loading $=$ Average Monthly Flow (in MGD) $\times$ Average Monthly BOD concentration (in mg/l) $\times 8.34$.
B. List the design flow and design BOD loading for your facility in the blanks below. If you are not aware of these design quaatities, refer to your Operation and Maintenance Manual ( $O$ \& M) or contact your consulting engineer.

| Design Flow, MGD | 54 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Desiga BOD, lb/day | 93,224 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X 0.90= \\
& \times 0.90=
\end{aligned}
$$

| 48.60 |
| :---: |
| 83,902 |

C. How many months did the montbly flow (Col. 1) to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) exceed $90 \%$ of design flow?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right

| moaths | 0 | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Write 0 or 5 in the C point total box |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | not Total |

D. How many months did the monthly flow (Col. 1) to the WWTP exceed the design flow?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

months \begin{tabular}{c}
0 <br>
points

 

1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \& 5 \& 6 \& 7 \& 8 \& 9 \& 10 \& 11 \& 12 \& months <br>
0 \& 5 \& 10 \& 10 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& 15 \& points <br>
5
\end{tabular}

E. How many monchs đid the monthly BOD loading (Col. 3) to the WWTP exceed $90 \%$ of the design loading?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

F. How many times did the monthly BOD loading (Col. 3) to the WWTP exceed the desigo loading? Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| months | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |
| points | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | points |

Write 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 in the F point total box 0 F Point Total
G. Add together each point total for $C$ through $F$ and place this sum in the box below at the right.
$\square$ $(\max =80)$

Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.

## PART 2: EHLLUENI QUAMTY/RLANT PERRORMANCE

A. List the monthly average effluent BOD and TSS concentrations produced by your facility duriog the last reporting year.

| Mont | Column 1 Avg. Moothly BOD (mag $)$ | Column 2 Avg. Monthly TSS (mgh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JUNE | 39 | 32 |
| JULY | 40 | 34 |
| AUGUST | 32 | 31 |
| SEPTEMBER | 28 | 31 |
| OCTOBER | 36 | 32 |
| NOVEMBER | 36 | 36 |
| DECEMBER | 45 | 39 |
| JANUARY | 50 | 37 |
| FEBRUARY | 36 | 29 |
| MARCH | 29 | 20 |
| APRIL | 32 | 24 |
| MAY | 26 | 25 |

B. List the monthly average permit limits for your facility in the blanks below.

| Permit Limit |  |  | $90 \%$ of Permit Limit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BOD , mg/ | 30 | $\times 0.90=$ | 27 |
| TSS, mg/t | 30 | $\mathrm{x} 0.90=$ | 27 |

C. Continuous Discharge to Surface Water
i. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits? Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| mooths | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| points | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |$\binom{11}{40} 12$| months |
| :--- |
| 40 |

Write $0,10,20,30$ or 40 in the i point total box 40 i Point Total
ii. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| points | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | points |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

iii. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (COI.2) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | 0 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | onchs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | poid |
|  | Write 0, 10, 20, 30, or 40 in the iii point total box 40 iii Point Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

iv. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (Col. 2 ) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | (10) |  | 10 | 10 | 10 | points |
|  |  |  |  | Write 0,5 , or 10 in the is point total box |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | iv Point Total |

v. Add together each point total for through iv and place this sum in the box below at the right.

D. Other Monitoring and Limits
i. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for other pollutants such as: ammonia-nitrogen, phosphorus, pH , residual chiorine, or fecal coliform?
$\checkmark$ Check one box
※ YesNo If yes, please describe:

FECAL COLIFORM . $4 / 6-12 / 04 \quad 5,910$ COL/100ML
ii. At any time in the past year was there a "failure" of a Biomonitoring (Whole Effluent Toxicity) test of the effluent?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes No If yes, please describe:
$\square$
iii. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for a toxic substance?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No If yes, please describe:
A. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was an overflow, bypass, or unpermitted discharge of unfreated or incompletely treated wastewater due to heavy rain: 56

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { (Circle One) } & 0=0 \text { points } & 1=5 \text { points }
\end{array} \quad 2=10 \text { points }
$$

(2) List the number of bypasses, overflows, or unpermitted discharges shown ia A (1) that were within the collection system and the aumber at the treatment plant.
Collection System_ 56 Treatment Plant_ 0
B. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was a bypass or overflow of untreated or incompletely treated wastewater due to equipment failure, either at the treatment plant or due to pumping problems in che collection system: 109
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (Circle One) } & 0=0 \text { points } \\ & 3=15 \text { points }\end{array}$
$1=S$ points
$2=10$ points
or more $=50$ points
(2) List the number of bypasses or overflows shown in B (1) that were withio the collection system and the number at the creatruent plant.

Collection Systern_ 101 Treatment Plant $\qquad$ 8
C. Specify whether the bypasses came from the city or village sewer system or from contract or tributary communities/sanitary districts, etc.
D. Add the point values circled for $A$ and $B$ and place the total in the box below.

$$
\text { TOTAL POINT VALUE FOR PART } 4 \longdiv { 1 0 0 } ( \operatorname { m a x } = 1 0 0 )
$$

Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
E. List the person responsible for reporting overflows, bypasses, or unpermitted discharges to State and Federal authorities:

CHARLES M. O'BRIEN, ASSISTANT WASTEWATER LABORATORY SUPERVISOR (225) 389-3240

Describe the procedure for gachering, compiling, and reporting:
THE PROCEDURE FOR GATHERING, COMPILING, AND REFORTING IS SPECIFIED IN THE PERMIT.
A. Please provide the following infonmation for the total of all sewer line extensions which were iustalied duritig the last year.

| Design Population: | 1,652 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Flow: | 0.69 | MGD |
| Design $\mathrm{BOD}_{\mathrm{s}}$ : | 190 | mgh |

B. Has'an industry (or other developouent) moved into the commuity or expanded production in the past year, such that either flow or pollutaut loadiogs to the sewerage system were significantly increased ( $5 \%$ or greater)?
(Circle One)
No $=0$ points
Yes $=15$ points

Desaibe:
$\square$
$\qquad$
List any new pollutants: $\qquad$
C. Is there any developmeat (industrial, commercial, or resideatial) anticipated in the next 2-3 years, such that either flow or pollutanc loadings to the sewerage system could significandy increase?
(Ciccle One)
No $=0$ points
$Y e s=15$ points

Describe: $\qquad$

List agy new pollutants that you anticipate:
D. Add together the point value circled in B and $C$ and place the suma in the blank below.


Also enter this value on the point caloulation table on page 16.
A. Sludge Storage

How many months of sludge storage capacity does your wastewater treatment facility have available, either on-site or off-site?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.


Write $0,10,20,30$, or 50 in the A point cotal box 10 A Point Total
B. For how many months does your facility have access to (and approval for) sufficient land disposal sites to provide proper land disposal?

Circle the number of months and comesponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | $<2$ | 6 to 11 | 12 to 23 | 24 to 35 | $>36$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points months |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00 | 30 | 20 | 10 | points |  |

Write $0,10,20,30$, or 50 in the B point total box 0 B Point Total
C. Add together the $A$ and $B$ point values and place this sum in the box below at the right:


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16 .
A. What was the name of the operator-in-charge for the reporting year? HKGH TAYLOR $\qquad$ Name
-B. What is his/her centification number?
C. What level of cerification is the operator-in-charge required to have to operate the wastewater treatment plant? WASTEHATER TRMT. IV Level Required
D. What is the level of certification of the operator-in-charge? WASTEWATER TRMT. IV Level Certified
E. Was,the operator-in-charge of the report year centified at least at the grade level required in order to operate this plant? $\quad \checkmark$ Check one box yes $=0$ points $\square$ an $=50$ points Write 0 or 50 ia the E point tatal box $\quad 0$ E Point Total
F. Has the operator-in-charge maintaized recentification requirements during the reporting year?

$$
\checkmark \text { Check one box } \quad \text { y yes } \square
$$

G. How many hours of continuing education has the operator-in-charge completed over the last two caleadar years? Check one box XI 2 hours or more $=0$ points $\square$ Less than 12 hours $=50$ points, Write 0 or 50 in the $G$ point total box 0 G Point Total
H. Is there a written policy regarding continuing education and traising for wastewater treatomeat plant employees? $\checkmark$ Check one box Bly yos

Explaio:
REQUTREMENTS: FOR EACH TWO YEAR PERIOA, MUST COMPIETE 16 HOURS OF WASTEJATER TRAINIMG.

1. What percentage of the continuing education expenses of the operatorin-charge were paid for:

By the permittee? $\qquad$ $100 \%$

By the operaton? $\qquad$ \%
J. Add together the $E$ and $G$ point values and place this sum in the box below at the right


Also enter this value on the proirt calculation table on page 16.
A. Are User-Charge Revenues sufficient to cover operation and maiatenance expenses? $\checkmark$ Cbeck one box Yes No If no, how are $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs being financed? Explain:

SAME AS B.
B. Whar finaacial resources do you bave available to pay for your wastewater improvements and reconstruction needs?

WASTEWATER IMPROVEMENTS AND RECONSTRUCTION NEEOS ARE FUNDED EROM FOUR MAIN REVENUE SOURCES. THEY ARE A ONE HALF PERCENT SALES \& USE TAX, SENER USER EEES, SEWER DMPACT FEES, AND A $\$ 4$ MILLION SUBSIDY EROM THE GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED FROM GAMING REVENUES.
A. Collection System Maintenance

1. Describe what sewer systear maintenance work has been done in the last year.
```
SEE ATTACHMENT
```

2. Describe what lift station work has been dooe in the last year. --

3. What collection system improvements does the community have under consideration for fhe next 5 years?

## SEE ATTACRMENT

B. If you have ponds, please answer the following questions:

1. Do you have duckweed buildup in your ponds?
2. Do you mow your dikes regularly (at least monthly), to the waters edge?Yes
D No
3. Do you have bushes or trees growing on the dikes or in the poods?Yes $\square$ No
4. Do you have excess sludge buildup ( $>1$ foot) on the bottom of any of your ponds?
Yes $\square$ No
5. Do you exercise all of your valves?No
6. Are your control manholes in good structural shape?
$\square$ YesNo
7. Do you maintais as least toree feet of freeboard in all your ponds?
$\square$ YesNo
$\square$ YesNo
8. Do you visit your pond system, at least weekly?YesNo

## LA MWPP ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

## PART 9: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

A1. AS PART OF THE CONSENT DECREE, OPERATION AND MALNTENANCE OF THE SOUTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA IS PERFORMED AND REPORTED ON A QUARTERLY BASIS. THE FOLLOWING TABLE IS A BREAKDOWN/SUMMARY OF ACTIVITES PERFORMED WITHIN THE SOUTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION SYSTEM AREA DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD.

SOUTH TREATMENT AREA
MONTTORING PERIOD (6/03-5/04)

## LINE CLEANING <br> $5 \%$

## CCTV INSPECTIONS <br> $1 \%$

SMOKE TESTING ..... 5\%
DYE TESTING ..... $1 \%$
MANHOLE INSPECTION ..... $3 \%$
LINE REPARED ..... $5 \%$
MANHOLE REHABLITATION ..... $0.8 \%$
FORCEMAIN-INSPECTIONS ..... 46\%
REPARED ..... $9 \%$
AIR RELEASE VALVES-INSPECTIONS ..... 163\%
REPAIRED ..... 21\%
WET WELL CLEANED ..... 55\%
PUMP STATIONS-REPAIRED ..... 8\%

A3. DURING THE NEXT 5 YEARS APPROXEMATELY 22 PROJECTS $\mathbb{N}$ THE SOUTH TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA (RELATED TO THE SSO CONSENT DECREE PROGRAM) ARE SCHEDULED TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THE PROJECTS WLLL INCLUDE PUMPSTATION UPGRADES, FORCEMAIN MPROVEMENTS, GRAVITY SEWERS, STORAGE AND WET WEATHER TREATMENT FACRITIES. ADDITIONALLY, ANNUAL CONTRACTS FOR SEWER REHABLLTTATION INCLUDING LINING, POINT REPAIR, UPSIZING. AND OTHER REHABILITATION METHODS WKL ALSO BE IMPLEMENTED.
C. Treatment Plants

1. Have the influent and effluent flow meters been calibrated in the last year?
(ख) Yes $\square$ No

Influent flow meter calibration dates(s): Effluent flow meter calibration date(s):

| $11 / 20 / 03,5 / 5 / 04$ | $11 / 24 / 03,5 / 10 / 04 / 11 / 20 / 03,5 / 19 / 04$ |
| :--- | :--- |

2. What problems, if any, have been experienced over the last year that have threatened treatment?

1: TRICKIING EILTERS \#5-8, STRUCTURAL FAELURE
2. BAR SCREEN ON THE GRAVITY MAIN DAMAGEZ
3. TRICKLING FILTERS \#1-4, DAMAGED GEAR BOX \& VFD
4. PRIMARY EFFLUENT PUMP VFD AND CHECK VALVE EAILURE
3. Is your community presently involved in formal planning for treatment facility upgrading?
$\square$ Yes $\mathbb{Q}$ No If yes, describe:

## D. Preventive Maintenance

1. Does your plant have a written plan for preventive maintenance on major equipment items?

凶 Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:
Weekly, monthly and semi-anually preventive maintenance sheets that reflect type and frequency as specified in the 0 \& $M$ manuals. A new computer program will manage the maintenance and preventive maintenance of plant equipment and spare parts.
2. Does this preventive maintenance prograrn depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, and other preventive maintenance tasks necessary for each piece of equipment?
$\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No
3. Are these preventive raaintenance tasks, as well as equipment problems, being recorded and filed so future maintenance problems can be assessed properly?
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No
E. Sewer Use Ordinance

1. Does your community have a sewer use ordinance that limits or prohibits the discharge of excessive conventional pollutants (BOD, TSS, or pH ) or toxic substances to the sewer from industries, commercial users, and residences?
[ $\mathbb{X}$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:
Sewer User Fee Ordinance (No. 7853) limits the discharge of BOD \& TSS to $200 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ and $250 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ respectively. Any discharge above these limits is surcharged at a rate of $2 \%$ of the monthly sewer user fee for each limit of $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$. Pretreatment Ordinance (No. 9195) limits the discharge of heavy metals, chemicals and toxic substances.
2. Has it been necessary to enforce? $\triangle>$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:

The Sewer User Fee Ordinance is strictly enforced by City-Parish and self monitoring sampling. The same apply to the Pretreatment Ordinance. Enforcement mechanisms include discharge permits, surcharges, letter and notice of violations, administrative orders, water termination and fines.
F. Any additional comments about your treatment plant or collection system? (Attach additional sheet if necessary.)

## POINT CALCULATION TABLE

Fill in the values from parts I through 7 in the columns below. Add the aumbers in the left column to determine the point total that the wastewater system has generated for the previous year.

## Actual Values

Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadings
Part 2: Effiueat Quality/Plant Performance

Part 3: Age of WWTT
Part 4: Overflows and Bypasses
Part 5: Ulimate Disposition of Sludge
Part 6: New Developmeat
Part 7: Operator Certification Training

Actual Values
0

## Maximum

80 Points

100 Points
50 Points
100 Points
100 Points
30 Poiats
100 Points

TOTAL POINTS
225

## ATTACHMENT 3

## SAMPLE MWPP RESOLUTION

Resolved that the city/town of BATON ROUGE
Eavironmental Quality that the following actions were taken by the METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
informs Louisiana Department of CITY/PARISH (goveraing body).

1. Reviewed the Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit Report which is attached to this resolution.
2. Set forth the following actions necessary to maintain permit requirements contained in the Louisiana Water Discharge Permit System (LWDPS) number LA0036412
(Please be specific in listing the actions that will be taken to address the problems identified in the audit report.)
a. GURRENTLY, WE ARE OPERATING UNDER A CONSENT DECREE WHICH BECAME EFEECTIVE MARCH 14, 2002.
b. IMPLEMENTATION OF AGGRESSIVE PROCESS CONTROL STRATEGIES RECOMMENDED BY LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY CIVIL \& ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING DEPARIMENT.
c. A PROJECT IS UNDERWAY TO REDUCE THE HIGH CONCENTRATION OF HYDROGEN SULFIDE ( $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ ).
d.
etc.

Passed by a majority) unanimous (circle one) vote of the CITY/PARISH METROPOLITAN COUNCIL, Resolution 43483 on__August 11, 2004 (date).


## ADOPTED <br> METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

## AUG 112004

# RESOLUTION 43483 <br> COUNCIL ADMINISTRATOQ TAEASURER <br>  <br>  

 LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION (MWPP) ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT REPORT FOR THE SOUTH WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ) FOR THE MONITORING PERIOD OF JUNE 1,2003 THROUGH MAY 31. 2004.BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Council of the Parish of East Baton Rouge and City of Baton Rouge that the submittal of the Louisiana Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Report for the South Wastewater Treatment Plant co the Deparcment of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for the monitoring period of June 1, 2003 through May 31, 2004, is hereby approved.

## CERTIFIED <br> A TRUE COPY

AUG 132004
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Department of Public Works
City of Baton Rouge
Panisla of Easl Baton Rouge
Post Office Box 1471
Baton Rouge, Loussiana 70821

October 18, 2004
Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Water Resources
ATTN: Permits
Post Office Box 82215
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2215
Re: Municipal Water Pollution Prevention (MWPP) Environmental Audit Report
LPDES PERMTT NUMBER-
LA0036421 AI\# 4842

Dear Sirs:
As required by your office, we are submitting the annual Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit report along with the MWPP Resolution. This report represents our Central Wastewater Treatment Plant for the monitoring period of September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004

If you have any questions conceming this matter, please contact Mr. Charles O'Brien of my staff at (225) 389-3240.

Sincerely yours,

FR/MO/pas
xc: Jeff Broussard, PE, Deputy Director
Richard Wright, PE IV, SOGA.
Robert Groht, Jr., Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager
Bob Wiks, Wastewater Treatment Process Control Supervisor
Walter Jenkins, Assistant WW Treatment Plant Manager
Garcia Dialekwa, Wastewater Laboratory Supervisor

Attachment(s):

## LOUISIANA

MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION MWPP



## Instructions to the Operator-in-Charge

1. Complete only the sections of the Environmental Audit which apply to your wastewater treatment system. Leave sections that do not apply blank and enter a " 0 " for the point value.
2. Parts 1 through 7 contain questions for which points may be generated. These points are iotended to communicate to the department and the governing body or owner what actions will be necessary to prevent effluent violations. Place the point totals from parts 1 throngh 7 on the Point Calculation page.
3. Add up the point totals.
4. Submit the Environmental Audit to the governing body or owner for their review and approval.
5. The governing body must pass a resolution which contains the following items:
a. The resolution or letter must acknowledge the governing body or owner has reviewed the Environmental Audit.
b. The resolution must indicate specific actions, if any, will be taken to maintain compliance and prevent effluent violations. Proposed actions should address the parts where maximum or close to maximum points were generated in the Environmental Audit.
c. The resolution should provide any other iuformation the governing body deems appropriate.

## PART 1: INLLUENI ELOWILOADINGS

Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadings (All plants)
A. List the average monthly volumetric flows and BOD loadings received at your facility during the last reporting year.

| Col. 1 <br> Average Monthly Flow (million gellona per day, MOD) |  | Col. 2 <br> Average <br> Monthly $\mathrm{BOD}_{3}$ Concentration ( $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{l})$ |  | Col. 3 <br> Average <br> Monthly BOD Loading (pounde per day) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.72 | X | 128 | X $8.34=$ | 11,444 |
| 9.25 | X | 143 | $\times 8.34=$ | 11,032 |
| 10.42 | X | 141 | $\times 8.34=$ | 12,253 |
| 9.59 | X | 147 | $\times 8.34=$ | 11,757 |
| 11.19 | X | 121 | $\times 8.34=$ | 11,292 |
| 18.64 | X | 79 | $\times 8.34=$ | 12,281 |
| 11.24 | X | 133 | $\times 8.34=$ | 12,468 |
| 10.43 | X | 125 | $\times 8.34=$ | 10,873 |
| 16.68 | X | 90 | X $8.34=$ | 12,520 |
| 14.02 | X | 126 | $\times 8.34=$ | 14,733 |
| 10.53 | X | 110 | $\times 8.34=$ | 9,660 |
| 8.91 | X | 132 | $\times 8.34=$ | 9,809 |

BOD loading $=$ Average Monthly Flow (in MGD) $\times$ Average Monthly $B O D$ concentration (in $\mathrm{mg} /$ ) $\times 8.34$.
B. List the design flow and design BOD loading for your facility in the blanks below. If you are not aware of these design quantities, refer to your Operation and Maintenance Manual ( $O \& / \mathrm{M}$ ) or contact your consulting engineer.

| Design Flow, MGD | 32 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 28.80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Design BOD, 1b/day | 55,244 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 49,720 |

C. How many months did the monthly flow (Col. 1) to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) exceed $90 \%$ of design flow?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
months

points \begin{tabular}{llllllllllllll}
0 <br>
0

 

1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \& 5 \& 6 \& 7 \& 8 \& 9 <br>
10 \& 11 \& 12 \& months <br>
0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

D. How many months did the monthly flow (Col. 1) to the WWTP exceed the design flow?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
months

points | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Write $0,5,10$, or 15 in the D point total box 00 D Point Total
E. How many months did the monthly BOD loading (Col. 3) to the WWTP exceed $90 \%$ of the desiga loading?
Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total io the box below at the right.

F. How many times did the monthly BOD loading (Col. 3) to the WWTP exceed the design loading? Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

G. Add together each point total for C through F and place this sum in the box below at the right.


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.

## PART 2: EFELUENT QUAMTIYRLANT PERFORMANCE

A. List the monthly average effluent BOD and TSS concentrations produced by yout facility during the last reporting year.

| Month | Column 1 Avg. Monthly BOD ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{I}$ ) | Column 2 <br> Avg. Monthly <br> TSS (mg/) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEPTEMBER | 16 | 15 |
| OCTOBER | 17 | 15 |
| NOVEMBER | 17 | 17 |
| DECEMEER | 25 | 18 |
| Jantuay | 24 | 19 |
| EEBRUAARY | 24 | 21 |
| MARCH | 22 | 17 |
| APRII. | 23 | 18 |
| MAY | 18 | 17 |
| JUNE | 18 | 15 |
| JULY | 17 | 13 |
| AUCUST | 16 | 14 |

B. List the monthly average permit limits for your facility in the blanks below.

| Permit Limit |  |  | $90 \%$ of Permit Limit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BOD. mg/l | 30 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 27 |
| TSS, mg/ | 30 | $\mathrm{X} 0.90=$ | 27 |

## C. Continuous Discharge to Surface Water

i. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.


Write $0,10,20,30$ or 40 in the i point total box 0 i Point Total
ii. How many months did the effluent BOD concentration (Col. 1) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

iii. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (Col. 2) exceed $90 \%$ of permit limits? Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { months } \\
\text { points }
\end{gathered} \begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned} \begin{array}{ccccccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & \text { months } \\
0 & 10 & 20 & 30 & 40 & 40 & 40 & 40 & 40 & 40 & 40 & 40 & \text { points } \\
\text { Write } 0,10,20,30, ~ o r ~ & 40 \text { in the iii point total box } & 0 & & \text { iii Point Total }
\end{array}
$$

Write $0,10,20,30$, or 40 in the iii point total box $\square$ iii Point Total
iv. How many months did the effluent TSS concentration (Col.2) exceed permit limits?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
v. Add together each point total for $i$ through iv and place this sum in the box below at the right.

D. Other Monitoring and Limits
i. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for other pollutants such as: ammonia-nitrogen, phosphorus, pH , residual chlorine, or fecal coliform?
$\checkmark$ Check one boxYes $\mathbb{X}$ No If yes, please describe:
ii. At any time in the past year was there a "failure" of a Biomonitoring (Whole Effluent Toxicity) test of the effluent?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes $\otimes$ No If yes, please describe:
iii. At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for a toxic substance?

Check one box $\quad \square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No If yes, please describe:
A. What year was the wastewater treatronent plant coastructed or last major expansion/improvements completed? 1998

Current Year - (Answer to A) $=$ Ago in years
$\qquad$
Enter Age in Part C below.
B. Cbeck the type of treatment facility that is employed:

## Factor

X
Mechanical Treatment Plant
(Trickling fiter, activated
sludge, etc.)
Specify Type
$\qquad$ Actated Lagoon 2.0
$\qquad$ Stabilization Pond 1.5
$\qquad$ Other (Specify) $\qquad$ 1.0
C. Multiply the factor listed next to the type of facility your community employs by the age of your facility to determine the total point value of Part 3:

$$
\text { TOTAL POINT VALUE FOR PART } 3=\frac{2.5}{\text { FACTOR }} \times \frac{6}{\text { AGE }}=\square 15 \quad(\max =50)
$$

Also enter this value or 50 , which ever is less, on the point calculation table on page 16.
D. Piease attach a schematic of the treatment plant.
A. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was an overflow, bypass, or unpermitted discharge of untreated or incompletely treated wastewater due to heavy rain: 22
(Circle One) $0=0$ points
$1=5$ points
$2=10$ poiots
$3=15$ points
$4=30$ points
5 or more $=50$ points
(2) List the number of bypasses, overflows, or unpermitted discharges shown in A (1) that were within the collection system and the number at the treatment plant.

Collection System 22 Treatment Plant 0
B. (1) List the number of times in the last year there was a bypass or overflow of untreated or incompletely treated wastewater due to equipment failure, either at the treatment plant or due to pumping problems in the collection system: 47

| (Circle One) | $0=0$ points | $1=5$ points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $3=15$ points | $4=30$ points |

(2) List the number of bypasses or overflows shown in B (1) that were within the collection system and the number at the treatment plant.
Collection System 45 Treatment Plant_2
C. Specify whether the bypasses came from the city or village sewer system or from contract or tributary communities/sanitary districts, etc.
D. Add the point values circled for A and B and place the total in the box below.

$$
\text { TOTAL POINT VALUE FOR PART } 4 \longdiv { 1 0 0 } \text { (max =100) }
$$

Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16 .
E. List the person responsible for reporting overflows, bypasses, or unpermitted discharges to State and Federal authorities:

CHARLES M. O'BRIEN, ASSISTANT WASTEWATER LABORATORY SUPERVISOR (225) 389-3240

Describe the procedure for gathering, compiling, and reporting:
THE PROCEDURE FOR GATHERING, COMPILING, AND REPORTING IS SPECIFIED IN THE PERMIT.

## PART 5: SLUDGE STORAGE AND DISTOSAL SITES

A. Sludge Storage

How many months of sludge storage capacity does your wastewater treatment facility have available, either on-site or off-site?

Circle the number of months and corresponding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.
\(\left.\begin{array}{cccc|cl}months \& <2 \& 2 \& 3 <br>
points \& 50 \& 30 \& 20 \& 4 to 5 <br>

10\end{array}\right)\)| $>6$ | months |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 | points |

Write $0,10,20,30$, or 50 in the A point total box 10 A Point Total
B. For how many months does your facility bave access to (and approval for) sufficient land disposal sites to provide proper land disposad?

Circle the number of months and correspooding point total. Write the point total in the box below at the right.

| months | $<2$ | 6 to I1 | 12 to 23 | 24 to 35 | $>36$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| points | 50 | 30 | 20 | 10 | months |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Write $0,10,20,30$, or 50 in the B point total box $0 \quad$ B Point Total
C. Add together the A and B point values and place this sum in the box below at the rigtt:


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.

## PART 6: NEW DEVELOPMENT

A. Please provide the following information for the total of all sewer line extensions which were installed during the last year.

B. Has an industry (or other development) moved into the community or expanded production in the past year, such that either flow or poltutant loadings to the sewerage system were significantly increased ( $5 \%$ or greater)?
(Circle One)

$$
\text { No }=0 \text { points } \quad Y_{e s}=15 \text { points }
$$

Describe: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

List any new pollutants: $\qquad$
C. Is there any development (industrial, commercial, or residential) anticipatod in the next 2-3 years, such that either flow or pollutant loadings to the sewerage system could sigoificandly increase?

$$
\text { (Circle One) } \quad \text { No }=0 \text { points } \quad \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{es}}=15 \text { points }
$$

Describe: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

List any new pollutants that you anticipate: $\qquad$
D. Add together the point value circled in B and $C$ and place the sum in the blank below.


Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.

## PART 7：DDERATOR CERTIFICAIION AND EDUCAIION

A．What was the name of the operator－in－charge for the reporting year？Robert Florida Name
B．What is his／ber certification number？
\#10-549

Cert．\＃
C．What level of certification is the operator－in－charge required to have to operate the wastewater trearment plant？Wastewater Trat．IV Level Required

D．What is the level of certification of the operator－in－charge？Wastewater Trmt．IV Level Certified

E．Was the operator－in－charge of the repor year certified at least at the grade level required in order to operate this plant？$\quad \checkmark$ Check one box an $=0$ points $=50$ points Write 0 or 50 in the E point total box 0 E Point Total

F．Has the operator－in－charge maintained recertification requirements during the reporting year？
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ no
G．How many hours of continuing education has the operator－in－charge completed over the last two calendar years？$\checkmark$ Check one box $\quad \square 12$ hours or more $=0$ points Less than 12 hours $=50$ points Write 0 or 50 in the $G$ point total box 0 G Point Total

H．Is there a written policy regarding continuing education and training for wastewater treatment plant employees？\＆Check one box $⿴ 囗 十 \nabla$ yes $\square$

## Explain：

The State of Louisiana requires that an operator have at least 16 hours of continuing education in a two－year period to maintain his／her certification．

I．What percentage of the continuing education expenses of the operator－in－charge were paid for：


By the operator？ $\qquad$ $0 \%$

J．Add together the E and G point values and place this sum in the box below at the right：

Also enter this value on the point calculation table on page 16.
A. Are User-Charge Revenues sufficient to cover operation and maiotenance expenses?
$\checkmark$ Check one box $\square$ Yes $\otimes$ No If no, how are $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs being financed?
Explain:

SAME AS B.
B. What financial resources do you bave available to pay for your wastewater improvemeats and reconstruction needs?

WASTEWATER IMPROVEMRNTS AND RFCONSTRUCTION NEEDS ARE EUNDED EROM FOUR MAIN REVENUE SOURCES. THEY ARE A ONE half PERCENT SALES \& USE TAX, SEWER USER EEES, SEJER IMPACT EEES, AND A $\$ 4$ MILLION SUBSIDY FROM THE GENERAL. FUND SUPPORTED EROM GAMING REVENUES.

## A. Collection System Maintenance

1. Describe what sewer system maintenance work has been done in the last year.

SEE ATTACHMENT
2. Describe what lift station work has been done in the last year.

Replacement and repairs of the Force Main on the discharge side of the pump station up to the $4^{\prime}$ level of the existing gravity lines and routine maintenance work.
3. What collection system improvements does the community have under consideration for the next 5 years?

## SEE ATTACHMENT

B. If you have ponds, please answer the following questions:

1. Do you have duckweed buildup in your ponds?YesNo
2. Do you mow your dikes regularly (at least monthly), to the waters edge?YesNo
3. Do you have bushes or trees growing on the dikes or in the ponds?
4. Do you have excess sludge buildup ( $>1$ foot) on the bottom of any of your ponds?YesNo
5. Do you exercise all of your valves?Yes No
6. Are your control manholes in good structural shape?Yes $\square$ No
7. Do you maintain at least three feet of freeboard in all your ponds?Yes $\square$ No
8. Do you visit your pond system, at least weekly?Yes $\square$ NoYesNo

## LA MWPP ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

## PART 9: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

A1. AS PART OF THE CONSENT DECREE, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE CENTRAL TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA IS PERFORMED AND REPORTED ON A QUARTERLY BASIS. THE FOLLOWING TABLE IS A BREAKDOWN/SUMMARY OF ACTIVITTES PERFORMED WTTHIN THE CENTRAL TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION SYSTEM AREA DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD.

CENTRAL TREATMENT AREA
MONITORING PERIOD (9/03-8/04)

## LINE CLEANING <br> 41\%

CCTV INSPECTIONS ..... 35\%
SMOKE TESTING ..... 29\%
DYE TESTING ..... 2\%
MANHOLE INSPECTION ..... 15\%
LINE REPAIRED ..... 3\%
MANHOLE REHABILITATION ..... 2.4\%
FORCEMAIN-INSPECTIONS ..... 17\%
REPALRED ..... 47\%
AIR RELEASE VALVES-INSPECTIONS ..... 93\%
REPAIRED ..... 22\%
WET WELL CLEANED ..... 616\%
PUMP STATIONS-REPAIRED ..... 56\%

A3. DURING THE NEXT 5 YEARS APPROXIMATELY 5 PROJECTS IN THE CENTRAL TREATMENT PLANT COLLECTION AREA (RELATED TO THE SSO CONSENT DECREE PROGRAM) ARE SCHEDULED TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THE PROJECTS WLL INCLUDE PUMPSTATION UPGRADES, FORCEMAIN IMPROVEMENTS, GRAVITY SEWERS, STORAGE AND WET WEATHER TREATMENT FACILITIES. ADDITIONALLY, ANNUAL CONTRACTS FOR SEWER REHABLITATION INCLUDING LINING, POINT REPAIR, UPSIZING, AND OTHER REHABILITATION METHODS WLLL ALSO BE IMPLEMENTED.
C. Treatment Plants

1. Have the influent and effluent flow meters been calibrated in the last year?
$\square$ Yes

Influent flow meter calibration dates(s): Effluent flow meter calibration date(s):

| $10-23-03 \& 05-24-04$ | $03-02-04$ |
| :---: | :---: |

2. What problems, if any, have been experienced over the last year that have threatened treatmeat?

NONE
3. Is your community presently involved in formal planning for treatment facility upgrading?
$\square$ Yes $\$$ No If yes, describe:
D. Preventive Maintenance

1. Does your plant bave a written plan for preveative maintenance on major cquipment items?

80 Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:
Weekly, monthly and semi-annual preventive maintenance sheets that reflect type and frequency as specified in the O\&M manuals A new computer program will manage the maintenance and preventive maintenance of plant equipment and spare parts.
2. Does this preventive maintenance program depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, a other preventive maintenance tasks necessary for each piece of equipment? $\quad 0$ Yes $\square$ No
3. Are these preveative maintenance tasks, as well as equipment problems, being recorded and filc so future maintenance problems can be assessed properiy?
© Yes $\square \mathrm{No}$

## E. Sewer Use Ordinance

1. Does your community have a sewer use ordinance that limits or prohibits the discharge of excessive conventional pollutants (BOD, TSS, or pH ) or toxic substances to the sewer from industries, commercial users, and residences?

* Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe: (Yes is for industries and ocmencial users.)

Sewer User Fee Ondinance (No. 7853) limits the discharge of BOO \& TSS to $200 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ and $250 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ respectively. Any discharge above these limits is surcharged at a rate of $2 \%$ of the monthly sewer user fee for, each limit of $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$. Pretreatment Ondinance (No. 9195). Limits the discharge of heavy metals, chemicals and toxic subustances.
2. Has it beea necessary to caforce? 囚 Yes $\square$ No If yes, describe:

The Sewer User Fee Ordinance is strictly enforced by City-Parish and self monitoring sampling. The same apply to the Pretreatment Ordinance. Enfonce.mechanisns include dischange permits, surcharges, letter and notice of violations, administrative orders, water temination and fines.
F. Any additional comments about your treatment plant or collection system? (Atach additional sheet if necessary.)

## POINT CALCULATION TABLE

Fill in the values from parts 1 through 7 in the columns below. Add the numbers in the left column to determine the point total that the wastewater system has generated for the previous year.

| Actual Values | Actual Values | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part 1: Influent Flow/Loadiags | 0 | 80 Points |
| Part 2: Effluent Quality/Plant Performance | 0 | 100 Points |
| Part 3: Age of WWTT | 15 | 50 Points |
| Part 4: Overflows and Bypasses | 100 | 100 Points |
| Part 5: Ultimate Disposition of Sludge | 10 | 100 Points |
| Part 6: New Development | 0 | 30 Points |
| Part 7: Operator Certification Training | 0 | 100 Points |

TOTAL POINTS
125

## ATTACHMENT 3

## SAMPLE MWPP RESOLUTION

Resolved that the city/town of BATON ROUGE $\quad$ informs Louisiana Department of
Environmental Quality that the following actions were taken by the CITY/PARISH
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

1. Reviewed the Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Environmental Audit Report which is attached to this resolution.
2. Set forth the following actions necessary to maintain permit requirements contained in the Louisiana Water Discharge Permit Systern (LWDPS) number LAOQ35421 4T\#4842
(Please be specific in listing the actions that will be taken to address the problems identified in the audit report.)
a. CURRENTLY, WE ARE OPERATING UNDER A CONSENT DECREE WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE MARCH 14, 2002.
b.
c.
d.
etc.

Passed by a majority unanimous circle one) vote of the CITY/PARISI METROROLITAN COUNCI, on OCTOBER 27, 2004 (date).
 Nom
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## Appendix C

| To: | Kent Mudd | Date: | January 26, 2004 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| cc: | Bill McHie | File No. | SSO 4.7 |
| From: | Jarrod Tramonte / Chris Young |  |  |
| Subject: | Environmental Results Monitoring Program |  |  |
|  | Phase I, Quarter 5 Results |  |  |

On December 29, 2003, the City of Baton Rouge, Parish of East Baton Rouge (City/Parish) conducted the fifth quarterly Phase I Baseline Monitoring event, as required by the 2002 Consent Decree. The purpose of this memorandum is to characterize the rain event, summarize the sampling procedures, and report laboratory analysis results. Background information regarding the purpose and procedures of the Environmental Results Monitoring (ERM) program can be found in the ERM Plan (Exhibit G to the Consent Decree).

## RAIN EVENT

Rain data was recorded at USGS monitoring stations located upstream of each of the designated sample locations. The locations of the observed USGS monitoring stations are shown in Figure I along with sample site locations.

Rainfall data from the December 29 event is summarized graphically in Figure 2. As shown in Figure 2, this was a short-duration, high-intensity event, with peak intensity occurring between $8 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. The end of rainfall occurred at approximately 1 p.m. A summary of the rainfall at each sample site at the time of sample collection is provided in Table l.

Table 1. Sample Time/Rainfall Summary for Phase 1, Quarter 5

| Location | Sample Time | Total Rainfall <br> (in) | Peak Intensity <br> (in/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1- Greenwell Springs Rd. \& Comite River | $4: 10 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | 1.38 | 1.84 |
| 2 - O'Neal Ln. \& Jones Creek | $4: 35 \mathrm{p} \cdot \mathrm{m}$. | 1.62 | 1.40 |
| 3- Highland Rd \& Ward Creek | $4: 10 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | 1.53 | 1.20 |
| 4 - Grand Lakes Dr. \& Bayou Fountain | $3: 50 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | $\ell .68$ | 1.44 |

## PROCEDURES

One grab sample was taken from each of the four designated sample sites between the hours of $3: 50 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and $4: 35 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. Samples were drawn from the approximate center of each stream. Grab samples from each site were poured into three separate laboratoryprepared sample containers. Sample containers were labeled with sample date, time, and location name immediately following sample collection. Samples were stored on ice and delivered to the laboratory immediately following collection of the final sample.

All samples were analyzed at a local laboratory for the parameters established in the ERM plan, which include fecal coliform, fecal streptococcus, and enterococcus. Sample holding times and laboratory procedures conformed to applicable sections of the USEPA "Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes", 1983, and ASTM "Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater", 19 ${ }^{\text {h }}$ Edition, 1995.

## RESULTS

Results of laboratory analyses are summarized in Table 2. Further analysis of these results based on future water quality and stream flow data will be conducted upon completion of Phase I Baseline Monitoring. Gage height/elevation data from December 29, recorded at USGS stream flow monitoring stations upstream of each sample location, is presented in Figure 3. As shown in Figure 3, gage heightelevation recorded at the Comite River and Ward Creek (Main Branch) monitoring stations showed no response to the December 29 rain event.

Table 2. WQ Sampling results for Phase I, Quarter 5

|  | Sampling Location |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | l-Comite River | 2-Jones Creek | 3-Ward Creek | 4-Bayou Fountain |
| Fecal Coliform (col/ 100 mL ) | >1600 | $>1600$ | 110 | $>1600$ |
| Fecal Streptococcus ( $\mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) | $\mathrm{ND}^{\text {(1) }}$ | $N \mathrm{D}^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}{ }^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}{ }^{(1)}$ |
| Enterococcus (col/ 100 mL ) | $\mathrm{ND}^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}{ }^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}^{(1)}$ | $N \mathrm{D}^{(1)}$ |
| Total Rainfall (in) ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1.38 | 1.62 | 1.53 | 1.68 |
| Gage Height (ft) ${ }^{(2)}$ | $24.0{ }^{(3)}$ | 22.4 | 15.1 (N. Branch) 11.0 (Main Branch) 11.4 (Dawson Ck) | 7.2 |
| ${ }^{(1)} \mathrm{ND}=$ None detected ( $<2$ colonies $/ \mathrm{L} 00 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) <br> ${ }^{(2)}$ Values at time of sample collection <br> ${ }^{(3)}$ Elevation ( ft NGVD) |  |  |  |  |




Note: Data was recorded at USGS rainfall/stream flow monitoring stations upstream of sample locations.
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# Laboratory \& Analytical Business Services, inc. 

Certificate of Analysis

NOTES

COMAENTS:

| A |  | Value reported was dis tiverage of two or more determintions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | $\frac{5}{5}$ | Vabe reported is lese than the gractical quantitation trme and greeter than or equal to the minimum detection fink |
| C |  | Estimated Vatue |
| 0 | \% | Paramater exceed holding time - prior to arrival at tab for arnalis |
| $E$ | $\cdots$ | Preseumptive ondence of presence of muterial |
| $F$ | (1) | Vetue reported is leses then the detected limit |
| $G$ |  | Peremeter was aratyzed frorn an unpreservedfirnpropenty preserved sample |
| H |  | Anayte wey detecred in boih somple end meithod thank |
| 1 |  | Teat methad requerred by ctient |
| $\downarrow$ |  | Qunity contral dets exceoded acceptable criteria because of. |
|  |  | 1) Batctusample specric Q C resuba for ansiyle canut ba assessed |
|  |  | 2) Quelity control date indicale the uncertainty aseocrated with the meseuremert , is ouscide soceptabie fimits |
|  |  | 3) Sample mestor presems an unweual chationge to a method or instrument |
| K |  | Anatysis or preparation exceed holding limes prior to completion |
| $L$ |  | Ressuls mased ori dry we catcutation |
| M |  | Resubs trison on wer we calcultion |
| - |  | The data method performed is not a LDEQ accredited method or is not for rogufatory puposes by LOEQ |

## METHOD REFERENCES:

EPA 1 Methods for Cherncal Analysis of Water and Wastes; USEPA Office of Reserch and Developmern. Cincinntet. OH. 3/93; EPA 600/4-79-020.
EPA 2 Methods for the Determination of Metabs in Ervionmentad Samples, USEPA Onto of Rewerch and Dovelopment Washington OC, 6/91. EPA500/4-91/010.
EPA 3 Tea Methods for Evahating Salid Wastes, PhysicaliChomical Methods. SW-846; 3rd edition ( $9 / 86$ ), with Final Updater I (7/92). II (9/94), IIA (9/93), ÍB (1/95) and III (12/96)
EPA 4 Method for the Devermination of Organic in Drinting Water. Suppernert I, EPA 50014-90020. July 1990.
EPA 5 Code of Federal Regutaions, Tite 40. Part 136: U.S. Goverminem Printing Olfice. Weahingtor, D.C., July 19
EPA 6 EPA CLP SOW for Inorganic Anstysis of Mult-Medi, Mub-Concernation Organica, GCAMS, SOW 7B4.
EPA 7 EPA CLP SOW for Organc Anatysis of Mud-Media. Mubi-Concertionion Organics, GCMMS. SOW 785.
STDM Stundand Methods for the Exameraion of Water and Watrumater. 18in Edition, 1992
ASTM American Socioty of Teating and Materials. 1996
BAM Enctnologice Armhtical Methocin FDA
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## DEFINITHONS:

| 80L | Below dutection limite |
| :---: | :---: |
| NO | None Outected ebowe the detection firmit |
| $\underline{8}$ | Mathod Bterik |
| DUP | Semple Duplicate |
| MS | Mutiu Spike |
| S | Sple |
| SC | Sub-Contract Lab aralysis |
| N/A | Net applicable |
| DET LMIT | The minimurn amount of the analyte thes can be detected utifiring thim method |

ror. 2 (900)
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## M E M O R A N DUM

| To: | Kent Mudd | Date: | April 19, 2004 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| cc: | Bill McHie | File No. | SSO 4.7 |
| From: | Jarrod Tramonte / Chris Young |  |  |
| Subject: | Environmental Results Monitoring Program <br>  |  |  |
|  | Phase I, Quarter 6 Results |  |  |

On February 6, 2004, the City of Baton Rouge, Parish of East Baton Rouge (City/Parish) conducted the sixth quarterly Phase I Baseline Monitoring event of the Environmental Results Monitoring Program. This was the final Baseline Monitoring event, per the requirements of the 2002 consent decree. The purpose of this memorandum is to characterize the rain event, summarize the sampling procedures, and report laboratory analysis results. Background information regarding the purpose and procedures of the Environmental Results Monitoring (ERM) program can be found in the ERM Plan (Exhibit G to the Consent Decree).

## RAIN EVENT

Rain data was recorded at USGS monitoring stations located upstream of each of the designated sample locations. The locations of the observed USGS monitoring stations are shown in Figure I along with sample site locations.

Rainfall data from the February 5-6 event is summarized graphically in Figure 2. As shown in Figure 2, this was a drenching, long-duration rain event, with continuous rainfall occurring over a 24 -hour period. The highest intensity occurred during the evening hours of February 5. The end of rainfall occurred at approximately midnight of February 6. A summary of the rainfall at each sample site at the time of sample collection is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Time/Rainfall Summary for Phase 1, Quarter 6

| Location | Sample Time | Total Rainfall <br> (in) | Peak Intensity <br> $(\mathbf{i n} / \mathrm{hr})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Greenwell Springs Rd. \& Comite River | $8: 45 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. | 3.68 | 3.16 |
| 2 - O'Neal Ln. \& Jones Creek | $9: 00 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. | 2.55 | 2.08 |
| 3 - Highland Rd \& Ward Creek | $9: 17 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. | 2.23 | 2.20 |
| 4 - Grand Lakes Dr. \& Bayou Fountain | $9: 30 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. | 1.75 | 1.68 |

## PROCEDURES

One grab sample was taken from each of the four designated sample sites between the hours of 8:45 a.m. and 9:30 a.m, February 6. Samples were drawn from the approximate center of each stream. Grab samples from each site were poured into three separate laboratory-prepared sample containers. Sample containers were labeled with sample date, time, and location name immediately following sample collection. Samples were stored on ice and delivered to the laboratory immediately following collection of the final sample.

All samples were analyzed at a local laboratory for the parameters established in the ERM plan, which include fecal coliform, fecal streptococcus, and enterococcus. Sample holding times and laboratory procedures conformed to applicable sections of the USEPA "Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes", 1983, and ASTM "Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater", 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 1995.

## RESULTS

Results of laboratory analyses are summarized in Table 2. Further analysis of these results, in combination with the results of previous Phase I Baseline events, will be provided. Gage height/elevation data from February 5-6, recorded at USGS stream flow monitoring stations upstream of each sample location, is presented in Figure 3.

Table 2. WQ Sampling results for Phase I, Quarter 6

|  | Sampling Location |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 1-Comute River | 2-Jones Creek | 3-Ward Creek | 4-Bayou Fountain |
| Fecal Coliform ( $\mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) | 188 | 188 | 900 | 350 |
| Fecal Streptococcus ( $\mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) | $\mathrm{ND}{ }^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}{ }^{(1)}$ | ND ${ }^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}^{(1)}$ |
| Enterococcus ( $\mathrm{col} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) | ND ${ }^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{ND}^{(1)}$ | ND ${ }^{(1)}$ |
| Total Rainfall (in) ${ }^{(2)}$ | 3.68 | 2.55 | 2.23 | L. 75 |
| Gage Height (ft) ${ }^{(2)}$ | $39.08^{(3)}$ | 21.85 | 14.73 (N. Branch) 13.12 (Main Branch) <br> 14.49 (Dawson Ck) | 9.79 |
| ${ }^{(1)} \mathrm{ND}=$ None detected ( $<2$ colonies $/ 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) <br> ${ }^{(2)}$ Values at time of sample collection <br> ${ }^{(3)}$ Elevation (ft NGVD) |  |  |  |  |



Figure 2. February 5-6 Rainfall Summary


Figure 3. February 5-6 Gage Height/Elevation Summary


Note: Data was recorded at USGS rainfall/stream flow monitoring stations upstream of sample locations.
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THIS REPORT CAN NOT BE DUPLICAYED EXCEPT IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF LABS INC.
 rAGE $50 \% \underline{1 \text { 角 }}$
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SAMPLE 1D: \#B WARDS CREEK/MIGHLAND RD.

## LABORATORY REPORT

LAB\# 78828

-EPA 1983 - METHOOS FOR CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF WATER AND WASTES. 1983

- STD M = STANDARO METHODS FOR THE EXAMINATION OF WATER AND WASTEWATER. 15 FH - 187H EDITION. 1994
"OSBC-TAKEN ON SITE AT TIME OF SAMPLING.
THIS REPORT CAN NOT BE DUPLICATEO EXCEPT IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF LABS INC.
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-EPA 1983 - METHODS FOR CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF WATER AND WASTES, 1983

- STD M = STANDARD METHODS FOR THE EXAMINATION OF WAYER AND WASTEWATER. 15TH - 18 TH EDITION, 1994
- OSBC. TAKEN ON SITE AT TIME OF SAMPLING

THIS REPORT CAN NOT BE OUPLICATED EXCEPT IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF LABS INC
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## NOTES

COMMENTS:


## METHOD REFERENCES:

EPA 1 Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes: USEPA Office of Reserch and Development, Cincinnati, OH, 3/83: EPA 600/4-79-020.
EPA 2 Methods for the Delermination of Melals in Environmental Samples, USEPA Office of Reaerch and Development. Washington DC, 6/91. EPA500/4-911010.
EPA 3 Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Wastes, PhysicaVChemical Methods. SW-846: 3rd edition (9186), with Final Updates $1(7 / 92)$. II (9/94), 1LA (9/93), IIB (1/95) and III (12/96)

EPA 4 Method for the Delermination of Organic in Drinking. Water, Supplement I, EPA 500/4-90020, July 1990.
EPA 5 Code of Federal Regulations. Tile 40, Part 136 : U.S. Govermmert Printing Office. Washington, D.C., July 1
EPA 6 EPA CLP SOW Ior inorganic Analysis of Mutti-Media, Mult-Concendration Organics, GC/MS, SOW 784.
EPA 7 EPA CUP SOW Ior Organic Analysis of Muli-Media, Muti-Concentration Orgsnics, GC/MS, SOW 785.
STDM Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastowaler, 18th Edition, 1992
ASTM American Society of Testing and Materials. 1998
日AM Bacterological Analytical Methods, FDA
$29 \mathrm{Laboratory} \mathrm{Procedures} \mathrm{for} \mathrm{Analysis} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{Oifield} \mathrm{Wastes}$,

## DEFINITIONS:

| BDL | Betow defection limids |
| :--- | :--- |
| ND | None Defected above the defection fimit |
| B | Method Blank |
| DUP | Sample Ouplicate |
| MS | Matrix Spike |
| S | Spike |
| SC | Sub-Contract Lab analysis |
| N/A | Not applicable |
| OET UMIT | The minimum amourl of the analyte that can be delected utilizing this mothod |

rev. $2(9 / 03)$


LABORATORY \& ANALYTICAL BUSINESS SERVICES (LABS)

## CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD

| commerocomewn mult |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | surnegy |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Nuvssemesto |
| 18882 | 1 | 2/6 | 8:45. |  |  | Freal Colifem |
| Tis.ad. | 412 | $2 / 6$ | " | Comiterewelorequell spring ict |  | Feral Stusitecocus |
| 183.23 | $\mathrm{Na}^{2}$ | 216 | - |  |  | Entuocacsus |
| 183. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 11.4 | 216 |  | n Sones Snuk /ownall ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | fecal Colutown |
| I Potis | 45 | 北 | $\cdots$ | Iones Cuet/o ivesiln |  | Fecal Sturtocacus |
| $18 \% 26$ | alls | $2 / 6$ | " | Iones Crack/o'vratln |  | Entrocaccios |
| $188.2{ }^{\circ}$ | (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 216 | 9:17am |  |  | Feral Coliform |
| -1820 | :1s | 1/6 | $\cdots$ | Whards Crat/ /tighanow Kd |  | Ecral stugto cascus |
| 1s 5.34 | H4 | 2/6 | , | Vardors Crat/ /ighland Kd |  | Tease Entroccacus |
| -10\% 30 | N1/6 | $2 / 6$ | 9:30an | Bapon forulain/ /tighland icd |  | Fecal Colitorm |
| Le $0^{2}$ | IIII | $2 / 6$ | , | Bayau Fountain/tighla and Kd |  | Feeal strytococus |
| 13, 32 | d12 | 2/6 | 4 | Bayou Foustminftlifland Md |  | Entrococcus |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | raut LSOF | ) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Necemox semmued |  |  |

CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD

| Contracto | mus |  |  | PURCHASE DPOER \＃JJOE |  | Iracr： |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIENTRE |  |  |  | SAMPLED DE：－$\quad$ NOURS： | kites | EXPENSES ${ }^{\text {PEETALI FEES }}$ |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | SAMPIE E | DATE | TME | DE DESCHIPTITMMEASE | a Contaners | ANALYSIS REOUESTEO |
|  |  | 2／6 | 8.45 a．d |  |  | Fecal Colform |
|  |  | －16 | ． | Comitekwo／bureru－el／Spring，id |  | tecal streptococrus |
|  |  | 216 | ， |  |  | Frituacorcus |
|  |  | $\bigcirc 16$ | 9：00． | Jowshork／oweall ${ }^{\text {J }}$ |  | Fecal Colilow， |
|  |  | 兩 | ， 1 |  |  | Eecal Sturilocarus |
|  |  | $8 / 16$ | 11 | －lanes Creek／o viallu |  | Futivorerin＇s |
|  |  | 2／6 | $7.13 \times 1$ | Wauts（reck 1 Hiolland $R 2$ | ， | Feca！Coliform |
|  |  | $1 / 6$ |  |  |  | Feral stucpilaracrus |
|  |  | 26 | 11 | Laodo Cuet／Hiohland hel |  | 靬致文 Endurorocous |
|  |  | s／in | 93000 | Ba－ron Fomilain＇／Hrghand vod |  | itecal Colltarim |
|  |  | $2 / 6$ | 11 | Poyou Fourtaw＇／I＇ishtand kd |  | fecal sthetococcus |
|  |  | L／62 | 1 |  |  | Fritorococus |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relvivisic | 为 |  | Diterma |  | comments： |  |
|  |  |  | OTEETME | RECEVEC EY：（SIGNTUAE） |  |  |
| neincuish | Mamarue： |  | Datetme | Recento br：Stimaruag |  |  |

## Appendix D



REQUESTING APPROVAL FOR SUBMITIAL OF THE
LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION
(MWPP) ENUIRONMENTAL AUDIT REPORT. FOR THE
CENTRAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ) FOR
THE MONITORING PERIOD OF SEPTEMBER 1,2003
THROUGH AUGUST $31,2004$.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Council of the Parish of East Bacon Rouge and City of Baton Rouge that the submittal of the Louisiana Municipal water pollution prevention (MWPP) Environmencal Audit Report for the Central Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for the monicoring period of September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004, is hereby approved.

## CRPMPCOM TRUECPM



## Appendix E



Office of Community Development Mail: Post Office Box 1471, 70821 Streef: $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ Louisiana Avenue, 2nd Floor Baton Rouge. LA 70802 (225) 389-3039, FAX: (225) 389-3939

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Date: Octotu 27,2604

To: Me David Ratcistt

PHONEH: $\qquad$

ATMN:

1:АX\#: $389-4838$
fROM: Edusira Patfeeson

HARI COPY TO FOIIIOW:
YES
 Numbeor of penges (inciendifleg cover): $-4$

COMMENTS: $\qquad$

TO REPORT RRROR IN TRANSMISSION. PLIUASI? CALL (385) 38U-3039

Enclosed is the second list of homeowners from the Sharon Hills, Cedar Glen Sub., etc. Who have applied for assistance, and have been found eligible for sewer line tie in under our program guidelines.

We have reserved funds under our Small/Limited Repair Program. The account number for this program is: 182.6114016 .643550 .3141503 .

If any additional information is needed, please contact Edwina Patterson at 389-3039.

## Enclosure

# LIST OF APPROVED APPLICANTS FOR SEWER LINE ASSISTANCE 

1. Ms. Angela K. Benton9314 Corlett Drive
Batom Rouge, La. 70811
357-5318
2. Ms. Violester V. Hampton
6622 Marionette Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
356-7593
3. Ms. Brittany K. Haynes
8535 Sharon Hills Blvd.
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-1041
4. $\mathbf{M} / \mathbf{M}$ James/Dorothy James
8867 Corlett Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
356-5428
5. Ms. Shirley Johnson
9425 Corlett Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-7503
6. Mr. William H. LeBeau
8636 Sharon Hills Bivd.
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-6143
7. M/M Ard/Dorothy Leiva
9550 Gov. Bauvias Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811774-6836
8. M/M Isaac/Rosetta Moore, Sr. 9079 Sharon Hills Blvd.
Baton Rauge, La. 70811
356-9043
9. M/M Dexter/Monica Parker
8835 Gov. Pleasant Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
356-1113
10. Ms. Ivel Potts
8652 Sharon Hilla Bivd.
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-4260
11. Ms. Mayola Ross
5944 Marionette Street
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-5872
12. M/M Robert/Betty Watts
8625 Sharon Hills Blvd.
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
357-8482
13. Ms. Geraldine Davis
9125Corlett Drive
Baton Rougen La. 70811
355-1516
14. Ms. Denita Williams
9048 Cefalu Drive
Baton Rouge, La. 70811
356-5708, work ..... 922-6537


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Project delered
    ${ }^{2}$ Project separated into smaller scopes/projects (Project number \& description may be changed or re-used)
    ${ }^{3}$ Project combined with others (Project number \& description may be changed or re-used)
    ${ }^{4}$ Project description may have changed
    ${ }^{5}$ New Project

