

January 7, 2011

Mr. Craig Noble, General Manger Russellville City Corporation P.O. Box 3186 Russellville, AR 72811-3186

RE: Inspection of the Pretreatment Program

NPDES Permit No.: AR0021768 AFIN

AFIN: 58-00105

Dear Mr. Noble:

On December 29, 2010, I performed a routine pretreatment compliance inspection of your facility in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act, the Arkansas Water and Air Pollution Control Act, and the regulations promulgated thereunder. This inspection revealed that you are in compliance with the terms of your permit.

If I can be any assistance, please contact me at 479-968-7339.

Sincerely,

Amy Back

Amy Beck District 5 Field Inspector Water Division

cc: Water Division Enforcement Branch Water Division Permits Branch

SEPA			Form Approved OMB No. 2040-0003 Approval Expires 7-31-85	
NPDES Compliance		Renort		
	ection A: National Data S			
Transaction Code NPDES	ection A. National Data 5	Yr/Mo/Day	Inspec. Type Inspector Fac. Type	
$1 \boxed{\mathbf{N}} 2 \boxed{5} 3 \boxed{\mathbf{A}} \boxed{\mathbf{R}} 0 0 \boxed{2} \boxed{1} 7$	6 8 11 12 1		Inspec. Type Inspector Fac. Type 18 P 19 S 20 1	
	Remarks			
Inspection Work Days Facility Evaluation Ra 67 0 0 1 69 70 N	ting BI 71 N 72	QA 73 74 75	Reserved 80	
	Section B: Facility	Data		
Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users disch include POTW name and NPDES permit number) RUSSELLVILLE WWTP (CITY CORPORATION)	aarging to POTW, also	Entry Time/Date 0900 / 12-29-2010	Permit Effective Date 10/01/2010	
404 Jimmy Lile Road Russellville, AR 72802		Exit Time/Date 1700 / 12-29-2010	Permit Expiration Date 09/30/2015	
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Numb Randy Bradley/ Pretreatment Coordinator / Phone: (479) 968-2 Charlotte Petrick / IU inspector		968-3265	Other Facility Data 35° 14' 57" N, 93° 06' 58" W	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Numbe Craig No ble, (479) 968-2080 ext. 113 RUSSELLVILLE CITY CORPORATION P.O. Box 3186 Russellville, AR 72811	PDS #067508			
	ion C: Areas Evaluated D			
		isfactory, N = Not Evaluated)	N Sampling	
N Permit N Flow Measurement N Records/Reports N Self-Monitoring Pr	^		N Sampling N Pollution Prevention	
N Facility Site Review N Compliance Sched		uge minung Disposal	N Multimedia	
N Effluent/Receiving Waters N Laboratory			N Other:	
		tach additional sheets if necessary)		
Reviewed areas of the pretreatment program were	e satisfactory. The fa	cilitator maintains very org	anized records.	
Industrial Users visited: 1. Premium Protein Products 2. P.O.M.				
	Agency/Office/Telephone/ AR Dept. of Environmen	tal Quality-Jonesboro	Date December 29, 2010	
Amy Beck	(870) 935-7221 ext. 12/(8'	70) 935-4715 (Fax)		
Signature of Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and	Fax Numbers	Date	

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION (PCI) REPORT

Name of Municipality: Russellville City Corporation

AFIN Number: **58-00105**

NPDES Permit Number(s): AR0021768

Program Tracked under NPDES Permit Number: AR0021768

Fact Sheet Preparation Date: NA

Date of Last PCI/Audit: April, 2009 - PCI

Date of Last Annual Report: February 2010

Name of Inspector: Amy Beck

Date PCI Performed: December 29, 2010

Name, Title, and Telephone Number of Facility Representative: Randy Bradley, Pretreatment Coordinator - (479) 968-2080 ext. 133

Name and Title of Other Participants: Charlotte Petrick, IU Inspector, City Corp.

Number of IUs Visited: 2

Name(s) of IUs Visited: **Premium Protein Products, P.O.M.**

AN IU SITE VISIT FORM SHOULD BE COMPLETED FOR EACH IU VISITED

NOTE: ANY QUESTION PRINTED IN ALL CAPS AND BOLD PRINT INDICATED A REGULATORY REQUIREMENT AND MUST BE ANSWERED FOR THE PCI REPORT TO BE COMPLETE. A NO ANSWER TO ONE OF THESE QUESTIONS SHOULD RESULT IN AN UNSATISFACTORY RATING.

Form approved July 1989

A. INDUSTRIAL USER SURVEY

- List any Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) which have been added or deleted from the program since the last audit or inspection. No change
- 2. Has ADEQ or EPA been notified of these changes? NA
- 3. HAS THE INDUSTRIAL USER SURVEY BEEN KEPT UPDATED? Yes
- 4. What procedures are being used to update the IU Survey? Review non-residential applications for water hook up to identify new industrial and commercial users, site visit if necessary, review monthly water use report to identify possible IUs.
- Total number of Significant Industrial Users, according to the definition used by the POTW. (This number must be greater than or equal to the answer to question 6) 13
- 6. Number of Categorical Industrial Users: 3
- 7. How does the POTW determine the appropriate categorical standards to apply to an IU? Based on 403 regulations, EPA regulations and the facility's program.
- 8. List all categorical IUs discharging under the approved (such program. Include the name of the IU, the regulatory category as Metal Finishing), and the regulated process (phosphating, zinc plating, etc.) Additional listings can be made in the comments section if necessary.

Name of IU:	Category:	Regulated Process:
P.O.M.	Metal finishing	Phosphatizing rinse
Taber Metals	Aluminum forming	Contact cooling
Grace Manufacturing	Metal finishing	Phosphatizing rinse

B. LOCAL LIMITS

- 1. IS THE POTW APPLYING LOCAL LIMITS WHICH HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY ADEQ OR EPA? The facility has drafted the local limits and is awaiting approval of ordinance by city counsel (expect vote in 2011 first quarter). Then approval from ADEQ.
- 2. Describe any apparent problems with the local limits. None.
- 3. How often are pollutant scans of POTW influent, effluent, and sludge performed by the POTW? Does this fulfill the requirements of the approved program (as described in the fact sheet) and part III of the NPDES permit?

	Requirement in					
Pollutant:	Frequency:	Permit:	Program:	Comments:		
Metals: Influent:	1/quarter	1/quarter	NA			
Effluent:	1/quarter	1/quarter	NA			
Sludge:	1/quarter	1/quarter	NA			
Organics: Influent:	1/year	1/year	NA			
Effluent:	1/year	1/year	NA			
Sludge:	1/year	1/year	NA			

4. Have there been any inhibitions or upsets at the POTW (since the last PCI of Audit) which were believed to be caused by industrial discharges? If so, describe the action taken by the City to ensure that the incident would not recur. Were these actions effective? None.

C. INDUSTRIAL USER CONTROL MECHANISM

- 1. Is the POTW using the type of control mechanism (permit, agreement, etc.) required by the approved program? **Permit**
- How many IU permits (or other control documents) have been issued? 13
- 3. DO ALL <u>SIGNIFICANT</u> <u>IUS</u> HAVE CURRENT (UNEXPIRED) CONTROL DOCUMENTS? IF NOT, LIST ALL UNPERMITTED SIUS, THE DATE OF EXPIRATION OF THEIR PREVIOUS PERMIT (IF APPLICABLE), AND THE REASON FOR DELAY IN ISSUING THE REQUIRED DOCUMENT. Yes, all SIUS have current permits
- 4. Does the control document contain the following items? (Taber Extrusion and MAHLE permits examined) An expiration date: Yes

Discharge limitations: Yes	
----------------------------	--

If	the	program	requires	self-monitoring	by	the	IUs,	do	the
Per	mits	s contair	n:						

IU self-monitoring requirements: Yes

IU	reporting	requirements:	Yes	
----	-----------	---------------	-----	--

5. Indicate which of the following recommended standard conditions are contained in the control documents:

Sample location: Yes	1		
Type of sample: Yes			
Monitoring frequency:	Yes		
Bypass prohibition:	Yes		
Right of entry: Yes			
Nontransferability:	Yes		
Revocation clause: Y	es		
Penalty Provisions:	les		
Slug load notificatio	n: Yes		
Notification of proce	ss change:	Yes	

D. MONITORING OF IUS BY POTW

	requirement below:	Current frequency.	Drogram Doguiromont.
	Sampling:	Current frequency:	Program Requirement:
	categorical IUs	2/year	2/year
	other SIUs	2/year	2/year
	Inspection: categorical IUs	2/year	2/year
	other SIUs	2/year	2/year
2.	HAS EACH SIU BEEN IN REQUIRED BY THE APPF	ISPECTED AND SAMPLED AT TH ROVED PROGRAM? yes	E FREQUENCY
3.	Are inspections anno	ounced or unannounced?	both
4.	Are records kept of	each inspection? yes	
5.	Does the inspection the following:	report contain an adequat	e description of
	Date and time of ins	spection: yes	
	Officials present:	yes	
	Inspection of chemic	cal storage areas: yes	
		ated processes, categoric of these waste streams: <u>y</u>	
	Inspection of the pr	etreatment facilities: <u>y</u>	es
	Review of self-monit	coring records: reviewed	prior to inspection
	Observation of IU se	elf-monitoring procedures:	Contract lab used
	Verification that ap	pproved analytical techniq	ues are used: yes
	Verification of IU f	flow measurement (where re	quired): yes
6.	Overall adequacy of	inspection documentation:	Documentation has

1. Indicate current inspection and sampling frequency and program

improved since last inspection, appears to be very thorough.

- 7. DOES THE POTW SAMPLE IUS FOR ALL POLLUTANTS REGULATED IN THEIR PERMITS? (IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO SAMPLE FOR ALL POLLUTANTS EVERY TIME, BUT IT MUST BE DONE PERIODICALLY). All parameters are sampled.
- 8. Are analyses performed in accordance with EPA-approved methods (40 CFR 136)? Certified contract lab used (EEG).
- 9. Are sampling and flow monitoring equipment properly maintained? Yes, sampling bottle cleaned after each use, sample tube for each IU, pH meter calibrated each use.
- 10. Is the POTW keeping proper field notes and chain of custody forms? yes
- 11. Is the sampling location representative of the discharge to the collection system? **yes**
- 12. Are sampling locations identified in POTW records? **yes**
- 13. Are sampling services available in an emergency? **yes**
- 14. What are the POTW's procedures for tracking receipt and review of IU reports, such as BMR's, semi-annual reports, progress reports, bypass reports, and self-monitoring reports? Pretreatment coordinator keeps track with the use of an ops system for tracking and an Excel spreadsheet.
- 15. ARE SELF-MONITORING REPORTS REVIEWED TO VERIFY THAT ANALYSES WERE PERFORMED FOR ALL REGULATED PARAMETERS, AND TO EVALUATE COMPLIANCE WITH EFFLUENT LIMITS? yes
- 16. IF VIOLATIONS ARE FOUND IN REPORTS, DOES THE POTW RESPOND TO ALL VIOLATIONS? Yes. Notice of violation is sent to the IU advising them of what was found along with a corrective action plan.

19.

- 17. What are the POTW's procedures for following up violations? Notice of violation requires a corrective action plan within 30 days of receipt. The plan is reviewed by the POTW and determined whether or not it is acceptable.
- 18. HAS THE POTW REVIEWED BMRS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH 40 CFR 403.12(b)? NA

Review a Baseline Monitoring Report from the POTW's file, and indicate which of the following items can be identified in the BMR: No new categorical SIUS.					
Name and address: NA					
Other environmental permits held: NA					
Description of operations: NA					
Process flow diagrams: NA					
Flow measurements: NA					
Measurements of regulated pollutants: NA					
Certification of compliance by the IU: NA					
Compliance schedule (if needed): NA					
Additional comments on the POTW's inspection and sampling procedures: All based on 40 CFR 403.12.					

E. Enforcement

- 1. HAS THE POTW IMPLEMENTED ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES TO ADEQUATELY ADDRESS EVERY IU VIOLATION OF PRETREATMENT STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS? yes
- 2. How does the POTW respond to the following violations?

Effluent limitations: Notice of violation

Late reports: Notice of violation

Unpermitted discharges: Notice of violation

Slug loads or spills: NOV & action order for slug prevention

- 3. IS THE LIST OF SIGNIFICANT VIOLATORS PUBLISHED BY THE POTW DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH EPA REGION VI CRITERIA FOR SIGNIFICANT VIOLATING INDUSTRIAL USER (DATED AUGUST 22, 1985)? Yes, printed in the local newspaper.
- 4. List the SIUs which have met the criteria for Significant Violator within the last 12 months, and describe the enforcement action which has been taken by the POTW. If construction is required, please indicate whether the IU has been placed on an enforceable compliance schedule. No significant violators in the last 12 months.

Name:	Type of Violation:	Enforcement Action:	Compliance Deadline:

5. Comments on the POTW's enforcement procedures: Reduction of violations since the last pretreatment inspection suggests the procedures are effective.

F. POTW'S PRETREATMENT ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

- Is the program structure essentially the same as that presented in the approved pretreatment program? yes
- 2. Are staffing levels adequate? yes
- 3. Are the responsible officials familiar with the approved program? **yes**

G. MULTIJURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

- List any IUs which are located outside of the jurisdictional area of the POTW: none
- Does the POTW have adequate procedures for controlling IUs located outside its jurisdictional area? <u>NA</u>
- 3. Does the POTW have copies of permits for IUs in other cities? **NA**
- 4. Have any of these IUs met the criteria for Significant Violator? If so, have they been published by the POTW in its annual list of Significant Violators? NA
- 5. Comments on multijurisdictional issues: <u>none</u>

H. EVALUATION AND COMMENTS

At permit renewal for Grace Manufacturing, remove flow meter requirement.

Grease trap and backflow programs have been implemented.

Pretreatment records are well organized. Inspection form has been updated and appears to be very thorough.

Continue local limit update.

ACC, industry in Dover, was determined to be ineligible for the pretreatment program.

The program is satisfactory in the reviewed areas.

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

IU SITE VISIT FORM

Name of Industry: **Premium Protein Products**

POTW Name: Russellville City Corp WWTP

Industry Contacts: Gary Reddell - Acting Plant Manager

Date and Time of Visit: December 29, 2010; 1130

Description of Manufacturing Process: Facility recycles protein for animal feed (rendering plant).

Sources of Process Wastewater: Rinse water from raw product area, process area, truck wash area.

Categorical Industry? No

Basis for Limits: BOD, NH3-N, TSS limits based on local limits (daily avg flow > 25,000 gal, and IU NH3-N contribution to STP. Point of Application: NA

Description of Pretreatment Equipment and Procedures: All flows directed to a skimmer, then anaerobic pond, and 3 aerobic ponds in series. Flow from last pond sent to WWTP.

Spill Prevention and Solvent Management Procedures: This area could use improvement. Chemical storage area is not contained. Process water flows to low areas then pump must be manually turned on to get to skimmer.

Sampling Location and Equipment: City and/or contract lab sample this facility. PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

IU SITE VISIT FORM

Name of Industry: **P.O.M.**

POTW Name: Russellville City Corp WWTP

Industry Contacts: Brent Huneycutt-Environment & Safety Manager

Date and Time of Visit: December 29, 2010; 1230

Description of Manufacturing Process:

This facility manufactures parking meters and various contracted parts.

Sources of Process Wastewater: Metal finishing line and powder paint line.

Categorical Industry? Yes

Basis for Limits: Metal finishing 40 CFR 433.15

Point of Application: NA

Description of Pretreatment Equipment and Procedures: The facility has a series of settling tanks, flocculent and ph adjustments added prior to discharging to the WWTP.

Spill Prevention and Solvent Management Procedures: All plant floor drains have been removed.

Sampling Location and Equipment: City and/or contract lab sample this facility.

PPETS CODE SHEET

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION (PCI)

CODE

INSPECTOR'S NAME:	Amy Beck	
NAME OF FACILITY:	Russellville City Corp WWTP	
PERMIT NUMBER USED TO TRACK PROGRAM:	AR0021768	NPID
DATE OF PCI:	December 29, 2010	DTIA

PPETS WENDB DATA ELEMENTS

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT IUS (SIUS):	13	SIUS
NUMBER OF CATEGORICAL IUS:	3	CIUS
SIUS NOT SAMPLED OR INSPECTED BY POTW:	0	NOIN
SIUS WITHOUT CONTROL MECHANISM:	0	NOCM
SIUS IN SIGNIFICANT NONCOMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS OR REPORTING:	0	PSNC
SIUS IN SIGNIFICANT NONCOMPLIANCE WITH SELF-MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:	0	MSNC
SIUS IN SIGNIFICANT NONCOMPLIANCE WITH SELF-MONITORING AND NOT INSPECTED OR SAMPLED BY POTW:	0	SNIN