

October 17, 2012

Mr. Tommy Shackelford, Chief Operating Officer Conway Corporation P.O. Box 99 Conway, AR 72033

RE: Inspection of the Pretreatment Program NPDES Permit No.: AR0051951, AFIN: 23-01095

Dear Mr. Shackelford:

On October 12, 2012, 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

€EPA				Form Approved OMB No. 2040-0003 Approval Expires 7-31-85			
	UNIT	ED STATES ENVIRONM	ENTAL PROTECTION a, D.C. 20460	N AGENCY	Y		
NPDE	S C	Complianc		tion	Report		
		S	Section A: Nation	nal Data	a System Coding		
Transaction Code 1 N 2 5 3 A R	0	NPDES 0 5 1 9	5 1 11	12	Yr/Mo/Day 1 2 1 0 1 2 17	Insp 18	PInspectorFac. TypeP19S201
			F	Remarks			
Inspection Work Days]	Facility Evaluation R	ating	BI	QA	F	Reserved
67 0 0 1 69		70 3	71	N 7	72 N 73 74 75		80
			Section I		<i>v</i>		
Name and Location of Facility Inspected include POTW name and NPDES permi CITY OF CONWAY – Tupelo Ba	t numi	ber)	harging to POTW	V, also	Entry Time/Date 0935 / 10-12-2012		Permit Effective Date 11/1/2009
900 Stanley Russ Road Conway, AR 72033					Exit Time/Date 1215/ 10-12-2012		Permit Expiration Date 10/31/2014
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/T	itle(s)	Phone and Fax Num	ber(s)			Oth	er Facility Data
Trey Lieblong/Environmental Coordi	nator	/Phone: 501-450-603	80, Fax: 501-450	-6061;			3' 5.35" N, 32' 11.05" W
Name, Address of Responsible Official/	Title/l	Phone and Fax Numb	ber				S #068300
Tommy Shackelford, 501-450-6080 CITY OF CONWAY – Tupelo Bayou	ww	ТР			Contacted	PD;	5 #000300
P.O. Box 99 Conway, AR 72033					Yes No		
					l During Inspection satisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)		
N Permit	Ν	Flow Measuremen	nt	N	Operations & Maintenance	Ν	Sampling
N Records/Reports	Ν	Self-Monitoring P	rogram	Ng	Sludge Handling/Disposal	N	Pollution Prevention
N Facility Site Review	Ν	Compliance Sche	dules	S I	Pretreatment	N	Multimedia
N Effluent/Receiving Waters	Ν	Laboratory			Storin Water	Ν	Other:
		÷			Attach additional sheets if necessary)	
Reviewed areas of the pr	etre	eatment prog	ram were s	atisfa	actory.		
Industrial Users visited:							
1. Tokusen							
2. Linen King	2. Linen King						
Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s Amy Beck	5)			t. of Env	ne/Fax vironmental Quality-Russellville 1.16, Fax: (479)968-7321		Date October 16, 2012
Signature of Reviewer			Agency/Office	Phone a	and Fax Numbers		Date
			<u> </u>				

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION (PCI) REPORT

Name of Municipality: Conway Corporation

AFIN Number: 23-01095

NPDES Permit Number(s): AR0051951, AR0033359, ARR000125

Program Tracked under NPDES Permit Number: AR0051951 (formerly under AR0033359)

Fact Sheet Preparation Date:

Date of Last PCI/Audit: June, 2012

Date of Last Annual Report: March 29, 2012

Name of Inspector: Amy Beck

Date PCI Performed: October 12, 2012

Name, Title, and Telephone Number of Facility Representative: Trey Lieblong, Environmental Coordinator, 501-450-6080

Name and Title of Other Participants: NA

Number of IUs Visited: 2

Name(s) of IUs Visited: Tokusen, Linen King

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. NA
- 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? All new industrial permits processed through Conway Corp's Environmental Coordinator. Spot checks on business' listed on Hazardous Waste Generator and Conway Business lists
- 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) 18
- 6. Number of Categorical Industrial Users: 6
- How does the POTW determine the appropriate categorical standards to apply to an IU? Based on 403 regulations, EPA guidelines.
- 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:
Southern E-Coat	Metal finishing	Phosphatizing rinse
IC Corp	Metal finishing	Phosphatizing rinse
SFI of Arkansas	Metal finishing	Phosphatizing rinse
Tokusen	Metal finishing	Brass Plating
Valley Plating	Metal finishing	Chrome Plating
Virco 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 updated the local limits and is awaiting approval from the Department. Approval has been delayed by construction of Tupelo Bayou WWTP.
- 2. Describe any apparent problems with the local limits. Local limits may need to be modified depending on final permit limits for Tupelo Bayou WWTP.
- 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:	Monthly	1/quarter	1/quarter		
Effluent:	Monthly	1/quarter	1/quarter		
Sludge:	1/quarter	1/quarter	1/quarter		
Organics: Influent:	1/quarter	1/quarter	1/quarter		
Effluent:	1/quarter	1/quarter	1/quarter		
Sludge:	1/quarter	1/quarter	1/quarter		

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? 18
- 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
- Does the control document contain the following items? (Tokusen and Linen King permits examined) An expiration date: Yes

Discharge limitations: Yes

If the program requires self-monitoring by the IUs, do the Permits contain:

IU self-monitoring requirements: NA - POTW monitors all IU

IU reporting requirements: NA

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

Sample location: Yes			
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

1.	Indicate	current	inspection	and	sampling	frequency	and	program
	requireme	ent below	v :					
			Current	fre	equency:	Prog	gram	Requirement:

	a 1.	1 1	5 1
	Sampling: categorical IUs	Monthly (metals)	Monthly
	other SIUs	Quarterly (organics)	Quarterly
	Inspection: categorical IUs	Annually	Annually
	other SIUs	Annually	Annually
2.	HAS EACH SIU BEEN IN REQUIRED BY THE APPP	NSPECTED AND SAMPLED AT TH ROVED PROGRAM? <u>yes</u>	E FREQUENCY
3.	Are inspections anno	ounced or unannounced?	both
4.	Are records kept of	each inspection? yes	5
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: _ y	
	Inspection of the pr	cetreatment facilities: <u>y</u>	res
	Review of self-monit	coring records: NA	
	Observation of IU se	elf-monitoring procedures:	NA
	Verification that ap	pproved analytical techniq	ues are used: NA
	Verification of IU f	flow measurement (where re	quired): NA

6. Overall adequacy of inspection documentation: Adequate

- 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)? **Yes**
- 9. Are sampling and flow monitoring equipment properly maintained? Yes
- 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? <u>"Linko Data Systems" tracking software, reminder</u> letter sent to IU prior to renewal, hard copies on file.
- 15. ARE SELF-MONITORING REPORTS REVIEWED TO VERIFY THAT ANALYSES WERE PERFORMED FOR ALL REGULATED PARAMETERS, AND TO EVALUATE COMPLIANCE WITH EFFLUENT LIMITS? NA. No self monitoring required, Conway Corp. performs all required sampling.
- 16. IF VIOLATIONS ARE FOUND IN REPORTS, DOES THE POTW RESPOND TO ALL VIOLATIONS? Yes. Retest and if necessary send notice of violation and request compliance plan.

17. What are the POTW's procedures for following up violations? Resample, and then send notice of violation. IU responds explaining reason for violation.

18. HAS THE POTW REVIEWED BMRS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH 40 CFR 403.12(b)? Yes

Review a Baseline Monitoring Report from the POTW's file, and indicate which of the following items can be identified in the BMR:
Name and address: Yes
Other environmental permits held: <u>No</u>
Description of operations: Yes
Process flow diagrams: Yes
Flow measurements: Yes - water consumption
Measurements of regulated pollutants: Yes
Certification of compliance by the IU: Yes
Compliance schedule (if needed): NA
Additional comments on the POTW's inspection and sampling procedures: POTW is meeting all inspection and sampling

19. Additional comments on the POTW's inspection and sampling procedures: <u>POTW is meeting all inspection and sampling</u> requirements. They seem to have a good working relationship with the IU visited.

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: retest, NOV

Late reports: NA - reporting not required

Unpermitted discharges: NOV, permitting or disconnect water

Slug loads or spills: report, NOV

- 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
- 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.

Name: none in last	Type of Violation: 12 months	Enforcement Action:	Compliance Deadline:

5. Comments on the POTW's enforcement procedures:

Violations have again been reduced since the last pretreatment inspection, suggesting the procedures are effective.

F. POTW'S PRETREATMENT ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

- 1. 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
- 2. Does the POTW have adequate procedures for controlling IUs located outside its jurisdictional area? **NA**
- 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>Conway Corp. does not</u> service facilities outside the city limits.

H. EVALUATION AND COMMENTS

Pretreatment records are well organized. The program is satisfactory in the reviewed areas. There were no significant violators for 2011. This is a good indication of the progress the program has made. The POTW seems to have a good working relationship with the industries visited.

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

IU SITE VISIT FORM

Name of Industry: **Tokusen**

POTW Name: Tupelo Bayou WWTP

Industry Contacts: David Yarberry

Date and Time of Visit: October 12, 2012 ; 1115

Description of Manufacturing Process:

This facility manufactures brass plated wire for tires.

Sources of Process Wastewater:

Pickling department, Copper/Zinc plating process, cooling tower blow down.

Categorical Industry? Yes

Basis for Limits: Categorical

Point of Application: NA

Description of Pretreatment Equipment and Procedures: Flocculation/Precipitation, series of clarifiers and pH adjustment.

Spill Prevention and Solvent Management Procedures: SPCC updated in 2011

Sampling Location and Equipment: ISCO sampler located at end of treatment process. PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

IU SITE VISIT FORM

Name of Industry: Linen King

POTW Name: Tupelo Bayou WWTP

Industry Contacts: Richard Warren, Earnest Ledbetter

Date and Time of Visit: October 12, 2012 ; 1200

Description of Manufacturing Process: This facility is a laundry service for regional hospitals.

Sources of Process Wastewater: washing machines

Categorical Industry? No

Basis for Limits: Local

Point of Application:

Description of Pretreatment Equipment and Procedures: Settling pit prior to discharge to WWTP.

Spill Prevention and Solvent Management Procedures: Spill kit maintained on site

Sampling Location and Equipment: Portable ISCO sampler set up in settling pit.

PPETS CODE SHEET

PRETREATMENT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION (PCI)

CODE

INSPECTOR'S NAME: _	Amy Beck	
NAME OF FACILITY: _	Tupelo Bayou WWTP	
PERMIT NUMBER USED TO TRACK PROGRAM: _	AR0051951	NPID
DATE OF PCI:	October 12, 2012	DTIA

PPETS WENDB DATA ELEMENTS

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT IUS (SIUS):	18	SIUS
NUMBER OF CATEGORICAL IUS:	6	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