

December 6, 2012

Hino Motors Manufacturing Jerry McPherson Manager of EHS 100 Hino Blvd. Marion, AR 72364

Re: ADEQ Pretreatment Compliance Assurance Visit at Hino Motors (ARP001025) discharging to the City of Marion (AR0021971)

Dear Mr. McPherson,

On October 23, 2012 a compliance assurance visit (CAV) was conducted by ADEQ Pretreatment personnel to satisfy the requirements of the memorandum of agreement with EPA Region VI in ADEQ's Pretreatment Program implementation procedures to "randomly sample and analyze the effluent from [Hino] and to conduct surveillance activities in order to identify, independent of information supplied by [Hino] occasional and continuing noncompliance with pretreatment standards" [see 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(v)].

The site visit observations, sampling analysis and subsequent information gained indicated Hino is in compliance with the Federal Metal Finishing pretreatment standards for new sources in 40 CFR 433.17. See the below **future requirements** and comments:

- 1) ADEQ's analysis (see attached analytical results) of the four (4) grab samples taken the morning and the afternoon of the CAV showed compliance with the Federal Metal Finishing limitations in 40 CFR 433.17 with nickel being the only metal slightly elevated;
- 2) The samples taken by Hino on the day of the CAV may be used in its December 2012 semi-annual report;
- 3) It was discussed that Hino has a certified ISO 14001 program as well as an Environmental Management System and two other corporate Pollution Prevention programs;
 - a. It was not obvious to this inspector any of those programs were facility wide. The pretreatment system utilized by Hino to treat its wastewater is separated from the production/process part of Hino's operations;
 - b. While the treatment system is well contained its numerous vertical treatment tanks and containment area are uncovered and exposed to the elements with rust observed on most all the iron supports, brackets, etc.;
 - i. Failure of a rusting vertical tank support could potentially lead to a catastrophic event causing a release of toxic chemicals to the adjacent fields:
 - ii. Or worst case scenario cause a worker injury issue;

- c. It was discussed during the site visit when winter weather occurred the previous year an attempt was made to cover the entire pretreatment system with a makeshift canvas/boarded structure heated by "space heaters" which ultimately failed and the wastewater had to be hauled off-site. This doesn't seem to fit an overall environmental management sytem;
- 4) If the treatment system is not completely covered by a permanent structure protected from rain events Hino must take into account (by a verifiable measuring device) the amount of rainwater (dilution) by adjusting its metal finishing limits in 40 CFR 433.17 using the combined wastestream formula per 40 CFR 403.6(e)(1)(i);
 - a. An estimate calculated during the site visit revealed a 1 inch rainfall event mixed with the regulated stream would result in alternate concentration limits of one third of the existing metal finishing limits [from NOAA's National Climatic Data Center, Marion's average annual precipitation is almost 54 inches];
 - b. Hino must sample and report after each rainfall event and calculate the appropriate alternative concentration limit per the above citation's formula at any time rainfall is mixed with the regulated wastestream being discharged. The alternate concentration limits would replace those on the standardized semi-annual report for those events;
- 5) pH monitoring is conducted by Hino. It was observed the upper buffer solution for pH calibration expiration date had passed. Hino should ensure the pH calibration buffer solutions are within their expiration dates for accurate pH monitoring; and
- 6) If Hino wishes to have its upper pH limit raised, a request to the appropriate City wastewater official should made in writing.

This office wishes to extend its sincere appreciation to you and your staff for the transparent exchange of information and dialogue during the visit. Your non-adversarial attitude, willingness to "open the books"; sharing of process knowledge and cooperation compliments the true spirit of environmental partnerships.

Attached you'll find the completed narrative compliance assurance visit checklist and ADEQ analysis of the wastewater discharged during the day of this office's visit.

If this office has misrepresented any part of the checklist items please advise as a few items were only cursorily discussed because of your time constraints on the day of the CAV.

Sincerely,

Allen Gilliam

Allen Hille

ADEQ State Pretreatment Coordinator

501.682.0625

Attachments: Hino's 10/23/12 Compliance Assurance Site Visit

ADEQ's Certificate of Analysis from samples taken at Hino on 10/23/12

ec: Jim Shempert, City of Marion, Utility Manager

Craig Uyeda, NPDES Enforcement Branch Manager Rudy Molina, EPA Region 6 Pretreatment Coordinator

ADEQ Pretreatme		Inspection
	Information	
Facility Name: Hino Motor Mfg. USA LLC		100 Hino Blvd.
	Marion, AR	TO THE TOTAL
Signatory Authority (Name & Title): Jerry McPherson;	1	
Phone: 870.702.3037	Mailing Addı	ress (if different): same
Cell: 870.635.1367	-	
Fax: 870.702.3000	-	wner Name and address:
Address: same		Mfg. USA, Inc.; 37777 Interchange Drive;
Contact Person (Name & Title): Jerry McPherson	Farmington F	Hills, MI 48335
	Phone: 248.4	42.9077
Phone: same	Fax: 248.442	.9068
Fax: same	Corporate CE	EO:
e-mail: jmcpherson@hmmusa.com	e-mail:	
Facility Tracking #ARP001025; AFIN #1800565	Last Inspect	ion Date: N/A (this will be the 1st CAV)
POTW (City) IU discharges to: Marion, AR		POTW's NPDES #AR0021971
Industrial Classification:	nisher	Significant
If Categorical, list which CFR #(s) the facility is subject	to: 40 CFR 433	.17
I. Summary of Inspection A. Inspection Objectives B. Inspection Analysis II. Pre-Inspection Meeting A. General Information B. Facility Permits	of Contents	Page 2 of 10 Pages 3 & 4 of 10
C. Additional Comments		
III. Attachments "Yes" indicates item exists at the f		
	at the facility and	d attachments/discussion aren't necessary
A. Industrial Processes		yes no Page 5 of 10
B. Pollution Prevention Activities		yes no Page 6 of 10
C. Pretreatment System		yes \(\sum \) no \(\sup \) Page 7 of 10
D. Chemical Storage/handling		yes no Page 8 of 10
E. Spill/Slug Control Plan		yes 🛛 no 🗌 Page 9 of 10
F. Self-Monitoring/TOMP		yes 🛛 no 🗌 Page10 of 10
Comments:		
Inspector's Name (Print):		Signature:
Allen Gilliam		allen Sillen
IU Rep's Name (Print): Jerry Mc Reyser	\	Signature Am Au
Date and Time Inspection Ended: 10/23/12 @ 5:30	Pm	

	I. Summary	of Inspection	
A, In	spection and Objective (Complete Before Ins	pection)
Permit Renewal	☐ Bi-Annual	Spill/Slug	Unscheduled
☐ New Construction	Noncompliance	Follow-up	Complaint
Inspection Objective(s): Comp Regulations in 40 CFR 403.8(f Pretreatment limitations in 40 CFR)(2)(v) and more specifically CFR 433.17 (Pretreatment S	to verify compliance water transfer to the verify compliance was to be the verified to the ver	ith the Federal Metal Finishing
Checklist of items to be review			
Pre-inspection Meeting	Permit Conditions (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
✓ Process Inspection✓ Chemical Storage	✓ Pretreatment Syster✓ Discharge point(s)	n IOMP (one Spills/Slug (not submitted as yet)
Records Review	RCRA information		w/Pretreatment Schematics
☐ IU sampling procedures	Flow/pH Meter(s)	☐ Trocess/Flow	7.74444
MSDS Inventory List	New MSDS	P2, BMPs, F	
Comments: Main MSDS inclu	1 hand		
Comments. Wain WisDS meta			
	B. Inspection		
Were there any deficiencies/vio	olations identified and noted	during the inspection?	∑ Yes ∐ No
Provide a brief narrative of def	iciencies/violations or other	concerns in the followin	g areas:
Records Review: Adequate, no	comment.		. 4
Process Area(s): Adequate, no	comment		
Treess Theu(e). That quality he			
to capture any rainfall. The are contribute over 2,100 gpd to th The combined wastestream for facility pumps from the contain	t of their pretreatment system ea not under cover was estimate facility's ~6,000 gpd of re- mula would have to be used ument area's sump into the in	in is not under cover and lated at 3,400 ft ² . A one-gulated wastewater. to take into account the late with a www. holding tank, late www.	is surrounded by a concrete wall-day, one inch rainfall event could
what amount at what time. More importantly, the condition could cause any one of them to stormwater containment area.	n of the pretreatment chemic fall outside the containment	cal tank "legs" were corre t area spilling many gallo	oding. A catastrophic failure ons of different chemicals into the
Proper maintenance of Hino's protected from the elements.	pretreatment system is deem	ed inadequate. The preti	reatment system should be
Self-Monitoring Procedures: U able.	pper pH buffer (for calibrati	on) had expired. Discha	arge flow meter was not calibrate-
Accidental discharge/Slug Con in the entire (production) build			igible. There are no floor drains
Sampling Point: Final pH adju when sampling for compliance		elements. Rainfall (or sr	nowmelt) not taken into account
Chemical Storage: All chemica	l have to be physically checl	ked out and signed for.	

	П. Pre-Inspec	tion Meeting		
	A. General L	nformation		
Date and Time Inspection Started: 10	/23/12 @ 8:20 a.m.	NAICs code(s): 33635	
IU Reps/Titles: Jerry McPherson/Mgr	of EHS	ADEQ Autho	ority Reps/	Titles:
Rico Jeffries/W.W. Treatment Operat	or/Maint. Tech.	Allen Gilliam	n/State Pre	treatment Coordinator
End product(s): "Finished" truck axle suspensions and "side rails".	s, differentials,	Approx. # of down.)	units prod	luced: ~400 (production is
Days of Operation: 5		Days of Prod	uction (if	different): same
Hours of Operation: 16		Hours of Pro	duction (if	f different): same
Shift 1, hrs: 6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	Shift 2, hrs: 5 p.m. t	to 1:30 a.m.	Shif	t 3, hrs: n/a to
# of Employees: 336	Peak Months: n/a		"Of	f' Months: n/a
Are there any scheduled plant shutdov	wns? Yes 🔀 No 🗌 N	J/A 🔲 If yes,	when? 2/y	r (mid-July & late December
Are there designated plant clean-up de	ays? Yes 🛭 No 🗌 N	/A 🔲 If yes, v	when? dai	ily
Is the facility currently in complian	ce with all pretreatn	nent reporting	requiren	ients and limits? Yes 🛭 No 🗌
If No, explain:				
Are there any Special Entry Procedure	es for the Discharge/S	ample point lo	cations?	Yes 🛛 No 🗌
If Yes, explain: An authorized rep wo		s a visitor and	have an es	scort to the sampling point.
This, for safety of person entering pla	nt.			
A 41 C. ft. C	-4:C-1111-41-44-4	- 1	1.3.1	CX/ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
Are there any Safety Concerns or Idea				
If Yes, explain: Watch for forklifts an	. \$4.5 L		(a. 14 a. 4 a. 4 a. 14 a. 14	
Has there been any changes since the compliance assurance visit.	ie last inspection reg	arding the fol	lowing ite	ems: N/A since this the first
	No If yes, obtain	copy of update	d schemat	ic for facility file.
Processes? Yes No If yes, e				
Production Levels? Yes No I	f yes, explain:			
				The second secon
Raw materials? Yes No If	yes, explain:			
Flow rates? Yes \(\square\) No \(\square\) If yes, e	xplain			
			Wiles Control	
Are regulated and non-regulated waste	estreams combined?	yes 🛚	no 🗌	
Prior to Pretreatment System?		yes 🛛	no 🗌	N/A 🗌
If Yes, was the CWF used to cal	culate limits?	yes 🗌	no 🖂	N/A 🗌
Prior to connection to the POTW sa	anitary sewer?	yes 🗌	no 🖂	N/A 🗌
See notation regarding the pretreatme			eing taker	n into account for compliance.

	B. Facility Permits	
ADEQ Permit Type	Permit No.	Expiration Date
Air	2070-AR-6	N/A
RCRA	ARR000017566	N/A
NPDES Storm Water	ARR151404	N/A
Pretreatment Tracking #	ARP001025	N/A
	C. Additional Comments	
Note which section or attachment	comments are regarding)	
Attachment C: Pretreatment Syste longer in use. Pretreatment schematic	em – Insulated fluorine adsorption chela cs need to reflect this.	te resin tower is by-passed and no
	in its pretreatment to meet that low pH. rage volume discharged to the City. An increase efficiency.	
-		
		NATIONAL (AND ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATION ADMI
	y	

		Attachme	ent A: I	ndustr	ial	Process(es)				
List process(es) gene	rating wastewa	ater. Note whether	it is sul	oject to	Fede	eral Pretreatment Star	ndards			
1. Conversion coating	g: Zn Phospha	tizing	Yes 🗵	No 🗌		4.		Yes 🗌	No	
2. Fluorozirconic Aci	id tank (conver	rsion coating)	Yes 🗵	No 🗌		5.		Yes 🗌	No	
3. Various ancillary of	perations (rins	ses)	Yes 🛚	No 🗌		6.		Yes 🗌	No	
Were processes visua	ally inspected?	Yes 🛛 No 🗌]							***
Brief description of pgal) of caustic solution water spray booth (48 tripotassium phospha with accelerants (sod followed by 6) a RO (cationic resin/pigme tank (1,600 gal) befor from once per 7 days pretreatment. "Side rails" for Hino channels (side rails), then shot blasted. The through a hot water s (185 gal) stage; then (conversion coating) through a dry-off over are discharged ~ ever (rinse) and batch disc	on of trisodium (30 gal); 3) this te and potassitium nitrate) and water rinse tarnt) tank (3,800 re being conveto once per 18 trucks are brosent through and side rails are pray "pre-degreto two (2) fresspray booth (3 ten then sent tory 30 days. Al	a phosphate, sodiur is followed by a cam hydroxide; 4) Fold additives (hydroxide); 7) Id additives (hydroxide); 8) Parts are eyed to the curing of 30 days with tanks aught in as cold roll straightening mace then sent through reasing" booth (13%) however the straightening the provider coating the lanks in the process.	n carbon austic survants are offluorosi Parts are then dipoven (197) and 8 ded steel hine, plate a typica 2 gal) for the (212) RO water sent t	then diplic acid) then diplic acid) then diple then dip	that copy a copy the copy a UF These as a copy a look a copy a look a copy a look a copy a look at the copy at	a nitrite and surfactant tioner dip tank (1,600 l in a "bonderizing" (then sent through a fd into the electro-dep water tank (1,600 gase tanks are batch distantial transport of further last osphatizing "wash". caustic degreasing (seen parts are sent through a curing oven.	ts; 2) then D gal) with Zn phosplinesh water to sition (Eal) with 9) charged and with sortanks. The ser hole cuarrent in the side is sodium hypough a hex All tanks	a sent thrace the trizing trizing tand to the trizing tand to the trizing tand to the trizing tand trizing the trizing tand trizing the trizing tand trizing tand the trizing tand trizing trizing trizing tand trizing t	ough dipho dipho k (1, nk (1) c coa RO w g freq freq iilling con y spra ircon ir dric iide r iide r	a fresh osphate, 600 gal) ,600 gal) ting rater rinse quencies o nto "C" g, tapping reyed yy booth nic acid ed or sent ail process
General observations	of facility's in	udoor housekeenin	g. Clear	n and or	derl	v Some clear fluids	were note	d on the	conc	rete floor
around the phosphati									COIIC	1001
General observations was directed via ditch				rly and o	lear	n. No evidence of ille	egal direct	dischar	ge. S	Storm water
Cll11			. H C'+				1/.1		1	
Check all sources of estimated. If batch d							vg. gai/ua	y, measu	rea c)r
Process Rinse Ov See above process de	erflows	Equip. Clean				Floor Cleanup		nt Bath ove proc		ions escription.
Product Cleaning		Forklifts Mai	nt./Wasl	h		Tank Dragout	Air	Pollutio	n De	vices
Boiler Blowdown	!	Spent Rinse 7		ption.	Equipment Non-Contact Cool Coolants		oling Water			
List Major Raw Mate on 4/13/12 including their pretreatment sys	hot rolled, pic									
Check Waste Stream	Pollutants of 0	Concern from Proc	ess(es)							
⊠ CN	⊠ Metals (1 433.17	List) All from 40 C	CFR			ts (List) All listed in ent Plan submitted as		33.11 (n	о То	xic Organic
. ⊠ pH										
Are there floor drains	s in the Process	s area? Yes	⊠ No	If yes li	st nu	imber and the location	n of all flo	oor drair	ıs:	
!										

Attachment B: Pollt	ition Preventi	ion (P2) / Recycling Activities
Does the facility have a written P2 Plan? Yes	No 🗌	"Toyota production System" (TPS) and "Houshin"
Does this facility practice P2? Yes ⊠	No 🗌	
Environmental Management System in place? Yes the potential impacts/aspects of a catastrophic pretr		Doesn't appear to be comprehensive since it hasn't identified failure and its effect on the environment or worker safety.
ISO 140001 Certified? Yes ⊠	No 🗌	
Written Standard Operating Procedures? Yes ⊠	No 🗌	
Explain: Every station and piece of machinery has QA/QC checks to measure or check off at their state		ard operation procedure located near it with an assortment of
Preventative Maintenance Program Yes 🛛	No 🗌	(hydraulic systems, valves, pumps, etc)
Explain: The facility has a computerized maintenan	ce management	system (CMMS) and using a MP2 data stream.
Water Reuse: Yes ⊠	No 🗌	
Explain: Counter current flows; RO rinses and air of	curtains.	
**		
Cost Accounting to Track Savings: Yes 🛛	No 🗌	
Explain: Didn't get into detail on this issue.		
·		
Inventory Control / "Green Purchasing": Yes	No 🔲	(lean manufacturing/"green purchasing", etc)
Explain: Certain chemicals will not be allowed to b	e bought in lieu	of "green" chemicals that accomplish the same function.
Employee Training: Yes 🖂	No 🗌	
Explain: Each "work station" has an SOP in a clear the operator on duty.	plastic cover o	n a board with quality control checklists to be filled out by
Spent Solvent Reclamation? Yes	No 🗌	N/A 🛛
Explain:		
Recycle Paper, Aluminum, Boxes, and Pallets? Ye	es 🛛 No 🛚	
Explain: All the above and scrap iron also.		
	s No 🗌	
Explain: Any of the above are sent off-site for recy	cle.	
Other Activities:		
P2 Equipment/Practices in use:		
Overflow Alarms		Aqueous Cleaning Solutions
☐ Fog Spray Rinsing		☐ Countercurrent Rinsing
☐ Dragout Collection Trays		Seal-Less Pumps
☐ Air Jets to Blow Parts Dry		Secondary Containment of Process Solutions
Aqueous Paint Stripping Solutions		☐ Bead Blasting to Remove Paint
Water Soluble Cutting Fluids		☐ Recycle Overspray
	nosis)	☐ Conductivity Meters
Dead Rinse Tanks		Bath / Rinse Filtration (in-situ)

Attachment C: Pretreatment System							
Are wastestreams se	egregated before pret	reatment?		⊠ Yes	☐ No		N/A
Are they pretreated	prior to discharge to	the sanitary sewer?		⊠ Yes	☐ No		N/A
Was the pretreatme	nt system visually ins	spected during this vis	it?. [⊠ Yes	□ No		N/A
Pretreatment system	n is separated from th	e main production/pro	ocess buil	ding by ab	out two hund	lred fe	et.
Check which of the	following are utilize	d for pretreatment pric	or to disc	harge to sa	nitary sewer:	-	
Dissolved air flo	oatation	Membrane Tech.		Ion Ex	change*		☐ Biological Treatment
Centrifugation		☐ Flow Equalization	n	Ozona	tion		Chlorinating
Chemical Precip	oitation	Oil/Water Separa	ation	Rever	se Osmosis		Grit Removal
Sludge Filter Pr	ess	Grease Trap		Screen	1		Solvent Separation
pH Adjustment		Sand Trap		☐ Sedim	entation		Silver Recovery
Belt/Disk Oil SI	kimmer						
*For heat treatment	water from axle shat	t quench.					
	····						
precipitation system through a filter pres	n beginning with a w. ss (with filtrate return pH neutralization tan	nt System (leaks, clear w. holding pit; w.w. tred to the w.w. tank); the k and discharge to the	ank; pH a further po	djustment; lishing wit	coagulation, h sand filter,	settlir activa	ng, solids slurry sent ted charcoal adsorption
			· ·····		V		
Does the descriptio	n match the schemati	c currently on file?		☐Ye:	s 🛮 No	1	N/A
Pretreatment systen	n schematic still show	vs the fluorine adsorpt	ion chela	te resin tov	ver which is r	10 long	ger in use.
	ame(s): Rico Jeffery				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Does discharge per	mit require licensed of	operator?		Ye	s 🛚 No		N/A
Is the System Opera	ator(s) licensed by the	e State of Arkansas?		∑ Ye	s No		N/A .
List Name(s) and L	icense classification:	Both the above have	an indust	rial Class A	license.		
		·					
	to the Pretreatment	······································	⊠ Ye	s No	N/A		
If Yes, list typ	e and frequency: No	t discussed.					
If any dischar	m the Pretreatment S ges are batch type or ge: ~7050 gallons per	combination, describe			mbination		
Describe process fr	om which batch origi	inated (spent bath, e.g	.): See "A	Attachment	A: Industrial	Proce	ess(es)", page 5.
Approximate durati	on of batch discharge						
Meter Type	Calibration Procedu				zer Reading)		
unknown	Not being done and flow meter can be.	not known if the	Daily re	adings are	recorded.		
L		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	L				

Attachme	nt D: Ch	emical Sto	orage Area(s)
Does the facility have a designated chemical storage	area(s)?	⊠Yes	□No	
Was this area(s) visually inspected?		⊠Yes	□No	□N/A
Describe Chemical Storage Area(s)	Are there drains in	floor this area?	If yes, wher	re does this drain lead to?
1. Locked and fenced in and can only be accessed by designated personnel with a magnetic card. There is a person behind the parts/chems counter that verifies/tracks all material taken from this area.	Yes	⊠No	Pretreati	ment Sanitary Sewer Storm Sewer
Specific chems are at designated stations and are only replenished as needed via system described above.	Yes	⊠No	Pretreati	ment Sanitary Sewer Storm Sewer
3. Outside chemical storage is self-contained and climate controlled. It mainly contains their powder and liquid ED coat paints.	□Yes	⊠No	Pretreati	ment Sanitary Sewer Storm Sewer
4.	∐Yes	□No	Pretreati	ment Sanitary Sewer Storm Sewer
Does the Chemical Storage Area(s) contain any of the	ne followi	ng?	,	
Dikes, Berms for Containment	Plug	s for Floor	Drains	
Secondary Tanks for Holding Premix (low) Concentrations				
□ Alarms (for temperature control of some processes)				
Spills Control Kits for Cleanup	Noti	fication Pro	cedures	
Chemical desegregation within Storage Area	Othe	er		
Chemical Inventory List (MSDS) on file?		∑Yes	□No [□N/A
All chems' MSDS including spray aerosols are kept computerized tracking system. Only a specific num				
Were any new MSDS reviewed during the Inspection	n?	Yes	□No [⊠n/A
Time constraints did not allow for a comprehensive on their tracking list that would not be allowed to be				
Chemical storage comments: Adequate, no commen	ıt. Combi	istibles are l	cept in separa	te closed door cabinets.
Chemical handling procedures (totes, dolly, buckets described in #1 above.	, hardline,	etc): forkli	fts and barrel	dollies using the "X-change program"
Hazardous waste chemical handling procedures (pro any observations or ask questions regarding haz was		ed container	rs, labeled, ma	anifests, etc): Did not have time to make

Attachment E: Spill/Slug Control Plan [Slug discharge potential deemed n	egligible]
Does the facility have an accidental discharge/Slug control plan?	yes 🛛 no
If yes are the following: 403.8(f)(2)(v)(A-D) requirements in place?	
Is the spill/slug control plan <2 years old?	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
(A) Describes discharge practices including non routine batch (slug) discharges	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
(B) Describes storage and handling of chemicals	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
(C) Procedures for immediate notification to POTW of slug discharges	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
(D) 1. Describes measures for controlling toxic/hazardous pollutants	yes no N/A
2. Describes procedures and equipment for emergency response	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
3. Describes follow-up to limit damage suffered by POTW or environment	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ N/A
4. Does the facility have Spill/ Slug Notification Procedures posted?	yes no N/A
5. Are worker personnel provided training in the event of a spill or slug discharge? Once/6 mos.	yes no N/A
Does the facility have Spill/ Slug Notification Procedures posted?	⊠ yes □ no
Is it posted in areas where chemicals are used and stored?	yes no
Are appropriate personnel provided training in the event of a spill or slug discharge?	yes no
Has there been any non-routine, episodic chemical spills discharged to the City in the past year?	yes 🛭 no
(Briefly Describe, Include Dates)	
Was the City notified of these occurrences? yes no N/A	
Visual Inspection of Discharge Lines/Points	
Sampling / Monitoring Point: The sampling point is at the final pH adjustment tank prior to being disch well mixed and homogenous. This open topped tank is about 6 to 7 feet in diameter. The Pretreatment s have to show an inspector which tank is for compliance sampling.	
Total Flow Monitoring Point:	
Upstream Manhole:	
Point of Connection:	

Attachment F: Self-Monitoring & if CFR 433, TTO/TOMP Requirements Have Operator (or person collecting the sample) to describe how composite and grab samples are collected and preserved. Record descriptions. Include name of individual and title. Rico Jeffery was the Pretreatment operator on-duty at the time of this CAV. His sampling technique is to dip a glass measuring container into the top of the continually mixed wastewater tank to be discharged. He rinses the measuring container and then collects enough fluid to top-off his sample containers provided by an outside lab. Where is the sample point located? End of Process Pretreatment Effluent ☐ Total Flow Combined Flow Metered Flow Flow Actuator Utility Manhole Private Manhole Advance Notice Required Is the Sample Collection Site Adequate? Does the facility rep. request a split sample on this sampling/inspection? Yes No (although not a true "split") Does the facility perform self-monitoring tests in-house? Yes (for pH) No No If no, record the name and address of Contract Lab: ETC, Memphis, TN Automatic Sampler or Manual X Yes No IU Self-Monitoring Results reviewed: (from initial 4/13/12 BMR and semi-□ N/A annual report. X Yes Is the Contract Lab certified by ADEQ for test parameters? No □ N/A Dates and Times of Sample Analysis Recorded? X Yes No □ N/A Correct Methods Used for Test Analysis (Refer To 40CFR Part 136) X Yes □ No □ N/A EPA recommended holding times being met (Refer to 40CFR Part 136) X Yes □ N/A No Chain of Custody Records for Self-Monitoring Samples Reviewed Yes No No N/A not included Were correct Sample Types Collected ⊠ No Yes N/A unknown Dates and times of Sample Collection Recorded? X Yes No N/A Were Samples preserved correctly (refer to 40CFR Part 136) X Yes No □ N/A Were Self Monitoring records on file for past 3 years? ☐ Yes \square No N/A Facility just began semi-annual reporting (1 rec'd). Toxic Organic Management Plan (TOMP) for Metal Finishers under CFR 433 How does the IU report TTO? Analysis Certification Statement If yes, Does the plan show how toxic organics are used, stored, and disposed? Yes No N/A List the date of the last revision to the TOMP: N/A If no, is there evidence that a TOMP is needed? Tyes No N/A (If yes, provide description of evidence in comments.) Comments: Initial TTO scan submitted with their 4/13/12 baseline monitoring report indicated non-detects for all, but some nondetects were reported at <0.5 and <0.2 mg/l. TTO samples were diluted by 10 times according to the contract lab's report.



5301 Northshore Drive North Little Rock, AR 72118

Telephone: 501-682-0744

Client Report For:

Hino Motor Mfg. 10-00565 2012 3388-3391

Attention:

Client Address:

Report Date:

December 04, 2012

LAB ID:

AR12OCT24-06

Comment:

Approved By: Allen Billian

Date:December 04, 2012

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Client:

CSI

Client Sample ID: Hino 1A

Lab ID:

2012-3388

Collection Date: 10/23/2012 10:46:00 AM

Matrix: Water

Analyses

Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	Batch: 12113004 Run: 1				
	Result	Reporting Limit	MDL	Qual	Uni	
Aluminum	<20	20	20		ug/l	
Antimony	<10	10	5		ug/l	
Arsenic	3.34	1	0.5		ug/	
Barium	<10	10	2.0		ug/	
Beryllium	<0.5	0.5	0.1		ug/	
Boron	124	25	5.0		ug/	
Cadmium	<1	1	0.3		ug/	
Calcium	104	0.04	0.04		mg	
Chromium	<1 ·	1	0.3		ug/	
Cobalt	1.49	1	0.5		ug/	
Copper	5.69	1	0.5		ug/	
Iron	<20	20	10.0		ug/	
Lead	<1	1	0.1		ug/	
Magnesium	0.78	0.1	0.1		mg.	
Manganese	453	1	0.2		ug/	
Potassium	14.7	1	0.05.		mg.	
Selenium	<2	2	0.5		ug/	
Silver	<5	5	1.0		ug/	
Thallium	<2.5	2.5	0.05		ug/	
Vanadium	<2.5	. 2.5	1.0		ug/	
Zinc	56.1	3	2.0		ug/	
Dilution Factor	1					
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy					
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:27AM					
Prep By						
Prep Date/Time						

Total Metals by EPA 200.8

EPA 200.8

Batch: 12113004 Run: 2

MDL

Result

Reporting **Limit**

Qual

Unit

Page

2 of 13

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

Nickel	1050	25	0.5	ug/L
Sodium	701	0.4	0.02	mg/L
Dilution Factor	10			
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy			
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:07PM			
Prep By				
Prep Date/Time				

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Client:

CSI

Client Sample ID: Hino 1B

Lab ID:

2012-3389

Collection Date: 10/23/2012 10:47:00 AM

Matrix: Water

Analyses

Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8 Result	Reporting	04 Run:	Qual	Unit
Aluminum	<20	<u>Limit</u> 20	20		ug/L
Antimony	<10 .	10	5		ug/L
Arsenic	12.0	1	0.5		ug/L
Barium	<10	10	2.0		ug/L
Beryllium	<0.5	0.5	0.1		ug/L
Boron	122	25	5.0		ug/L
Cadmium	<1	1	0.3		ug/L
Calcium	53.0	0.04	0.04		mg/l
Chromium	<1	1	0.3		ug/L
Cobalt	<1	1	0.5		ug/L
Copper	2.82	1	0.5		ug/l
Iron	<20	20	10.0		ug/l
Lead	**************************************	1	0.1		ug/L
Magnesium	0.55	0.1	0.1		mg/l
Manganese	230	1	0.2		ug/L
Potassium	15.5	1	0.05		mg/l
Selenium	<2	2	0.5		ug/L
Silver	<5-	5	1.0		ug/L
Thallium	<2.5	2.5	0.05		ug/L
Vanadium	2.62	2.5	1.0		ug/L
Zinc	21.9	3	2.0		ug/L
Dilution Factor	1				
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy				
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:33AM				
Prep By					
Prep Date/Time					

Total Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8		Batch: 12113004 Run: 2			
	Result		Reporting	MDL	Qual	Unit	
			Limit				
Nickel	837		25	0.5		ug/L	

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Client:

CSI

Client Sample ID: Hino 2A

Lab ID:

2012-3390

Collection Date: 10/23/2012 4:10:00 PM

Matrix: Water

Analyses

Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	Batch: 12113004 Run: 1				
	Result	Reporting Limit	MDL	Qual	Unit	
Áluminum	<20	20	20		ug/L	
Antimony	<10	10	5		ug/L	
Arsenic	3.39	. 1	0.5		ug/L	
Barium	<10	10	2.0		ug/L	
Beryllium	<0.5	0.5	0.1		ug/L	
Boron	121	25	5.0		ug/L	
Cadmium	na spisa da promovenso <1 mili	1	0.3		ug/L	
Calcium	104	0.04	0.04		mg/L	
Chromium		1	0.3		ug/L	
Cobalt	1.52	1	0.5		ug/L	
Copper	5.80	1	0.5		ug/L	
Iron	<20	20	10.0		ug/L	
Lead	deligio de successo de para productivo per de California.	1	0.1		ug/L	
Magnesium	0.76	. 0.1	0.1		mg/L	
Manganese	452	1	0.2		ug/L	
Potassium	14.8	1	0.05		mg/L	
Selenium	<2	2	0.5		ug/L	
Silver	<5	5	1.0		ug/L	
Thallium	<2.5	2.5	0.05		ug/L	
Vanadium	<2.5	2.5	1.0		ug/L	
Zinc	55.9	3	2.0		ug/L	
Dilution Factor	1					
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy					
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 6:10	AM				
Prep By						
Prep Date/Time						

Total Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	Batch: 1211300	Batch: 12113004 Run: 2				
	Result	Reporting	MDL	Qual	<u>Unit</u>		
		Limit					
Nickel	1060	25	0.5		ug/L		

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

Sodium	710	0.4	0.02	mg/L
Dilution Factor	10			
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy			
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:25PM			
Prep By				
Prep Date/Time				

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Client:

CSI

Client Sample ID: Hino 2B

Lab ID: 2012-3391

Collection Date: 10/23/2012 4:10:00 PM

Matrix: Water

Analyses

Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	Batch: 121130	04 Run:	1	
	<u>Result</u>	Reporting Limit	MDL	Qual	Uni
Aluminum	<20	20	20		ug/L
Antimony	<10	10	5		ug/L
Arsenic	11.3	1	0.5		ug/L
Barium	<10	10	2.0		ug/L
Beryllium	<0.5	0.5	0.1		ug/L
Boron	120	25	5.0		ug/L
Cadmium	<1 💹	1	0.3		ug/L
Calcium	53.9	0.04	0.04		mg/l
Chromium	1.16	1	0.3		ug/L
Cobalt	1.06	1	0.5		ug/L
Copper	5.66	1	0.5		ug/L
Iron	24.4	20	10.0		ug/L
Lead	3.52	1	0.1		ug/L
Magnesium	0.59	0.1	0.1		mg/l
Manganese	232	1	0.2		ug/L
Potassium	15.9	1	0.05		mg/l
Selenium	<2	2	0.5		ug/L
Silver	<5	5	1.0		ug/L
Thallium	<2.5	2.5	0.05		ug/L
Vanadium	2.61	2.5	1.0		ug/L
Zinc	57.2	3	2.0		ug/L
Dilution Factor	1				
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy				
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 6:17AM				
Prep By					
Prep Date/Time					

Total Metals by EPA 200.8	EPA 200.8	Batch: 1211300	04 Run:	2	
	Result	Reporting Limit	MDL	Qual	<u>Unit</u>
Nickel	836	25	0.5		ug/L

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

Sodium	760 0.4 0.02 mg/L
Dilution Factor	10
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:32PM
Prep By Prep Date/Time	

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Analytical Quality Control Results Report

Batch: 12113004				101 metan	s - water (total)
Hino 1B					LIMS ID: 2012-3389
ICP Metals - water (Total) DUP					Run: 1
Parameter	Result	DL	RL	Accuracy Control	Precision Control
Aluminum	<20 ug/L	20	20		
Aluminum (RPD)	198 %				0 - 20
Antimony (RPD)	802 %				0 - 20
Antimony	<10 ug/L	5	10		
Arsenic	3.54 ug/L	0,5	1		
Arsenic (RPD)	109 %				0 - 20
Barium (RPD)	85.9 %				0 - 20
Barium	<10 ug/L	2	10	na in minima and a Committee (an a beauthrain de fine and an an aige eine minima. T	
Beryllium	<0.5 ug/L	0.1	0.5		
Beryllium (RPD)	0 %		and the control of American Ed		0 - 20
Boron (RPD)	0.8 %				0 - 20
Boron	123 ug/L	5	25	ing mengang sebagai dan kelanggan penggan beranggan beranggan beranggan beranggan beranggan beranggan berangga Teranggan penggan peng	
Cadmium	<1 ug/L	0.3	1		
Cadmium (RPD)	0 %				0 - 20
Calcium (RPD)	66.0 %				0 - 20
Calcium	105 mg/L	0.04	0.04		
Chromium The Chrom	<1 ug/L	0.3	4.41.5		
Chromium (RPD)	30.2 %				0 - 20
Cobalt (RPD)	44.5 %				0 - 20 miles
on in the company of the second s Cobalt	1.51 ug/L	0.5	1	e en el voltable dell'essence delle ut	
Copper	5.76 ug/L	0.5	19.848		
Copper (RPD)	68.5 %				0 - 20
ron (RPD)	144 %				0 - 20
inon	<20 ug/L	10	20		
Lead San	<1 ug/L	0.1			
Lead (RPD)	0 %				0 - 20
Magnesium (RPD)	35.8 %				0 - 20
Magnesium	0.79 mg/L	0.1	0.1		
Manganese	460 ug/L	0.2	1		
Manganese (RPD)	67 %				0 - 20
Potassium	15.0 mg/L	0.05	์ ได้ ค.โทยได้ 5		
er i er av skipta se er til i er		D of 13			

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

Potassium (RPD)	2.9 %			0 - 20
Selenium (RPD)	15.0 %			0 - 20
Selenium	<2 ug/L	0.5	2	
Silver	<5 ug/L	1	5	
Silver (RPD)	0 %			0 - 20
Thallium (RPD)	0 %			0 - 20
Thallium	<2.5 ug/L	0.05	2.5	
Vanadium (RPD)	929%			0 - 20
Vanadium	<2.5 ug/L	1	2.5	
Zinc	57.4 ug/L	2	3	
Zinc (RPD)	89.4 %			0 - 20
Dilution Factor	1			•
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy			ting service the Andrea Community of the William to the Andrea (Section 1997) in the Section (Community of the Section 1997) in the Section 1997 in the
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:39AM			

Hino 1B					LIMS ID: 2012-3389
ICP Metals - water (Total) DUP	O PERSONAL PROPERTY DE LA PROPERTY D		- 7 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 13 - 13 - 13 - 13 - 13		Run: 2
Parameter	Result	DL	RL	Accuracy Control	Precision Control
Nickel	1100 ug/L	5	25		
Nickel (RPD)	24 %				0 - 20
Sodium (RPD)	7.6 %			and provide the world provide a first provide the con-	0 - 20
Sodium	708 mg/L	0.2	0.4		
Dilution Factor	10				
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy				
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:19PM				

Hino 1B					LIMS ID: 2012-3389
ICP Metals - water (Total) MS					Run: 1
Parameter	Result	DL	RL	Accuracy Control	Precision Control
Aluminum (% Recovery)	59.9 %			70 - 130	
Antimony (% Recovery)	51.6 %			70 - 130	
Arsenic (% Recovery)	97.0 %			70 - 130	
Barium (% Recovery)	58.4 %			70 - 130	
Beryllium (% Recovery)	62.5 %			70 - 130	
Boron (% Recovery)	77.5 %			70 - 130	
Cadmium (% Recovery)	48.3 %			70 - 130	
Calcium (% Recovery)	99.5 %			70 - 130	

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us

501-682-0955

Chromium (% Recovery)	57.6 %	70 - 130
Cobalt (% Recovery)	83.6 %	70 - 130
Copper (% Recovery)	46.4 %	70 - 130
Iron (% Recovery)	46.3 %	70 - 130
Lead (% Recovery)	58.0 %	70 - 130
Magnesium (% Recovery)	87.4 %	70 - 130
Manganese (% Recovery)	82 %	70 - 130
Potassium (% Recovery)	95.6 %	70 - 130
Selenium (% Recovery)	96.7 %	70 - 130
Silver (% Recovery)	12.4 %	$70 \div 130$
Thallium (% Recovery)	100 %	70 - 130
Vanadium (% Recovery)	89.3 %	70 - 130
Zinc (% Recovery)	38.7 %	70 - 130
Dilution Factor	e international in Programme sees production and a second control of the control	
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy	
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:45AM	

Hino 1B					LIMS ID: 2012-3389
ICP Metals - water (Total) MSD				Mandhic de Arbourge (1,44 log i e log Marinese 122)	Run: 1
Parameter	Result	DL	RL	Accuracy Control	Precision Control
Aluminum (% Recovery)	61.0 %			70 - 130	
Aluminum (RPD)	1.8 %				0 - 20
Antimony (% Recovery)	52.1 %			70 - 130	
Antimony (RPD)	1.0 %		enken ik de etti senera		0 - 20
Arsenic (% Recovery)	93.8 %			70 - 130	
Arsenic (RPD)	2.1 %				0 - 20
Barium (% Recovery)	58.8 %			70 - 130	
Barium (RPD)	0.7 %				0 - 20
Beryllium (% Recovery)	60.9 %			70 - 130	
Beryllium (RPD)	2.7 %				0 - 20
Boron (% Recovery)	76.8 %			70 - 130	
Boron (RPD)	0.5 %				0 - 20
Cadmium (% Recovery)	47.9 %			70 - 130	
Cadmium (RPD)	0.8 %				0 - 20
Calcium (% Recovery)	99.4 %			70 - 130	
Calcium (RPD)	0 %				0 - 20
Chromium (% Recovery)	56.3 %			70 - 130	
Chromium (RPD)	2.2 %				0 - 20
Cobalt (% Recovery)	83.3 %			70 - 130	

Page 12 of 13

Laboratory Contact: Jeff Ruehr

Ruehr@adeq.state.ar.us 501-682-0955

Cobalt (RPD)	0.3 %		0 - 20
Copper (% Recovery)	46.6 %	70 - 130	
Copper (RPD)	0.3 %		0 - 20
Iron (% Recovery)	45.9 %	70 - 130	
Iron (RPD)	0.9 %		0 - 20
Lead (% Recovery)	57.1 %	70 - 130	
Lead (RPD)	1.6 %		0 - 20
Magnesium (% Recovery)	87.2 %	70 - 130	
Magnesium (RPD)	0.2 %	AM DAN BAR AMARIE BARDE PARTE PARTE AND AMARIES.	0 - 20
Manganese (% Recovery)	80 %	70 - 130	
Manganese (RPD)	0.2 %		0 - 20
Potassium (% Recovery)	95.7 %	70 - 130	
Potassium (RPD)	$^{\circ}$	properties and control of the contro	0 - 20
Selenium (% Recovery)	95.3 %	70 - 130	
Selenium (RPD)	1.4 %		0 - 20
Silver (% Recovery)	12.8 %	70 - 130	
Silver (RPD)	3.8 %		0 - 20
Thallium (% Recovery)	100 %	70 - 130	
Thallium (RPD)	0.2 %		0 - 20
Vanadium (% Recovery)	88.6 %	70 - 130	
Vanadium (RPD)	0.8 %		0 - 20
Zinc (% Recovery)	40.0 %	70 - 130	
Zinc (RPD)	1.4 %		0 - 20
Dilution Factor			
Analysis Date/Time	Nov 27 2012 5:52AM		
Analyzed By	Robert Graddy		