

Mokhtari, Parviz

From: Shafii, Mo
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 12:22 PM
To: Mokhtari, Parviz; Mokhtari, Parviz
Subject: FW: Mountain View

-----Original Message-----

From: Byron Hicks [mailto:bhicks@mcclelland-engrs.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 11:15 AM
To: Shafii, Mo
Subject: Fw: Mountain View

----- Original Message -----

From: Byron Hicks
To: SHAFFI@adeq.state.ar.us
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 3:00 PM
Subject: Mountain View

Mo,

Per our earlier conversation, I understand that you are concerned about what someone has called the "bypass" capabilities that this plant has.

In this application, "bypass" refers to the capability of closing one of the aeration basin channels during high flow periods in order to ensure retention of solids.

I feel that bypassing of a channel is a lesser evil than losing solids to the creek. However, you have indicated that this procedure is not allowed. Therefore I will advise the Owner not to close a channel during high flows and that the channel should only be taken out of service temporarily for maintenance purposes.

I think this is the only remaining concern regarding the Mountain View wastewater treatment plant. If you have any questions, please call.

If you have no more questions, please let me know when you expect this project to go to the paper for public notice.

Thanks

Byron

Mokhtari, Parviz

From: Byron Hicks [bhicks@mccllelland-engrs.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 9:37 AM
To: Mokhtari, Parviz
Cc: PNSHUPE@aol.com
Subject: Re: Mountain View Construction project

Parviz,
 Regarding violations you have referred to:

BOD : I see only one violation of BOD monthly avg on 1/31/03 that would have exceeded our limits. There are no violations beyond Jan 03 that I see. Out of over 6 years of data, only one violation.

AMMONIA: our monthly average is 5 or 10 depending on time of year. This limit was exceeded one time. It was again in 1/31/03.

PHOSPHORUS: We do not treat for phosphorus. However, look at the results. Only two monthly average violations in over 6 years.

Parviz- of the items we are required to remove, no violations have occurred since 2003. This is good. Of the few violations cited, and the fact that the plant has obviously worked well w/o any violations since 2004, I don't think that inadequate design can be attributed to the cause of the violations cited above.

Please consider this during your approval process.

Thanks

BH

----- Original Message -----

From: Mokhtari, Parviz
To: bhicks@mccllelland-engrs.com
Cc: Roberts, Christopher ; Shafii, Mo
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 11:58 AM
Subject: Mountain View Construction project

Mr. Hicks,

Using the design flow of 0.73 MGD, the proposed BOD loading and F/M ratio of the Orbal process for Mountain View are 21.03 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf and 1.2 lb BOD5/d/lbMLVSS, respectively. These values exceed the BOD loading = 15 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf and F/M ratio = 0.1 lb BOD5/d/lbMLVSS in the 10-State Standards for treatment plants with Extended Aeration and Single Stage Nitrification. ADEQ believes that the proposed oxidation ditch is small based on the 10-State Standards.

Mr. George Smith's Letter (Subject: Orbal Aeration Design Parameters) dated June 29, 2006, stated that USFilter has designed numerous Orbal systems in States that follow the 10-State Standards where exception to BOD loading = 15 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf were allowed and listed a few projects. ADEQ has reviewed the DMR Data for the City of Hillsboro, Ohio (Design flow = 1.0 MGD and BOD loading = 20 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf) because the design parameters are reasonably similar to Mountain View project.

The DMR data for the City of Hillsboro, Ohio (attached) show numerous violations for CBOD5, Ammonia-Nitrogen, and phosphorus. Based on the poor performance of this similar

system, please explain how the Mountain View Orbal treatment system will meet the permit limits.

Additionally, please clarify whether the existing drying bed and post aeration will remain or will be abandoned.

Thanks,

Parviz Mokhtari
NPDES Staff Engineer
Arkansas Dept. of Environmental Quality
Voice: (501) 682-0613
Mokhtari@adeq.state.ar.us

Mokhtari, Parviz

From: Mokhtari, Parviz
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 12:52 PM
To: 'Byron Hicks'
Cc: Roberts, Christopher; Shafii, Mo
Subject: RE: Mountain View Construction project

Mr. Hicks,

In response to your e-mail, please see the highlighted sections of the Hillsboro data (attached). It shows more than one violation for CBOD5 and ammonia-nitrogen (yellow highlight w/ red on the high numbers). We also found one additional ammonia sample that will fail the ammonia toxicity criteria (daily max=3.9 mg/L for April to October) when the permit is renewed in 2008 (green highlight with pink on the high number). Based on the water quality criteria for ammonia toxicity, please explain how this lower ammonia limit (i.e., that will be in effect when the permit is renewed) has been considered in the design for this upgrade.

We also wonder why the same proposed Orbal treatment system (from US Filter) for the City of Cabot can meet the 10-State Standards, but in the City of Mountain View, the proposed loading is 21 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf. Please clarify. However in order to expedite the permitting process for this project you must comply with one of the following items;

1. Meet the 10-State Standards, or
2. Submit accurate data and justifications why you do not meet 10 – State Standard.

Also, please call me to discuss the above issues.

Thanks,

Parviz

-----Original Message-----

From: Byron Hicks [mailto:bhicks@mcclelland-engrs.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 9:37 AM
To: Mokhtari, Parviz
Cc: PNSHUPE@aol.com
Subject: Re: Mountain View Construction project

Parviz,
 Regarding violations you have referred to:

BOD : I see only one violation of BOD monthly avg on 1/31/03 that would have exceeded our limits. There are no violations beyond Jan 03 that I see. Out of over 6 years of data, only one violation.

AMMONIA: our monthly average is 5 or 10 depending on time of year. This limit was exceeded one time. It was again in 1/31/03.

PHOSPHORUS: We do not treat for phosphorus. However, look at the results. Only two monthly average violations in over 6 years.

Parviz- of the items we are required to remove, no violations have occurred since 2003. This is good. Of the few violations cited, and the fact that the plant has obviously worked well w/o any violations since

8/3/2006

2004, I don't think that inadequate design can be attributed to the cause of the violations cited above.

Please consider this during your approval process.

Thanks

BH

----- Original Message -----

From: Mokhtari, Parviz
To: bhicks@mcclelland-engrs.com
Cc: Roberts, Christopher ; Shafii, Mo
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 11:58 AM
Subject: Mountain View Construction project

Mr. Hicks,

Using the design flow of 0.73 MGD, the proposed BOD loading and F/M ratio of the Orbal process for Mountain View are 21.03 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf and 1.2 lb BOD5/d/lbMLVSS, respectively. These values exceed the BOD loading = 15 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf and F/M ratio = 0.1 lb BOD5/d/lbMLVSS in the 10-State Standards for treatment plants with Extended Aeration and Single Stage Nitrification. ADEQ believes that the proposed oxidation ditch is small based on the 10-State Standards.

Mr. George Smith's Letter (Subject: Orbal Aeration Design Parameters) dated June 29, 2006, stated that USFilter has designed numerous Orbal system in States that follow the 10-State Standards where exception to BOD loading = 15 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf were allowed and listed a few projects. ADEQ has reviewed the DMR Data for the City of Hillsboro, Ohio (Design flow = 1.0 MGD and BOD loading = 20 lb BOD5/day/1000 cf) because the design parameters are reasonably similar to Mountain View project.

The DMR data for the City of Hillsboro, Ohio (attached) show numerous violations for CBOD5, Ammonia-Nitrogen, and phosphorus. Based on the poor performance of this similar system, please explain how the Mountain View Orbal treatment system will meet the permit limits.

Additionally, please clarify whether the existing drying bed and post aeration will remain or will be abandoned.

Thanks,

Parviz Mokhtari
NPDES Staff Engineer
Arkansas Dept. of Environmental Quality
Voice: (501) 682-0613
Mokhtari@adeq.state.ar.us

CITY OF HILLSBORO, OHIO - OH0020389
PCS DMR DATA: 01/2000 TO PRESENT (001 ONLY)

NPID	NAM1	NAM2	NAM3	STNO	VDSG	MVDT	VPRM	FHBC	RDF5	FHBC	VPRM	VML0	MQAV	MQMX	MCMN	MCAV	MCMX	NODI	MVIO
		SIC2 TYPO MRAT RDF4 FLOW RDF2 ENGI PERFD																	
		MADI FTYP																	
		RWAT																	
001A	01/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.536303	6.695286				9	E00
001A	02/29/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.037401	2.953435		.3025	.7		E00
001A	03/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.037401	2.953435		.2984615	.9		E00
001A	04/30/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.9413547	5.725948		.2216666	1.22		E00
001A	05/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						3.202879	10.82733		.9346666	2.86		E90
001A	06/30/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.612558	4.639804		.5041666	1.54		E00
001A	07/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.4853680	2.048896		.1492307	.52		E00
001A	08/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.3097373	1.665551		.0985714	.38		E00
001A	09/30/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.537903	5.449945		.4623076	.98		E00
001A	10/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.2638009	1.402948		.095	.47		E00
001A	11/30/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						1.099164	1.428913		.0338461	.44		E00
001A	12/31/00	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.2432241	2.918689		.0525	.63		E00
001A	01/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						9.942619	144.3636		2.97	43		E90
001A	02/28/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.6887375	5.031324		.1725	1.24		E00
001A	03/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.1078567	1.294280		.0291666	.35		E00
001A	04/30/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.3128491	2.524443		.0783333	.56		E00
001A	05/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1						.109008	1.308096		.03	.36		E00
001A	06/30/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	07/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	08/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	09/30/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	10/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	11/30/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	12/31/01	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	01/31/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E90
001A	02/28/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	03/31/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	04/30/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	08/31/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	09/30/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	10/31/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	11/30/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	12/31/02	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	01/31/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E90
001A	02/28/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E90
001A	03/31/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	04/30/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	05/31/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00
001A	06/30/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E90
001A	07/31/03	NITROGEN,	AMMONIA	TOTAL	(AS N)	00610	1												E00

7-DAY = Daily MAX