11th Report - Sept. 1982

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

1990 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 223-9525

October 5, 1982

Ms. Vicky Keramida, Ph.D.
Project Manager
Pretreatment Program
Department of Public Works
2460 City-County Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Ms. Keramida:

Enclosed please find our monthly project status report for September 1982.

Important events that should be highlighted include:

- At meetings with the State of Indiana and EPA on September 16 and 17, 1982, we established a schedule of State and EPA review of the draft ordinance:

  - by December 15, 1982, the draft ordinance, would be submitted;

  - by January 15, 1983, the State and EPA would return to us their comments on the draft ordinance for corrections; and

  - in the Spring, the final ordinance to the Indananapolis City Council would be submitted for review and approval.

- The EPA office indicated that the ordinance review would not require that the Indianapolis ordinance follow the EPA Region 5 model ordinance "word for word;" it needs to cover just the main points.

- The additional printout of industry information with the priority pollutants will be forwarded to you by October 12, 1982, for review and submission to EPA and the State.

- The preliminary meeting was held at the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District. A second meeting to tour field operations was scheduled for October 15, 1982, and City staff was invited to observe a training program involving their industrial surveillance branch and the Chicago fire department on October 16.

- The Citizens Advisory Committee toured the pilot plant on September 14, 1982.

- A two-day session was held with the Technical Advisory Committee of the Chamber of Commerce and both management and technical issues were reviewed. A principal concern voiced by the TAC was the integration of the pretreatment, combined sewage overflow, and sludge study results.

- Preliminary discussions were held with the Belmont Treatment Plant on the future research program for the pilot plant. James Montgomery will propose several options and submit written materials with budget estimates to the City.

- At a luncheon meeting with Miss Beulah Coughenour, Chairwoman of the Public Works Committee, City-County Counsel, initial steps were taken to introduce the schedule for revising City ordinance. Beulah asked that Mr. Jones be briefed on the project and invited to the next TAC meeting.

- An updated project schedule is attached. This schedule was developed on the basis of our discussions with the EPA on procedures to review the draft ordinance before City-County Council approves it.

- A proposal was made by the Environmental Protection Agency to introduce an amendment to the Clean Water Act that will allow municipalities to request a waiver from categorical standards if they comply with certain requirements. That proposal is attached to this letter. Unfortunately, discussions on September 30, 1982, with members of trade associations in Washington indicated that industry and other groups are not happy with the proposal and may attempt to stop it from being enacted.

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

- Discussions with EPA and with the states have indicated that EPA Region 5 will move forward with notification procedures, and Dale Bertleson is developing a methodology for working with EPA to make sure that all of the industries in each category are notified.

- On October 14, 1982, a program management and ordinance meeting will be held with Dale Bertleson and his staff to:

  - delineate past problems of the industrial surveillance branch; and

  - solicit possible problem solutions to incorporate in program management and ordinance development.

The St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District has invited the Indianapolis pretreatment staff to tour its facilities on October 8, 1982, at 9:30 a.m. We are looking forward to that visit and to working with other members of the technical exchange committee at our meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 6, 1982, in St. Louis.

We plan to have our monthly project review meeting on Wednesday, October 13, 1982, at 1:00 p.m. at your office.

Very truly yours,

PEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL & CO.

Larry Scully

Larry J. Scully,
Senior Manager

cc: Susan Loudermilk, DPW
Allen McFearin, DPW
Dale Bertleson, DPW
Pat Stevens, DPW
John Wander, PMM
Deems Buell, PMM
Jim Fagan, PMM
Larry Russell, JMM
Chris Cain, JMM

Pretreatment Study

City of Indianapolis -- Monthly Status Report For September 1982

Task Summaries

Task 1 - Survey: Discussions with EPA indicate that an additional table should be developed which highlights individual industries and their priority pollutants. Chris Cain and Deems Buell will submit that as Appendix A to the Task 1 report by October 11.

Task 2 - Notification Procedures: All tasks are complete. Dale Bertleson is developing a methodology for the City to respond to new categorical standards as they are published and fo notify the industries within Indianapolis.

Task 3 - Waste Characterization: This task is complete except for finalizating of the Task 3 report scheduled for March 1983.

Task 4 - Technical Information: Work has continued during the month of September on the draft pilot plant report, which is scheduled for submission to the City during the first week of November 1982. At the September 15, 1982 meeting, draft pilot plant data were issued to the City and the Chamber of Commerce Technical Advisory Committee in the form of a draft discharge limits development chapter, with example limit calculation. The discussion at the meeting and at a subsequent meeting the following day with City staff resulted in improvements and refinements to the limit development methodology. Additional comments are expected from the TAC, and will be incorporated before inclusion of the chapter in the pilot plant report.

The design case run of the pilot plant was completed during September, along with the second 30-day fathead minnow chronic bioassay, and 96-hour minnow acute bioassay. The experimental run confirmed the absence of acute toxicity and the presence of chronic toxicity. The run also demonstrated that the cause of the chronic toxicity was removable by activated carbon treatment. The second chronic daphnia bioassay was attempted, but results were inconclusive because the Daphia lacked sufficient food in the wastewater dilutions. Off-gas samples were taken to check the oxygen activated sludge vent gas for the presence of stripped priority pollutant organic compounds.

A pilot plant upset occurred in late September, involving several days loss of nitrification in the oxygen activated sludge system. Analyses are being run to identify the cause. Analyses from samples taken during an upset in early August have confirmed the presence of unusually high concentrations of pentachlorophenol (PCP) and related phenolic compounds in the plant influent.

The results of analysis of the White River water and sediment samples are just being released by the laboratory, and plans are being made to take four follow-up samples during October. The results show detectable levels of a number of priority organic pollutants in the river, as well as the metals indicated by earlier studies.

JMM has continued to run batch spike tests to determine the concentrations of heavy metals that will reduce the rate of nitrification in pilot plant activated sludge. Preliminary results indicate a high degree of sensitivity to PH.

Between October 1, and October 10, JMM plans to test the effects of raising the PH of the activated sludge on metals removal and ozonation. Next, JMM would start a program of spiking the pilot plant influent with a mixture of priority pollutants representative of what might occur in Indianapolis if industrial discharges increase by a factor of 2 to 10 from current levels.

A proposal was submitted to the city to perform the fish tissue analyses that were deferred in Task 5.5 in the original pretreatment project grant award. A proposal was also submitted to perform a third chronic bioassay to more clearly identify the probable cause of the chronic toxicity detected in the two tests covered in the current study scope.

Task 5 - Ordinance Review: At the TAC meeting on September 14, 1982, Jim Fagan and Jeff Sirmin reviewed ordinance revisions and draft enforcement strategy with the Chamber of Commerce, and a management issues list was distributed (Attachment C). The Chamber of Commerce will submit comments by October 1. Jim Fagan drafted an assessment of the existing ordinance provisions as they compare with EPA requirements. We submit that assessment as Activity 2A to the City for review and submission to the State. The draft ordinance without these effluent limitations will be delivered to the City on October 15.

Task 6 - Fundings: Funding option review was discussed with EPA and with the JRB representative. JRB Will provide familiar cost allocation formulas. These formulas will be compared with those used by other cities that Peat Marwick has reviewed. Mark Battle Associates is assisting in this task and will coordinate the collection of the information from JRB.

Task 7 - Personnel to Carry Out the Pretreatment Program: Following the visit by the Indianapolis staff and the consulting team to the Metropolitan Sanitary Districts (MSD) operations in Chicago, and St. Louis, preliminary discussion will be held on Task 7.1 and Task 7.2. In addition, the organizational structure review under Task 7.3 will be initiated. This will include, in particular, discussing the relationship between the industrial surveillance group, the pretreatment coordination efforts downtown, the director, and the public works board (which will act as the appeals board). We plan to review the organizational tasks at our meeting scheduled for October 14 at the Belmont Plant.

Task 8 - Self Monitoring Report: This task will be integrated into the data management system and procedures that are being developed under Task 1.1. Initial discussions on this task will be at our meeting on October 14.

Task 9 -

Task 10 -

Task 11 - Monitoring Equipment Review: JMM is in the process of reviewing monitoring equipment inventory information received from the industrial surveillance branch, preparatory to writing the task report on this task. JMM personnel participated in a visit with the Chicago MSD on September 17 to compare its pretreatment program with that being developed for Indianapolis. A draft Task 11 report will be issued to the City along with the pilot plant report during the first week in November.

Task 12 - Analytical Equipment Review: A visit from the head of the JMM Pasadena laboratory to the Belmont lab is scheduled for early October, to evaluate the type and quantity of analyses that the City Lab can run. This will be combined with the results of the discharge limit development activity in Task 4 to produce recommendations for City action to complete the staffing

and equipping of the lab. During the first week in November, a draft Task 12 report will be issued to the City along with the pilot plant report.

Task 13 - Public Participation: On September 14 the Citizens Advisory Committee visited the pilot plant and discussed plant operation and pilot work with pretreatment study members.

Two meetings were held with the Chamber of Commerce. One meeting was dedicated to the ordinance and management issues, the second to a review of the ordinance limits calculations by James Montgomery. A separate meeting was held with Beulah Coughenour of the Public Works Committee City-County Council.

Task 14 -

Task 15 - Water Quality Model: The water quality model will be run during the month of October using the data acquired during the August and September river sampling and analytical work. Draft results should be available in early November.

Task 16 - Technical Coordination: A meeting with the Technical Coordination Committee is scheduled for October 6, 1982 in St. Louis.

An invitation letter and a packet of information summarizing the status of the pretreatment project was mailed to the members of the Technical Exchange Committee in preparation for the meeting scheduled for October 6.

Task 17 - Coordination with Other Studies: The next contractor's quarterly meeting will be held in October. The CSO and pretreatment integration question will be discussed at that meeting.

A draft of the data produced in the CSO study was received, and is being incorporated in the technical data base for the pretreatment project.

Task 18 - Project Management: The updated project schedule is attached to this memo. Peat Marwick and James M. Montgomery indicate that we are on time and on budget with the tasks. The ordinance development task changes are highlighted in the attached memo.

Our October 14 meeting, the contract between James Montgomery, Peat Marwick and the City will be reviewed. We will determine if the wording on Page 4 should be amended to make the study team available for the EPA comment period--approximately two months after the report is submitted in March. Changing the ending date would extend the contract to a 22-month period and the study team members would be available for a limited number of meetings during the review period.

BULLETIN

TO:	AMSA Members and Subscribers	DATE:	September 16, 1982
FROM:	National Office	BULLETIN NO.:	LB 82-26
SUBJECT:	CWA Amendments; FY 1983 Appropriations	FILE:	Legislation

NEW EPA CONCEPTS FOR CLEAN WATER ACT FLOATED

With a little more than ten legislative days remaining for action to be taken on the Clean Water Act, EPA has floated a scaled back proposal in an effort to assure passage of a bill this year. If proposed, it would limit action to pretreatment, BAT, dams and NPDES issues.

Under the new proposal, EPA would be able to modify applicable industrial categorical standards under the Clean Water Act, provided the municipality demonstrated to EPA, or where applicable the State, that:

- o POTW is in compliance with its NPDES conditions;
- o POTW is in compliance, or on a schedule for achieving compliance, with secondary treatment limitations;
- o there are effluent limitations for the specific pollutants subject to modification to ensure that such quantities do not pass through the POTW, thereby interfering with the attainment or maintenance of the designated water use into which POTW discharges;
- o modification will not result in any pollutant interfering with the operation of such POTW or impairing sludge use;
- o adequate resources are available to ensure compliance of program as well as a monitoring program; and
- o annual report documenting compliance.

In the event any of the above requirements are not complied with, the Administrator may modify or rescind municipality's pretreatment program and set effluent limitation standards for the POTW.

TIMETABLE TO APPLY

Under the proposal a POTW would have 120 days after promulgation of industrial categorical standards to submit a letter of intent for modification of the standard and to permit a pretreatment program. This letter of intent would include a demonstration that the treatment works is in compliance with its NPDES permit or with effluent limitations pursuant to secondary treatment, and a schedule meeting the requirements of the program is set out. If this letter of intent is acceptable the Administrator may stay requirements of a categorical standard. For further details, please refer to the attached new pretreatment proposal.

HOUSE PASSES EPA FY 83 APPROPRIATION

By a vote of 343-38, the House approved its version of the HUD-Independent Agencies FY 83 appropriations, which includes the EPA funding. As a result, the $2.4 billion construction grants appropriation will now be considered by the Senate sometime during the week of September 20th. Because the Senate version will probably include $300 million for estuary related CSO problems,which is at odds with the House version,a conference will be necessary

PRETREATMENT

(a) Section 307 is amended by adding a new subsection (e) as follows:

(1) The Administrator with the concurrence of the State (or, if appropriate, the State) may issue a permit under section 402 for a treatment works (as defined in section 212 of this Act) which is publicly owned, which modifies applicable industrial categorical standards established under sections 307(b)(1) and (c) of this Act for industrial sources introducing pollutants into such works upon a showing, satisfactory to the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) that -

(A) the treatment works is in compliance with the requirements of section 402(b)(8) of this Act;

(B) the treatment works is in compliance or subject to a schedule for achieving compliance with effluent limitations based upon secondary treatment (as defined pursuant to section 304(d)(1) of this Act or as may be modified pursuant to section 301(h) of this Act) and with the requirements of section 403 of this Act;

(C) there are applicable numerical effluent limitations for the treatment works specific to the pollutants for which the modification is requested to ensure that such pollutants do not pass through the treatment works in quantities sufficient to interfere with the attainment or maintenance of the designated uses (established pursuant to section 303(c) of this Act) of the body of water into which such

works discharge, and that the works is in compliance or subject to a schedule for achieving compliance with such limitations as expeditiously as possible and with the requirements of section 403 of this Act;

(D) such modification will not result in any pollutant interfering with the operation of such works or impairing current or planned future sludge use or disposal by such works;

(E) there exist adequate legal, financial, technical, analytical, administrative, and enforcement authority, as well as resources and a system of enforceable limitations to ensure compliance with the requirements of this subsection;

(F) a monitoring program will be established in accordance with section 402 of this Act to ensure continued compliance with the requirements of this subsection; and

(G) an annual report will be submitted to the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) to document continued compliance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) Upon a finding that any of the applicable requirements of this subsection are not being met by the treatment works to which a modified permit was granted, and after notice and consultation with State and local authorities (or, if appropriate, the Administrator), the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) shall modify or rescind such modification, and may establish such effluent limitations for the treatment works as may be necessary to achieve the purposes of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

(3)(A) Any application for a modification filed by a treatment works under this subsection shall not operate to stay any requirement of subsection (b) or (c) of this section unless such works submits a letter of intent to the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) within 120 days of the promulgation date of the industrial categorical standard for which the modification is requested, or within 120 days of the date of enactment of this bill if the applicable standard was promulgated prior to such date.

(B) The letter of intent shall include, but not be limited to, a demonstration satisfactory to the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) that (i) the treatment works is in compliance with the requirements of section 402(b)(8) of this Act or with effluent limitations based upon secondary treatment (as defined pursuant to section 304(d)(1) of this Act or as may be modified under section 301(h) of this Act), and (ii) both an achievable schedule containing planning, development, and performance dates by which all the requirements of paragraph (1) will be met, and a workplan specifying the scientific, technological, and administrative methodologies to be relied on in meeting the schedule have been established.

(C) Upon receipt of a satisfactory letter of intent, the Administrator (or, if appropriate, the State) may stay the applicable requirements of a categorical standard for which a modification is requested for an industrial source introducing pollutants into the treatment works for no more than two years from the date such letter of intent is received.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS
PRETREATMENT PROGRAM

MANAGEMENT ISSUES
FOR CHANGES TO ORDINANCE AND
PROCEDURES

Variances

Definitions
- EPA
- State
- Existing Ordinance

Small Industry Exemption

Enforcement Program
- Terms - Violation - Excursion
- Hearing Officer
- Legal Fees
- Appeals Board

Allocation of the costs for the Pretreatment Program

LS/as
9-15-82