JONES ISLAND

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Influent Flow and Loading

Exceedances

Total Number of Points

Points

0

0

1. Monthly Ave 1.1 Verify the	erage Flo followir	ows and (C)Bo	OD Lo ows a	oadings nd (C)BOD load	ing	s to	your	facility.		
Outfall No. 701	Influe Averaç	ent Monthly je Flow, MGD	x	Influent Monthly Average (C)BOD Concentration mg/L		x	8.34	=	Influent Monthly Average (C)BOD Loading, Ibs/day	
January	6	9.0645	х	299			х	8.34	=	172,056
February	6	6.5000	х	347			х	8.34	=	192,529
March	7	6.5806	х	300			х	8.34	=	191,811
April	1	22.4667	х	234			х	8.34	=	238,592
May	8	5.5806	х	276			х	8.34	=	197,315
June	9	2.9667	х	352			х	8.34	=	272,920
July	9	2.9032	х	318			x	8.34	=	246,465
August	8	6.4516	х	317			x	8.34	=	228,861
September	9	2.1000	х	267			x	8.34	=	205,086
October	7	1.4839	х	330			x	8.34	=	196,930
November	1	05.9000	х	248			x	8.34	=	218,682
December	1	11.3226	x	195			x	8.34	=	181,493
	Design		D	esign Factor	х		9	6	=	% of Design
Max Month D	Max Month Design Flow MGD			164				0		147.6
	osigiri re				10	0	_	164		
Design (C)BO	D lbs/d	ídav 2		299000	X		9	0	=	269100
	D, 103/0	uy		277000	X	x		0		299000
2.2 Verify the number of times the flow and (C)BOD exceeded 90% or 100% of design, points earned, and score:										
	Months Number of times of flow was greater Influent than 90% of		imes eater of	es Number of times I er flow was greater (C than 100% of th		Number of times (C)BOD was greater than 90% of design		es ater ign	Number of times (C)BOD was greater than 100% of design	
January	1	0		0		0			0	
February	1	0		0				0		0
March	1	0		0				0		0
April	1	0		0			0			0
May	1	0		0			0			0
June	1	0		0		1			0	
August	1	0		0		0		0		
September	1	0		0		0		0		
October	1	0		0	+			0		0
November	1	0		0				0		0
December	1	0		0				0		0
Points per ea	per each 2 1			3			2			

0

0

1

3

0

0

3

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined Last Updated: Rep 8/18/2016			Last Updated: Reporting 8/18/2016 2015	For:	
 3. Flow Meter 3.1 Was the influent for the second seco	flow meter calib Inter last calibra	prated in the last year? ation date (MM/DD/YYYY)	07/06/2015		
O No If No, please explain	:				
Jones Island influen meter: 7/17/15; Lov Sanitary Sewer met	t flow meters w w Level Influent er: 1/29/15 & 1	vere calibrated with the fo t Meter: 7/6/15; Inline S 10/26/15	ollowing schedule . High Level influent torage System meters: 7/17/15;		
 4. Sewer Use Ordinance 4.1 Did your communexcessive conventional industries, commercia Yes No If No, please explain 	e ity have a sewe al pollutants ((C al users, hauled n:	er use ordinance that limi BOD, SS, or pH) or toxi waste, or residences?	ted or prohibited the discharge of c substances to the sewer from		
 4.2 Was it necessary f Yes No If Yes, please explain 	to enforce the o in:	ordinance?			
Various violations occurred. The District responds to violations according to Enforcement Response Plan. The semi-annual and annual Pretreatment Program reports summarize the violations and the MMSD response.					
 Septage Receiving Did you have required Septic Tanks 	uests to receive Holding Tanks	septage at your facility? Grease Traps			
o Yes	o Yes	o Yes			
● No	● No	• No			
5.2 Did you receive se Septic Tanks o Yes	eptage at your f	faclity? If yes, indicate vo gallons	lume in gallons.		
 No Holding Tanks Yes 		gallons			
No Grease Traps O Yes gallons					
 No 5.2.1 If yes to any of any of these wastes. 	f the above, ple	ase explain if plant perfo	rmance is affected when receiving		
 6. Pretreatment 6.1 Did your facility ex or hazardous situation commercial or industrion o Yes No 	xperience opera is in the sewer s ial discharges ir	ational problems, permit s system or treatment plar n the last year?	violations, biosolids quality concerns, at that were attributable to		

If yes, describe the situation and your community's response.

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

6.2 Did your facility accept hauled industrial wastes, landfill leachate, etc.? o Yes

• No

If yes, describe the types of wastes received and any procedures or other restrictions that were in place to protect the facility from the discharge of hauled industrial wastes.

Total Points Generated	3
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	97
Section Grade	A

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (BOD/CBOD)

1.	Effluent	(C)BOD Results
----	----------	----------------

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for BOD or CBOD

Outfall No. 002	Monthly Average	90% of Permit Limit	Effluent Monthly Average (mg/L)	Months of Discharge	Permit Limit Exceedance	90% Permit Limit	
	Limit (mg/L)	> 10 (mg/L)	5 . 5 ,	with a Limit		Exceedance	
January	30	27	6	1	0	0	
February	30	27	8	1	0	0	
March	30	27	9	1	0	0	
April	30	27	11	1	0	0	
Мау	30	27	7	1	0	0	
June	30	27	7	1	0	0	
July	30	27	5	1	0	0	
August	30	27	5	1	0	0	
September	30	27	5	1	0	0	
October	30	27	5	1	0	0	0
November	30	27	7	1	0	0	
December	30	27	5	1	0	0	
		* Eqi	uals limit if limit is	<= 10			
Months of d	ischarge/yr			12			
Points per e	Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge 7 3						
Exceedance	S				0	0	
Points	Points 0 0						
Total num	Total number of points 0						
NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge. Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is 12/6 = 2.0 1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?							
No violatio	ons occurred.						
 2. Flow Meter Calibration 2.1 Was the effluent flow meter calibrated in the last year? Yes Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY) 08/04/2015 O No If No, please explain:]
 3. Treatment Problems 3.1 What problems, if any, were experienced over the last year that threatened treatment? 							
 4. Other Monitoring and Limits 4.1 At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for any other pollutants such as chlorides, pH, residual chlorine, fecal coliform, or metals? o Yes No 							

If Yes, please explain:

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

4.2 At any time in the past year was there a failure of an effluent acute or chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) test?

• Yes

If Yes, please explain:

4.3 If the biomonitoring (WET) test did not pass, were steps taken to identify and/or reduce source(s) of toxicity?

o Yes

o No

• N/A

Please explain unless not applicable:

Total Points Generated				
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100			
Section Grade	A			

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Total Suspended Solids)

 Effluent Total Suspended Solids Results 1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for TSS: 								
Outfall No. 002	Monthly Average Limit (mg/L)	90% of Permit Limit >10 (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance	90% Permit Limit Exceedance		
January	30	27	4	1	0	0		
February	30	27	6	1	0	0	1	
March	30	27	7	1	0	0	1	
April	30	27	12	1	0	0		
Мау	30	27	6	1	0	0		
June	30	27	6	1	0	0		
July	30	27	5	1	0	0		
August	30	27	5	1	0	0		
September	30	27	5	1	0	0		
October	30	27	5	1	0	0		
November	30	27	7	1	0	0	0	
December	30	27	4	1	0	0		
* Equals limit if limit is <= 10								
Months of Discharge/yr 12							11	
Points per	each exceed	ance with 12	months of disch	arge:	7	3		
Exceedance	S				0	0		
Points	Points 0 0							
Total Number of Points 0							j	
NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge. Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is 12/6 = 2.0 1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?								

No violations occurred.

Total Points Generated				
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100			
Section Grade	A			

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Phosphorus)

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for Phosphorus

phosphorus Limit (mg/L)	Average phosphorus (mg/L)	Discharge with a Limit	Exceedance	
.66	0.2	1	0	
.66	0.2	1	0	
.66	0.3	1	0	
.66	0.3	1	0	
.66	0.2	1	0	
.66	0.2	1	0	
.66	0.2	1	0	
.66	0.3	1	0	
.66	0.4	1	0	
.66	0.3	1	0	
.66	0.3	1	0	
.66	0.2	1	0	
e/yr		12		
xceedance with 1	2 months of dischar	ge:	10	
			0	
Total Number of Points				
that discharge inte s section shall be ba oths of discharge. stewater facility disc occurred, what act	rmittently to waters of sed upon a multiplicat charging only 6 month ion was taken to regai	f the state, the point ion factor of 12 mon s of the year, the mu n compliance?	s per monthly ths divided by ultiplication factor	
	<pre>/// (mg/L) </pre>	phospholds Limit (mg/L)Average phospholds (mg/L).660.2.660.2.660.3.660.2.660.2.660.2.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.3.660.2e/yre/yrexceedance with 12 months of discharPointss that discharge intermittently to waters or s section shall be based upon a multiplicat of section shall be based upon a multiplicat of discharge.stewater facility discharging only 6 month s occurred, what action was taken to regai	phospholds LimitAverage phospholdsDischarge with a Limit660.21660.21660.31660.21660.21660.21660.21660.21660.21660.21660.31660.31660.31660.31660.31660.21660.21660.31660.21660.2112xceedance with 12 months of discharge:Pointssthat discharge intermittently to waters of the state, the point s section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 mon on ths of discharge.stewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor of 12 mon on ths of discharge.stewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication compliance?	

Total Points Generated				
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100			
Section Grade	A			

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Biosolids Quality and Management

 Biosolids 1.1 How d Land a Publicl Hauled Kandfil Inciner Other NOTE: If 	 Biosolids Use/Disposal 1.1 How did you use or dispose of your biosolids? (Check all that apply) Land applied under your permit Publicly Distributed Exceptional Quality Biosolids Hauled to another permitted facility Landfilled Incinerated Other NOTE: If you did not remove biosolids from your system, please describe your system type such as largoons, rood bods, recirculating sand filters, etc. 																	
	ns, re	ea be	as, re d Oth	circu or pl	ating	g san	a III	ers, o	etc.									
		IECKE		ы, рі	ease	uesu												
Land ap	oplica	ation (of Exce	eptio	nal C	2ualit	y bio	solid	s did	not	requi	re la	nd to	be p	permi	itted.	About	154
	IS IFOI	m Ou v dist	ributo	J6 W6 d Ar	ere a	gricu	alv 2	1 dry	na aj		1.AD ດໄລ	out 4 ndfill	disn	osod	y ton	s were	2	
comme	i ciun	y uist	induce			innat							uisp	0300	•			
 Biosolids Number of 	3. Biosolids Metals Number of biosolids outfalls in your WPDES permit:																	
3.1 For ea calendar y	3.1 For each outfall tested, verify the biosolids metal quality values for your facility during the last calendar year.																	
Outfall No.	006	- Milo	organi	te (Jo	ones	Islan	nd)											
Parameter	80% of	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic	Limit	41		6	4.6	87	2.2	Δ	42	4.6	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.6	23		0	0
Cadmium		39		3.5	3	.83	.13	25	44	.52	.45	.47	.57	.54	.5		0	0
Copper	-	1500		280	250	240	250	250	250	250	260	260	260	250	240		0	0
Lead		300		32	22	28	45	47	56	51	55	57	51	43	46		0	0
Mercury		17		.61	.44	.36	.56	.46	.54	.33	.37	.5	.44	.48	.62		0	0
Molybdenum	60		75	12	9.7	11	10	9.9	10	11	12	12	13	12	10	0		0
Nickel				33	29	31	32	30	30	29	31	30	30	28	32	0		0
Selenium				.11	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.6	4.4	5	4.5	4.8	5.4	5.6	6	0		0
Zinc		2800		600	540	530	560	510	640	600	510	510	500	490	440		0	0

3.1.1 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the high quality limits OR 80% of the limit for molybdenum, nickel, or selenium = 0

Exceedence Points

- 0 (0 Points)
- 0 1-2 (10 Points)
- 0 > 2 (15 Points)

3.1.2 If you exceeded the high quality limits, did you cumulatively track the metals loading at each land application site? (check applicable box)

o Yes

o No (10 points)

• N/A - Did not exceed limits or no HQ limit applies (0 points)

O N/A - Did not land apply biosolids until limit was met (0 points)

3.1.3 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the ceiling limits = 0

Exceedence Points

- 0 (0 Points)
- 0 1 (10 Points)

0 > 1 (15 Points)

3.1.4 Were biosolids land applied which exceeded the ceiling limit?

o Yes (20 Points)

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

 No (0 Points) 3.1.5 If any metal limit (high quality Has the source of the metals been in the source of the source	y or ceiling) was exceeded at any time, what action was dentified?	taken?	
Not Applicable.			
4. Pathogen Control (per outfall):4.1 Verify the following information.	If any information is incorrect, Contact Us.		
Outfall Number:	006		
Biosolids Class:	A		
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F		
Sample Dates:	01/01/2015 - 12/31/2015		
Density:	0		
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Process:	HTDRY		
Process Description:	Biosolids pellet temperatures exceed 176 degrees F or 80 C and product contains less than 10 percent moisture. Pathogen samples were collected three times each month and start and end sample dates are reported on each of the monthly Characteristic Reports for 2015. On this report I am summarizing the year by noting the start date for January and the end date for December. Similarly, I am reporting the average density and solids concentration for the entire year.		
Outfall Number:	006		
Biosolids Class:	A		
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F		
Sample Dates:	01/01/2015 - 01/31/2015		
Density:	0		
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Process:	HTDRY		
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.		

	0, 10, 2010	2010
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	1
Sample Dates:	02/01/2015 - 02/28/2015	1
Density:	1	1
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	1
Process:	HTDRY	1
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	Α	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	1
Sample Dates:	03/01/2015 - 03/31/2015	1
Density:	0	1
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	1
Process:	HTDRY	1
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	
Outfall Number:	006]
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	1
Sample Dates:	04/01/2015 - 04/30/2015	1
Density:	0	1
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	1
Process:	HTDRY	1
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	

Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	
Sample Dates:	05/01/2015 - 05/31/2015	
Density:	0	
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.]
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	1
Sample Dates:	06/01/2015 - 06/30/2015	1
Density:	0	1
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.]
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	Α	-
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	-
Sample Dates:	07/01/2015 - 07/31/2015	-
Density:	0	-
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	1
Process:	HTDRY	1
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	

Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	
Sample Dates:	08/01/2015 - 08/31/2015	
Density:	0	
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.]
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	-
Sample Dates:	09/01/2015 - 09/30/2015	-
Density:	0	-
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.]
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	Α	-
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	-
Sample Dates:	10/01/2015 - 10/31/2015	-
Density:	0	-
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	1
Requirement Met:	Yes	1
Land Applied:	Yes	1
Process:	HTDRY	1
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined

Last Updated:	Repor
8/18/2016	2

odated:	Reporting	For
2016	2015	

Outfall Number:	006	
Biosolids Class:	A	1
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	-
Sample Dates:	11/01/2015 - 11/30/2015	-
Density:	0	
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	
Outfall Number:	006	1
Biosolids Class:	A	
Bacteria Type and Limit:	F	
Sample Dates:	12/01/2015 - 12/31/2015	
Density:	0	
Sample Concentration Amount:	MPN/G TS	
Requirement Met:	Yes	
Land Applied:	Yes	
Process:	HTDRY	
Process Description:	The temperature of sewage sludge particles exceeds 80°C / 176° F and the moisture content of the sludge is less than 10%.	

4.2 If exceeded Class B limit or did not meet the process criteria at the time of land application. 4.2.1 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of land application? o Yes (40 Points)

• No

If yes, what action was taken?

5. Vector Attraction Reduction (per outfall):

5.1 Verify the following information. If any of the information is incorrect, Contact Us.

006
01/31/2015
DRY90
Yes
Yes
90
93.20

ilwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined	Last Updated:	Reporting Fc	
		8/18/2016	2015
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	12/31/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93.20		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	02/28/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	92.30		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	03/31/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	92.80		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	04/30/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93.50		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	05/31/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93.50		

ilwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined		Last Updated:	Reporting Fo
		8/18/2016	2015
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	06/30/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	94		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	07/31/2015		_
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	08/31/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93.30		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	09/30/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93		
Outfall Number:	006		
Method Date:	10/31/2015		
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:	DRY90		
Requirement Met:	Yes		
Land Applied:	Yes		
Limit (if applicable):	90		
Results (if applicable):	93.20		

Outfall Number:006Method Date:11/30/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.50Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)O No			
Method Date: 11/30/2015 Option Used To Satisfy Requirement: DRY90 Requirement Met: Yes Land Applied: Yes Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 93.50 Outfall Number: 006 Method Date: 12/31/2015 Option Used To Satisfy Requirement: DRY90 Requirement Met: Yes Land Applied: Yes Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 93.40 5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points) Nic Nic			Τ
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.50Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Requirement Met:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):90S.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)No			
Requirement Met: Yes Land Applied: Yes Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 93.50 Outfall Number: 006 Method Date: 12/31/2015 Option Used To Satisfy Requirement: DRY90 Requirement Met: Yes Land Applied: Yes Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 90 S.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points) • No			
Land Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.50Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):90S.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Limit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.50Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Results (if applicable):93.50Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Outfall Number:006Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Method Date:12/31/2015Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Option Used To Satisfy Requirement:DRY90Requirement Met:YesLand Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I 0 Yes (40 Points)• No			
Requirement Met: Yes Land Applied: Yes Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 93.40 5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Land Applied:YesLimit (if applicable):90Results (if applicable):93.405.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I 0 Yes (40 Points)• No			0
Limit (if applicable): 90 Results (if applicable): 93.40 5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
Results (if applicable): 93.40 5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I o Yes (40 Points)			
 5.2 Was the limit exceeded or the process criteria not met at the time of I Yes (40 Points) 			
If yes, what action was taken?			
 6. Biosolids Storage 6.1 How many days of actual, current biosolids storage capacity did your facility have either on-site or off-site? >= 180 days (0 Points) 0 150 - 179 days (10 Points) 0 120 - 149 days (20 Points) 0 90 - 119 days (30 Points) 0 < 90 days (40 Points) 0 N/A (0 Points) 6.2 If you checked N/A above, explain why. 	wastewater treat	ment	0
 7. Issues 7.1 Describe any outstanding biosolids issues with treatment, use or overable 	all management:		
No Outstanding Biosolids Issues.	5		1

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Ο

Staffing and Preventative Maintenance (All Treatment Plants)

- 1. Plant Staffing
- 1.1 Was your wastewater treatment plant adequately staffed last year?
- Yes
- o No

If No, please explain:

Could use more help/staff for:

1.2 Did your wastewater staff have adequate time to properly operate and maintain the plant and fulfill all wastewater management tasks including recordkeeping?

• Yes

o No

If No, please explain:

2. Preventative Maintenance

2.1 Did your plant have a documented AND implemented plan for preventative maintenance on major equipment items?

• Yes (Continue with question 2)

o No (40 points)

If No, please explain, then go to question 3:

2.2 Did this preventative maintenance program depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, and other tasks necessary for each piece of equipment?

• Yes

O No (10 points)

2.3 Were these preventative maintenance tasks, as well as major equipment repairs, recorded and filed so future maintenance problems can be assessed properly?

• Yes

- Paper file system
- Computer system
- Both paper and computer system

O No (10 points)

3. O&M Manual

- 3.1 Does your plant have a detailed O&M Manual that can be used as a reference when needed?
- Yes

o No

4. Overall Maintenance /Repairs

4.1 Rate the overall maintenance of your wastewater plant.

o Excellent

• Very good

• Good

o Fair

o Poor

Describe your rating:

Maintenance work is addressed on a priority system in a timely manner.

	8/18/2016	2015
Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined	Last Updated:	Reporting For:

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Operator Certification and Education

1. Operato 1.1 Did yc ● Yes (0	r-In-Charge ou have a designated operator-ir points)	n-charge during the	e report year?)		
0 No (20) points)					0
Name						
Certificat	tion No: 01840					
2. Certifica 2.1 In acc and subcla treatment	ition Requirements cordance with Chapter NR 114.56 ass(es) were required for the op t plant and what level and subcla	6 and 114.57, Wisc erator-in-charge (0 ass(es) were held b	consin Admini DIC) to opera	strative Cod te the waste pr-in-charge?	e, what level water ?	
Sub	SubClass Description	WWTP		OIC		
Class		Advanced	OIT	Basic	Advanced	
A1	Suspended Growth Processes	Х			Х	
A2	Attached Growth Processes				Х	
A3	Recirculating Media Filters					
A4	Ponds, Lagoons and Natural				Х	
A5	Anaerobic Treatment Of Liquid					
В	Solids Separation	Х			Х	
С	Biological Solids/Sludges	Х			Х	0
Р	Total Phosphorus	Х			Х	
N	Total Nitrogen					
D	Disinfection	Х			Х	
L	Laboratory				Х	
U	Unique Treatment Systems					
SS	Sanitary Sewage Collection	Х	NA	NA	NA	
2.2 Was t plant? (No basic leve ● Yes (0 ● No (20	he operator-in-charge certified a ote: Certification in subclass SS, I only.) points) 0 points)	at the appropriate I N and A5 not requ	evel and subo ired in 2015	class(es) to c - 2016; subc	operate this class SS is	
 3. Success 3.1 In the to ensure of the following of the	ion Planning event of the loss of your design the continued proper operation owing options (check all that app r more additional certified opera angement with another certified angement with another communerator on staff who has an opera- tified within one year sultant to serve as your certified of the above (20 points) of the above" is selected, please	nated operator-in-c and maintenance c oly)? tors on staff operator nity with a certified tor-in-training certi operator e explain:	harge, did yo of the plant th operator ficate for you	u have a cor hat includes o ar plant and i	ntingency plan one or more is expected to	0
4. Continui 4.1 If you Education	ing Education Credits 1 had a designated operator-in-cl 1 Credits at the following rates?	harge, was the ope	rator-in-char	ge earning C	Continuing	

OIT and Basic Certification:

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined	Last Updated: 8/18/2016	Reporting For: 2015
 O Averaging 6 or more CECs per year. O Averaging less than 6 CECs per year. Advanced Certification: Averaging 8 or more CECs per year. O Averaging less than 8 CECs per year. 		

Total Points Generated	
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Reporting Year

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dis	t Combined		Last Updated: 8/18/2016	Reporting For 2015
Financial Managemer	it			
 Provider of Financial Info Name: Telephone: E-Mail Address (optional): 	Drmation David Deiringer (414) 225-2254 ddeiringer@mmsd.com		(XXX) XXX-X	xxx
 2. Treatment Works Operation 2.1 Are User Charges or on treatment plant AND/OR content Yes (0 points) No (40 points) If No, please explain: 	ting Revenues ther revenues sufficient to cove ollection system ?	r O&M expens	es for your wastev	vater
 2.2 When was the User Ch Year: 2015 0-2 years ago (0 points) 3 or more years ago (20 0 N/A (private facility) 2.3 Did you have a specia financial resources available plant and/or collection systematics Yes (0 points) No (40 points) 	arge System or other revenue s])) points) I account (e.g., CWFP required s le for repairing or replacing equi tem?	source(s) last segregated Re pment for you	reviewed and/or re placement Fund, e ir wastewater trea	evised? 0 etc.) or tment
REPLACEMENT FUNDS [PI	JBLIC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES S	HALL COMPLE	TE QUESTION 3]	
 3. Equipment Replacement 3.1 When was the Equipm Year: 2015 1-2 years ago (0 points) 0 3 or more years ago (20 0 N/A If N/A, please explain: 	Funds ent Replacement Fund last revie])) points)	ewed and/or r	evised?	
2.2. Equipment Depleseres				
3.2.1 Ending Balance Re 3.2.2 Adjustments - if neo audit correction, withdrawa	eported on Last Year's CMAR essary (e.g. earned interest, al of excess funds, increase all, etc.)	9	5 <u>14,411,000</u> 5 (0.00
3.2.3 Adjusted January 1s	t Beginning Balance	ç	5 14,411,000	0.00
3.2.4 Additions to Fund (e earned interest, etc.)	.g. portion of User Fee,	+ \$	98,308	3.00
3.2.5 Subtractions from Fireplacement, major repairs3.2.6.1 below*)3.2.6 Ending Balance as one of the second second	und (e.g., equipment 5 - use description box f December 31st for CMAR	- 9	5	0.00

\$

14,509,308.00

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined	Last Updated 8/18/2016	l: Reporting 2015	For
All Sources: This ending balance should include all Equipment Replacement Funds whether held in a bank account(s), certificate(s) of deposit, etc.			
3.2.6.1 Indicate adjustments, equipment purchases, and/or major repairs	from 3.2.5 al	oove.	
3.3 What amount should be in your Peplacement Fund? \$ 14.500	208.00		
Please note: If you had a CWFP loan, this amount was originally based or Assistance Agreement (FAA) and should be regularly updated as needed. instructions and an example can be found by clicking the HELP link under menu.	the Financial Further calcul Info in the lef	lation ft-side	0
 3.3.1 Is the December 31 Ending Balance in your Replacement Fund above greater than the amount that should be in it (#3.3)? Yes 	re, (#3.2.6) eo	qual to, or	
O No If No, please explain.			
 4. Future Planning 4.1 During the next ten years, will you be involved in formal planning for u or new construction of your treatment facility or collection system? Yes - If Yes, please provide major project information, if not already lis No 	pgrading, reh ted below.	abilitating,	
Project Project Description #	Estimated A Cost	Approximate Construction Year	
1 Conveyance Projects : 30 Projects	135066435	2021	
2 Water Reclamation Facilities(Jones Island and South Shore) Projects: 98 projects	258485549	2021	
5. Financial Management General Comments			
Response #4 above represents planned spending for conveyance and wate facilities(Jones Island and South Shore) projects for the District's 6-year p in 2016. Additional projects, i.e. watercourse improvement and other projects, during the same 6-year period will total \$921.2 million. For a com projects and expenditures planned for the period 2016 to 2021, refer to the Budget.	er reclamation lanning cycle l ects, as well a plete listing of e MMSD 2016	beginning s debt f all 6 Capital	

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems

 CMOM Program 1.1 Do you have a Capacity, Management, Operation & Maintenance (CMOM) requirement in your WPDES permit? Yes
1.2 Did you have a documented (written records/files, computer files, video tapes, etc.) sanitary
 Sewer collection system operation & maintenance (O&M) or CMOM program last calendar year? Yes (Continue with question 1)
• No (30 points) (Go to question 2)
1.3 Check the elements listed below that are included in your O&M or CMOM program.
⊠ Goals
Describe the specific goals you have for your collection system:
 The MMSD CMOM goals related to the conveyance and storage system as presented in the CMOM Program Annual Report for 2015, are: 1. Continue the support of the CMOM Program within the District organizational structure. 2. Communicate the goals and objectives of the CMOM Program to internal and external stakeholders, monitor the CMOM Program, and institute program modifications. 3. Continue to maintain adequate financial planning. 4. Continue to comply with regulatory requirements. 5. Continue to support and monitor the regional CMOM program. 6. Continue to maintain a safe work environment and facilities and also sustain a competent workforce. 7. Establish CMOM program elements specific to minimizing the number and volume of CSOs. 8. Continue to implement and support the Wet Weather Peak Flow Management Program. 9. Where possible, establish additional practices to prevent SSOs, maintain or improve system performance, and avoid preventable failures. 10. Continue to establish and document level of protection, design, and performance standards for new conveyance assets constructed in the District service area, and consider documented and predicted changes in climate. 11. Minimize the cost of conveyance asset ownership while maintaining necessary stewardship of
assets and achieving defined protection levels. 12.Enhance District level of knowledge and understanding of wet weather flows and system response to precipitation and other factors. 13.Provide information receipt, response activity, and feedback regarding customer inquiries.
 Do you have the following written organizational elements (check only those that apply)? Ownership and governing body description Organizational chart Personnel and position descriptions
Internal communication procedures
\square Internal communication procedures \square Public information and education program
Do you have the legal authority for the following (check only those that apply)?
Sewer use ordinance Last Revised Date (MM/DD/YYYY) $01/25/2010$
X Pretreatment/industrial control Programs
X Fat, oil and grease control
✓ Illicit discharges (commercial, industrial)
Private property clear water (sump pumps roof or foundation drains, etc.)
\square Private lateral inspections/repairs
Service and management agreements
Maintenance Activities (provide details in question 2)

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist	Combined	Last Updated:	Reporting For:
		0/10/2010	
 ☑ Design and Performance How do you ensure that y ☐ State plumbing code ☑ DNR NR 110 standards ☐ Local municipal code r ☑ Construction, inspection ☐ Others: 	Provisions our sewer system is designed and constructe s equirements on, and testing	d properly?	
 Overflow Emergency Res Does your emergency res Alarm system and rou Emergency equipment Emergency procedures 	sponse Plan: ponse capability include (check only those th tine testing : s	at apply)?	
Communications/notif	ications (DNR, internal, public, media, etc.)		
Capacity Assurance:			
How well do you know you Current and up-to-dat	ur sewer system? Do you have the following? e sewer map	>	
Sewer system plans a	nd specifications		
Manhole location map			
Lift station pump and Lift station O&M manu	als		
Within your sewer system Areas with flat sewers	have you identified the following?		0
Areas with surcharging	g 		
Areas with bottlenecks	s or constrictions		
Areas with chronic bas	sement backups or SSUs		
Areas with boovy root	arouth		
Areas with excessive i	growth pfiltration/inflow (1/1)		
Areas with sovere de	finite attom in the second sec		
Adoguacy of capacity f	for now connections		
\square Lift station canacity ar	ad/or numping problems		
Annual Self-Auditing of v	our O&M/CMOM Program to ensure above co	moonents are heir	
implemented, evaluated,	and re-prioritized as needed		'9
Special Studies Last Yea	r (check only those that apply):		
☑ Infiltration/Inflow (I/I)) Analysis		
Sewer System Evaluat	ion Survey (SSES)		
Sewer Evaluation and	Capacity Managment Plan (SECAP)		
Lift Station Evaluation	Report		
⊠ Others:			
In 2015, MMSD comple Overflow at Brown Dee	eted the following special study: Analysis of A er Road, Bayside.	April 2015 Sanitary	' Sewer
2. Operation and Maintenan	ce		
2.1 Did your sanitary sewe maintenance activities? Con	r collection system maintenance program inc nplete all that apply and indicate the amount	lude the following maintained.	
Flow monitoring	85 % of system/year		

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist	Combined		Last Updated: 8/18/2016	Reporting Fo 2015
Smoke testing	0	% of system/year		
Sewer line televising	3.76	% of system/year		
Manhole inspections	0	% of system/year		
Lift station O&M	16.3	# per L.S./year		
Manhole rehabilitation	2.92	% of manholes rehabbed		
Mainline rehabilitation	0	% of sewer lines rehabbe	d	
Private sewer inspections	0.7	% of system/year		
Private sewer I/I removal	0.2	% of private services		
Please include additional c	omments about your	sanitary sewer collection s	system below:	
3. Performance mulcators 3.1 Provide the following co 32.84 Total 34.76 Annua 34.76 Annua 318 Miles 19 Numb 0 Numb 0 Numb 0 Numb 0 Numb 11 Numb 87 Avera 121 Peak 333 Peak 3.2 Performance ratios for th 0.00 Lift st 0.00 Sewe 0.01 Sanita 0.00 Baser 0.03 Comp 1.4 Peaki 3.8 Peaki	ellection system and f actual amount of pre- al average precipitati of sanitary sewer per of lift stations per of lift station failu- per of sewer pipe failu- per of basement back per of complaints age daily flow in MGD hourly flow in MGD (ne past year: cation failures (failure r pipe failures (pipe f ary sewer overflows ment backups (numb plaints (number/sewe ng factor ratio (Peak ng factor ratio (Peak	flow information for the pase ecipitation last year in inchest on (for your location) ares ures up occurrences (if available) (if available) (if available) if available) es/year) failures/sewer mile/yr) (number/sewer mile/yr) er/sewer mile) er mile) Monthly: Annual Daily Avg) Hourly: Annual Daily Avg)	st year. es	
4. Overflows				

Last Updated:	Reporting For:
8/18/2016	2015

Date Location Cause Estimated Volume (MG) 0 4/9/2015 9-28:00 AM WPDES 263 -Gravity overflow bypass relief sewer at Rain 1.67 - 1.67 1 1/9/2015 12:18:00 PM MNSD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd Rain 0.36 - 0.36 1 1/9/2015 100:00 PM MNSD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd Rain 0.36 - 0.36 **1 If here were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected. 0.36 - 0.36 **1 If here were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected. 0.36 - 0.36 **1 If here were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected. 0.36 - 0.36 **1 If here were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected. 0.36 - 0.36 **1 of targe analysis was completed and concluded that the main causes of the overflow in E. Brown Deer Road were precipitation and inadequate conveyance capacity of the 72-inch MIS from W. Mill Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W. Green Tree Road at N. Niere Road, compounde by indequate conveyance capacity in the 15-inch MIS more M. Simo M. Sidney Place upstream to W. Green Tree Road at N. Niere Road, compounde by indequate conveyance expecting the Verson Deer Road verson the separate sever area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, Implemented in 2011, in		LIST OF SANITARY SE	WER (SSO) AND TREATMENT FACILITY (T	FO) OFERFLOWS RE	PORTED **		
a Very2015 9-28:00 AM Very2015 22:18:00 PM 1 Very2015 12:18:00 PM Creen Tree Rd at Milwaukee River in River Hills 1.67 - 1.67 1 Very2015 12:18:00 PM MMSD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd Rain 0.36 - 0.36 1 Very2015 6:00:00 PM MMSD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd Rain 0.36 - 0.36 ** If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until Corrected. What actions were taken, or are underway, to reduce or eliminate SSO or TFO occurrences in the future? A root cause analysis was completed and concluded that the main causes of the overflow In E. Brown Deer Road were precipitation and inadequate conveyance capacity of the 72-inch MIS from V. MIII Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W Green Tree Road. Deer Road. A planning analysis for both the 72-inch MIS from V. MIII Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W Green Tree Road. 5. Infiltration / Inflow (1/1) 5.1 Total asse analysis for both the 72-inch dila from V. MIII Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W Green Tree Road. 6 No 1 Crean Free Road. 5. Infiltration / Inflow (1/1) 5.1 If the rean Road. 5.1 Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contribu		Date	Location	Cause	Estimated Volume (MG)		
1 4/9/2015 1:00:00 PM MISD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd Rain 0.36 - 0.36 ** If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DIR and stop work on this section until corrected. What actions were taken, or are underway, to reduce or eliminate SSO or TFO occurrences in the future? A root cause analysis was completed and concluded that the main causes of the overflow in E. Brown Deer Road were precipitation and inadequate conveyance capacity of the T2-inch MIS from W. Mill Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W. Green Tree Road and N. River Road, compounded by inadequate conveyance capacity in the T3-inch MIS in W. Brown Deer Road. A lanning analysis for both the T2-inch MIS from W. Mill Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to the Ceren Tree Road and N. River Road, compounded by inadequate conveyance capacity in the T3-inch MIS in W. Brown Deer Road. 5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/I) Significant in your community last year? • Yes O No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sever area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, implemented in 2011, intends to encourage and assist development and implementation of satellite municipality private property work to reduce I/I from private property sources. 5.2. Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year? • Yes No 1f Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow	0	4/9/2015 9:28:00 AM - 4/9/2015 12:18:00 PM	WPDES 263 -Gravity overflow bypass relief sewer at Green Tree Rd at Milwaukee River in River Hills	Rain	1.67 - 1.67		
 ** If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected. What actions were taken, or are underway, to reduce or eliminate SSO or TFO occurences in the future? A root cause analysis was completed and concluded that the main causes of the overflow in E. Brown Deer Road were precipitation and inadequate conveyance capacity of the 72-inch MIS from W. Mill Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W. Green Tree Road and N. River Road, compounded by inadequate conveyance capacity in the 15-inch MIS in w. Brown Deer Road. A planning analysis for both the 72-inch diameter MIS and the 15-inch diameter MIS is scheduled to begin in 2016. The study will include the evaluation of capacity improvements, as well as the feasibility of removing the overflow at Green Tree Road. 5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/I) 5.1 Was infiltration/inflow (I/I) significant in your community last year? • Yes • No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, implemented in 2011, intends to encourage and assist development and implementation of satellite municipality private property work to reduce I/I from private property sources. 5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year? • Yes • No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow (I/I) in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD conveyance system and is one of the primary causes of separate sever overflows from the MMSD system. 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believ	1	4/9/2015 1:00:00 PM - 4/9/2015 6:00:00 PM	MMSD MIS Manhole 15604 on Brown Deer Rd	Rain	0.36 - 0.36		
A root cause analysis was completed and concluded that the main causes of the overflow in E. Brown Deer Road were precipitation and inadequate conveyance capacity of the 72-inch MIS from W. Mill Road and N. Sidney Place upstream to W. Green Tree Road and N. River Road. compounded by inadequate conveyance capacity in the 15-inch MIS in W. Brown Deer Road. A planning analysis for both the 72-inch diameter MIS and the 15-inch diameter MIS is scheduled to begin in 2016. The study will include the evaluation of capacity improvements, as well as the feasibility of removing the overflow at Green Tree Road.	** cor	If there were any SSOs or T rected.	FOs that are not listed above, please contact the DN	R and stop work on this s	section until		
 5. Infiltration / Inflow (1/1) 5.1 Was infiltration/inflow (1/1) significant in your community last year? Yes No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, implemented in 2011, intends to encourage and assist development and implementation of satellite municipality private property work to reduce I/I from private property sources. 5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year? Yes No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow (1/1) in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer overflows from the MMSD conveyance system and is one of the primary causes of separate sewer overflows from the MMSD system. 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (1/1) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believes that 1/1 has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/1 reduction projects completed or in progress in the first 5 years of the PPI/1 Program. Many of the municipalities also completed public sector 1/1 reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue 1/1 reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce 1/1. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system? 	A pr W D 20 at	root cause analysis was con recipitation and inadequate of C Green Tree Road and N. R eer Road. A planning analys D16. The study will include Green Tree Road.	npleted and concluded that the main causes of the ov conveyance capacity of the 72-inch MIS from W. Mill iver Road, compounded by inadequate conveyance ca is for both the 72-inch diameter MIS and the 15-inch the evaluation of capacity improvements, as well as t	rerflow in E. Brown Deer Road and N. Sidney Place apacity in the 15-inch MI diameter MIS is schedule he feasibility of removing	Road were e upstream to S in W. Brown ed to begin in g the overflow		
Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, implemented in 2011, intends to encourage and assist development and implementation of satellite municipality private property work to reduce I/I from private property sources. 5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year? • Yes • No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow (I/I) in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD conveyance system and is one of the primary causes of separate sewer overflows from the MMSD system. 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believes that I/I has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system?	 5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/I) 5.1 Was infiltration/inflow (I/I) significant in your community last year? Yes No If Yea, places describe: 						
 5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year? Yes No If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow (I/I) in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD conveyance system and is one of the primary causes of separate sewer overflows from the MMSD system. 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believes that I/I has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects completed public sector I/I reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system? 		Infiltration and Inflow in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD system. The PPI/I Program, implemented in 2011, intends to encourage and assist development and implementation of satellite municipality private property work to reduce I/I from private property sources.					
If Yes, please describe: Infiltration and inflow (I/I) in satellite municipal collection systems is the primary contributor of peak flows from the separate sewer area of the MMSD conveyance system and is one of the primary causes of separate sewer overflows from the MMSD system. 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believes that I/I has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects completed or in progress in the first 5 years of the PPI/I Program. Many of the municipalities also completed public sector I/I reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system?	5.2 yo •	2 Has infiltration/inflov ur collection system, li Yes No	w and resultant high flows affected perforn ft stations, or treatment plant at any time	nance or created pro in the past year?	oblems in		
 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: MMSD believes that I/I has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects completed or in progress in the first 5 years of the PPI/I Program. Many of the municipalities also completed public sector I/I reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system? 		f Yes, please describe Infiltration and inflow peak flows from the s primary causes of sep	: (I/I) in satellite municipal collection system eparate sewer area of the MMSD conveyar parate sewer overflows from the MMSD sys	ms is the primary co ice system and is or tem.	pontributor of ne of the		
MMSD believes that I/I has been reduced over the past year. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects completed or in progress in the first 5 years of the PPI/I Program. Many of the municipalities also completed public sector I/I reduction projects. Municipalities have entered into a stipulation with the state to continue I/I reduction work. MMSD has adopted peak flow performance standards in its Chapter 3 revisions which require tributary municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, all municipalities have developed and implemented CMOM programs.	5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years:						
5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system?		MMSD believes that I/I twenty-eight member in the first 5 years of the reduction projects. Multi reduction work. MMSD which require tributary and implemented CMO	has been reduced over the past year. Two municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects PPI/I Program. Many of the municipalities nicipalities have entered into a stipulation has adopted peak flow performance stand municipalities to reduce I/I. In addition, a M programs.	enty-five of the s completed or in pr also completed pub with the state to cor ards in its Chapter 3 Il municipalities hav	ogress in lic sector I/I ntinue I/I 3 revisions re developed		
	5.4	4 What is being done t	o address infiltration/inflow in your collecti	on system?			

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

MMSD continues sewer rehab through Operation and Maintenance, and Capital programs. As part of this program, the District has installed approximately 143 area velocity meters in strategically selected sanitary sewers within its service area to more accurately measure wastewater flows under both dry and wet weather conditions. The area velocity meters replaced previously installed level sensors, which were used to calculate wastewater flows based on a Manning equation; however, this method of flow measurement does not work under surcharged conditions. The area velocity meters will use depth and average velocities to more accurately calculate flows and will work under surcharged conditions. Most of the flow measurements are recorded on a real time basis and displayed on the District's conveyance SCADA system. All of the flow measurements are recorded in five minute intervals in the District's historical flow data repository. The measured peak flows will be compared to the allowable peak flows listed in Chapter 3 of the District's rules. Action will be taken for any metersheds that are identified as exceeding the allowable peak flows. MMSD is continuing to work with satellite municipalities to reduce inflow and infiltration with the wet weather peak flow management program. MMSD has implemented the Private Property Inflow and Infiltration (PPI/I) Reduction Program in 2011 to support municipal work in reducing I/I from local private property sources. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight member municipalities have PPI/I reduction projects completed or in progress in the 5th year of the PPI/I Program. MMSD completed and implemented the MMSD CMOM program in 2007 and continued implementation in 2012.

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Grading Summary

WPDES No: 0036820

SECTIONS	LETTER GRADE	GRADE POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	SECTION POINTS
Influent	A	4	3	12
BOD/CBOD	A	4	10	40
TSS	A	4	5	20
Phosphorus	A	4	3	12
Biosolids	А	4	5	20
Staffing/PM	А	4	1	4
OpCert	А	4	1	4
Financial	A	4	1	4
Collection	А	4	3	12
TOTALS		32	128	
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) = 4.00				

Notes:

- A = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)
- B = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)

C = Recommendation Range (Response Required)

D = Action Range (Response Required)

F = Action Range (Response Required)

Milwaukee Metro Sew Dist Combined

Last Updated: Reporting For: 8/18/2016 2015

Resolution or Owner's Statement

Name of Governing		
Body or Owner: MINISD Commission		
Action Taken: 09/26/2016		
Resolution Number:		
Date of Submittal:		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO SPECIFIC CMAR		
SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for grade C, D, or F): Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: TSS: Grade = A		
Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = A		
Biosolids Quality and Management: Grade = A		
Staffing: Grade = A		
Operator Certification: Grade = A		
Financial Management: Grade = A		
Collection Systems: Grade = A		
(Regardless of grade, response required for Collection Systems if SSOs were reported)		
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO THE OVERALL		
(Optional for G.P.A. greater than or equal to 3.00, required for G.P.A. less than 3.00)		
G.P.A. = 4.00		